

INTERNATIONAL AFRICAN INSTITUTE

LUGARD LECTURE 2003

© International African Institute

A View of Africa: the International African Institute

John Middleton¹

This paper has two aims. One is to offer an outline account of the history and activities of the International African Institute, of which there is no full-length published history;² the second is to ask how this intermediary institution, as it may be called, has been related to and has affected our knowledge of Africa. There are several histories of the study of Africa and the various disciplines concerned with it, most being limited to arguments for or against various 'schools' of anthropology, history, and other fields;³ but there are few histories of research institutes, even though they are both influenced and shaped by disciplinary developments and also influence and shape the disciplines themselves. An example is the relationship between the study of Africa and the International African Institute, an organization concerned with the study of African societies and cultures, and known mainly as the publisher of a widely read journal, many scholarly books, and for its seminar and other programmes. Its first chairman was Lord

¹Editor's note: This paper was first presented as the IAI-sponsored Lugard Lecture in 2003. John Middleton was revising his text to render the paper a more full account of the history of the IAI at the time of his death in 2009. Notably, John was planning to add material on the latest 30 years of the Institute's existence, on the instrumental role played by Jacob Ajayi, on the European connections, and on the legacy of the International Institute of African Languages and Culture's important African orthography initiative. Sadly, John did not live to complete that work. The paper is therefore published on the IAI's website, though incomplete, in the latest available version submitted in November 2008. With only minor copyediting, it remains as faithful as possible to John Middleton's original text. It remains amongst John Middleton's last unpublished works.

²Except for Edwin Smith's and David Dalby's brief accounts of its early years, from which I have drawn some of my history of the Institute's beginnings. See Smith 1937 and Dalby, a former the editor of the Institute's journal *Africa*, and later the Administrative Director. There is also a short earlier account by Lord Lugard (1928).

³I find the most useful to be Kuper 1973, Goody 1995, Asad 1973, and for the earlier phase of the Institute's history Kuklick 1991.

Lugard, in whose honour the Lugard Lectures have been given at various times.⁴

The Institute's full title is 'The International Institute for the Study of African Languages and Cultures', and its early work was mainly on languages and cultural institutions as adjuncts to the improvement of education in African colonies. Its aims and history should be seen largely in the light of the interdependence between it and the discipline of anthropology, which has been and remains that most closely linked to the Institute's aims and programmes during the last years of what its former chairman Jacob Ajayi has called 'the colonial interlude' and the first years of the post-colonial period. This interdependence has essentially been between anthropologists and others as producers of knowledge of African societies and their cultures, on the one hand, and the Institute as a non-profit making disseminator of that knowledge, on the other, even though it has also organized its own research projects. An account of the Institute over more than three quarters of a century must be set against the wider colonial and intellectual history of the time: it cannot be understood in isolation. It has been intimately linked to that of social anthropology, as I discuss below, but I do not repeat in detail the many accounts of the relationship between that discipline and colonialism. Nevertheless, there has been over almost a century an consistently single view of 'Africa' held by the Institute's officers and members, a view that, translated into action, has had an important influence on the world's view of the continent's peoples.

The Institute's history may be seen as comprising three phases or periods, linked to societal and cultural changes in African and European societies and the aims of scholars concerned to understand them. The first phase included the Institute's formal founding in London in 1926 and lasted until the end of the second World War in 1945. By the 1920s tropical Africa was no longer in its former isolation from Europe, but contact between the two continents had most deeply affected the coastal lands and peoples, even though virtually every part of the continent

⁴I am honoured to have been invited to give the Lugard Lecture for 2003, the first in several years, on which this paper is based. The Chairman, Professor V.Y.Mudimbe, suggested it to mark 75 years of Executive Council meetings and to provide a brief general history. This somewhat personal account is based on Institute records, on past years of the journal *Africa*, and on conversations at various times with E.M.Chilver, David Dalby, Germaine Dieterlen, Elizabeth Dunstan, Meyer Fortes, Daryll Forde, Jacqueline Hunt, Phyllis Kaberry, Lucy Mair, Barbara Pym, and Jean Rouch.

had long been formally absorbed into one European colonial empire or another. The most powerful colonial rulers of Africa were Britain and France, with Portugal, Belgium, Italy, and Spain lagging behind. Germany had lost its colonies in 1918 and they had been distributed between Britain, France, and South Africa, and South Africa had been a self-governing dominion since 1910. The United States showed little interest in Africa beyond its virtual colony Liberia. The academic study of tropical Africa was growing but was still largely inchoate and of little general importance, and there was little cooperation between the scholars of the linguistically diverse European countries whose colonial policies differed widely. Little was yet widely known in Europe about African societies, their languages and their cultures, and most of what knowledge existed was held by missionary organizations. This period was that of high colonialism, and the Institute had the task of making its way as worthy of support, or at least not of disapproval, by colonial administrations which did not encourage research into their activities.

After the second World War there followed the second phase, which forever changed the importance of knowledge of Africa, the aims and activities of the Institute and the colonial powers' universities and research organizations, as well as the academic disciplines associated with them. This phase was that of preparation for decolonization, of formal postcolonial independence, and of what has often been called modernization, a confused notion but which none the less provided new research aims in political, economic, social and cultural fields following radical structural changes in virtually all African societies. This was a phase of extensive research work within Africa itself, by both non-African and, increasingly, African academics and 'development' practitioners. Anthropology changed radically from previous emphasis on evolutionist and diffusionist theories to the practice of functionalism, and the relationship between the 'academic' and the 'practical' in Africanist research became central to the role of the Institute. We may then discern the third and present phase of the Institute's history, in which the Institute has had to rethink its aims and organization, although without being as assured of its programmes as previously. Today we may discern the beginning of a probable fourth phase. The Institute has thus been for more than three quarters of a century, and remains, both a mirror of the ill-defined idea of 'Africa' and of differences in its continual

'invention' and 're-invention' by both Africans and others⁵ and also a crucial link between the study of 'Africa' and of its social and political culture and forms of organization and government.

The founding of the Institute

In the years after the first World War colonial administrations and missionary bodies increasingly realized the importance of education in Africa as necessary for 'development' and as an apparently politically easy and peaceful way of 'civilizing primitive peoples'. The American Phelps-Stokes Fund had sent an investigatory educational commission to Africa in 1920-21, and in 1923 the British Colonial Office, influenced by its findings, established an Advisory Committee on Educational Policy in British Tropical African Dependencies, with its secretary Major (later Sir) Hanns Fischer, a former educational official in Nigeria. The Committee's work interested missionary organizations in Britain, Germany, and France, and in 1924 these held a meeting on African education at High Leigh in Hertfordshire, largely organized by the former missionary J.H. Oldham, who in 1931 until 1938 became the Institute's Administrative Director.⁶ In 1925 the colonial office's Advisory Committee organized a conference on the same topic at the School of Oriental Studies (as it then was) in London and established a Bureau of African Languages and Literatures. This was followed by a wider international conference in June 1926, which renamed it the International Institute for the Study of African Languages and Cultures on 1 July 1926. This formal inauguration included an address by the then Secretary of State for the Dominions, who emphasized the urgent need for help in colonial education. Thus the Institute was founded by a small group of European men and women with long and varied colonial interests and experiences who were linked to and had the support of many in the fields of missionary endeavour and colonial administration; some came from the few academic bodies than interested in Africa. It was accepted that it was essential that the Institute be an independent organization and not merely an arm of Christian missions or of the British Colonial Office, but certainly the original plans were largely put

⁵See V.Y. Mudimbe 1988 and 1997.

⁶See Clements 1999 for a biography of Oldham. He was also the Secretary of the Church Missionary Society from 1921 until 1938: the missionary influence on the Institute was crucial during much of its first phase.

forward by those bodies and their influence remained strong for most of the Institute's first phase.

The first chairman was Lord Frederick Lugard, at first sight perhaps an odd choice but in fact a brilliant one. The Institute was concerned with change and development – mainly educational and humanitarian but essentially within the colonialist context – and needed someone with willingness to accept and act on new ideas, with colonial experience and with political influence. They found him in Lugard, a military figure who had a record both of helping to abolish the African slave trade and of introducing into Africa a new form of colonial administration ('indirect rule') to reflect and include indigenous forms of government. He became the Institute's chairman, with two directors: one was a former French colonial governor, Maurice Delafosse, who died the same year and was replaced by another French ex-governor, Henri Labouret, and the German linguist Dietrich Westermann. Hanns Fischer (who had been director of education in Northern Nigeria with Lugard) became Vice-Director and Secretary-General, with the assistance of Sir Humphrey Leggett as treasurer and a month or two later a secretary, Dorothy Brackett. The Institute had a Governing Body of up to sixty representatives of scholarly institutions in Britain, France, Germany, and elsewhere (only one from Africa, and he was from Egypt), and an Executive Council of up to fifteen members (the Governing Body was too diffuse to control everyday affairs) The Executive Council included several former administrative, missionary, and military officials,⁷ three anthropologists, Lucien-Lévy-Bruhl (France), Charles G. Seligman (London) and Fr Schebesta (Vienna), and the linguist Alice Werner (London), who together represented academic concerns in distinction to the more 'practical' ones of the majority. The first meeting of the Council was held at the British Colonial Office in London in October 1926 and the second two months later at the French Ministry for the Colonies in Paris; it met again in London in 1927 and in Berlin in 1928. The Institute's journal *Africa* was first published in 1926 with Professor Westermann as editor and has appeared with four issues a year ever since but for a gap during the second World War.

The leading figure was Lord Frederick John Dealtry Lugard. Who was he? He was born in 1858

⁷Many colonial administrators at that time were retired or seconded military officers.

in Madras, the son of a Protestant clergyman. He joined the British army and during the 1880s fought in various Asian wars; in 1890 he was sent by the British East Africa Company to obtain a treaty of allegiance from the Kabaka of Uganda; in 1895 he became High Commissioner for Northern Nigeria; and was appointed Governor of Hong Kong from 1907 to 1912. Finally in 1914 he was appointed the first Governor-General of a united Nigeria where his fame came largely from his introduction of so-called 'Indirect Rule', based largely on his experience as an administrator in India. He came to exercise immense influence in colonial matters and his position as chairman of the Institute is an indication of the importance of the Institute's foundation. He died in England in 1945.⁸

At its beginning the Institute represented two main concerns: that of the Christian missions which saw it as providing knowledge useful for their conversion of African peoples, and that of colonial administrations which realized that they needed educated Africans if they were to administer their territories efficiently and cheaply, and thought that greater knowledge of African peoples might help them obtain them. Although both administrations and missions were to different degrees and in different ways directly self-interested, they were also at least ostensibly concerned with the wellbeing and moral advancement (as they saw it) of the peoples of tropical Africa. It is easy today to overemphasize their self-interest, but many - perhaps most - colonial and mission reports of the period show a sense of intellectual concern and responsibility for what they did although usually unable to achieve much, due largely to their ignorance of African societies and cultures as well as the nature of their own roles within Africa itself. There has always been uncertainty and conflict in the role of the Institute and its supporters between the 'practical' and the 'academic' or 'intellectual' in understanding Africa and in administering and educating its peoples, even if understanding and administering were not all that separated. Besides missionaries and administrators, the latter typically doubtful of the value of 'academic' research, the Institute has always, and increasingly, attracted both the support of and has been dependent upon academic interests, learned and well-funded foundations, and to a much less extent commercial and financial companies. One of its successes has been to help transform the narrow concerns of administration and of missionary

⁸See Margery Perham 1956-1960.

conversion into a wider interest in and understanding of the 'ordinary' and often regarded as inferior people of Africa by both Europeans and Africans themselves.

The Institute's aims in the colonial world

The Institute's aims were clearly set out in the first issue of *Africa*, in 1928, which Lugard introduced by writing that the Institute was to be a 'coordinating agency' and clearing house for information about Africa, to disseminate information, stimulate enquiries, and exchange ideas; emphasis would be given to articles on education and the provision of books for African schools. Following were papers on language and cultural identity; on African music; on Mandingo theatre; on anthropology and Christian missions; on a common script for Gold Coast languages; on recent publications on 'African tribes'; and on orthography for African languages. Later issues of the same year included articles on preferential marriage in South Africa and on dance.⁹ Plans were made to publish book reviews, a series of 'African Studies' by 'experts', another on 'African Documents' by African writers, in their own languages and to be awarded cash prizes,¹⁰ and items of research news.

The readership of the journal, the Institute's longest lasting achievement, has always been of central concern, as membership of the Institute has been by subscription to it. Some subscribers were 'practical' in terms of missionary endeavour, which varied as to whether vocational or 'classical' education were the better, or at least the more useful; others were local administrators troubled by their ignorance of the peoples whom they ruled, yet who also held that 'practical' education was more useful for their subjects and feared that 'academic' education might give them ideas above their station in the colonial world. Very few readers were African: their believed interests were at the time rarely catered for outside missionary institutions, few individuals could afford the subscription in any case, and the literate elite of the time was small, comprising mostly lawyers and political officials in western and southern Africa. However, the journal played a crucial role that grew ever more important in later years by emphasizing and making 'academic' researches, views, and ideas open to its readership. This role of course

⁹By E.E.Evans-Pritchard, his second published article.

¹⁰The Margaret Wrong prize, awarded from 1930, but later dropped.

mirrored a central problem of missionary and administrative headquarters in Europe, that of guiding their representatives within Africa itself who were in turn expected to represent their local subjects and who, with Lugard himself, held that to do their work properly local 'indirect' rulers might need as much academic as practical knowledge.

Much was to change in later years, in particular the emphasis on language work. One reason was the increasing control of education in most colonies by their administrations, even where the actual schools were still run by missions; the other was that students of African languages were decreasingly missionaries but rather professional academic linguists who wanted more specialized and technical studies; in addition, literature and education were soon to develop into professionally separate disciplines. The Institute was increasingly left with the field of 'culture' and so with an emphasis on anthropology, at first mainly the ethnological study of what the German members called the *naturvoelker*, but during the 1930s also an increasingly professional discipline concerned not only with Africa but also with comparisons of the entire spectrum of human societies throughout the world.

The Institute soon came to have the central task of gathering and disseminating ethnographic knowledge. There were at the time only a few important Africanist monographs, mostly by missionaries: John Roscoe's *The Baganda* (1911), Junod's *Life of a South African Tribe* (1913), Smith and Dale's *The Ila of Northern Rhodesia* (1920), and Lindblom's *The Akamba of Kenya* (1920, the only one of these monographs by a professional ethnographer). However, in 1922 there had been published two deeply influential non-African ethnographies: Bronislaw Malinowski's *The Argonauts of the Western Pacific* and A.R Radcliffe-Brown's *The Andaman Islanders*. These books turned British anthropology, at least, from the romantic meanderings of Sir James Frazer into a modern discipline. Other theoretically important works came from France and influenced British anthropology, mainly through Radcliffe-Brown. All influenced by the work of Emile Durkheim, these included writings by Arnold van Gennep, Marcel Mauss, Robert Hertz, and Lucien Levy-Bruhl. These gave impetus to the new Africanist research of the 1930s, beginning with the Seligmans' *Pagan Tribes of the Nilotic Sudan* (1932) and the reports of the government anthropologists Rattray in the Gold Coast, Meek and Abraham in Nigeria, and others elsewhere, followed by the most influential of them all, Evans-Pritchard's *Witchcraft, Oracles, and Magic*

among the Azande of 1937, which put to rest earlier notions of 'primitive mentality' and 'pre-rational thought' and enabled anthropology to make more than superficial descriptive ethnographies of Africa: there were no more 'pre-logical' 'primitives'. This also solved the missionary problem of whether Africans could become Christians if their mode of thought meant that they could not understand the Bible: to change it had led largely to the Institute's original emphasis on education as the basis for all 'moral development'.

Besides publishing the journal *Africa* the Institute has always had an important programme of publishing books, thereby demonstrating its main aims and ambitions as an intermediary between scholarly research and the general public. The first books published were in 1931, Thomas Mofolo's *Chaka: An Historical Romance* and H.A. Stayt, *The Bavenda*, followed in 1933 by Westermann and Ward's *Practical Phonetics for Students of African Languages*. These showed the Institute's views of its responsibilities: to show the modernity of African civilizations, the nature of African societies, and that of African languages. To continue the first did not prove easy due to the then lack of material, although to some extent made up by the awards of the Wrong prizes that started in 1930. The emphasis on ethnography became the most important of the three, with at least one volume published in most years. There was also a steady flow of linguistic material geared to the educational needs of African schools. The Institute also published a series of Memoranda on specific or narrow topics not suitable for full length books or journal articles.

The history of the International African Institute before the second world war should thus be considered in the light of the changing aims of the colonial powers, the influence and support of, yet often opposition to, the Institute by the same colonial powers and by missionary organizations, the continued colonization of the indigenous societies of the continent; and the development of the academic disciplines concerned with Africa. The Institute's directors had to juggle their ever-uncertain roles and it was always difficult for them to integrate the often contradictory messages they received from the various actors involved. They had also to take account of the often abrasive personalities and the enmities of academic, colonial, and missionary leaders concerned with funding, publishing, and other activities of the Institute's programmes.

The knowledge of Africa

I have suggested that the history of the Institute may be divided into three phases which correspond closely to those of the history of colonialism and postcolonialism. When the Institute was founded in 1926 the then colonial world appeared to be solid and long-lasting, despite the end of the German empire. European governments still accepted the 'naturalness', the 'mandate', the 'duty', and the 'moral responsibility', of colonial overrule. There were no very obvious official plans for ending it, although there was accepted a need to improve it for the benefit of both rulers and ruled, as expressed in Lugard's 'dual mandate'.¹¹

To do so required knowledge of those ruled. Earlier years had seen the growth of the European 'discovery' or invention of Africa in terms of geographical space and the languages of its inhabitants. The first was by so-called 'explorers' and early administrators who produced maps and geographies of various 'races' and peoples and therefore assumed that they acquired proprietary rights over them; the second was by missionaries who classified local languages and produced orthographies and grammars for them, usually with a view to their use in Bible translation. Missionaries reduced many African languages to writing so as to translate and teach the Bible, a classification and introduction to writing that were not merely linguistic but intensely political. Neither Protestants nor Catholics could or tried to use all languages but selected those that appeared to have the most speakers and so were used over wide areas. They introduced Christian and 'Western' education mainly to those groups and thereby ensured their acquiring closer political ties with the colonial administrations and so greater political power than their neighbours. They thus redrew the 'indigenous' map of most of the continent, with local groups now defined as 'more civilized' and 'less civilized', a distinction made throughout the following decades.

The Europeans were in a dilemma: they assumed that as the continent's possessors (or of most of it) they owned the right to knowledge about it, as an elite which could use and control that knowledge to strengthen their political and moral position. On the other hand, if they were to

¹¹See Frederick Lugard 1965.

'develop' Africa they had to share knowledge with Africans, especially the powerful elites of West Africa such as the northern Nigerians favoured by Lord Lugard. Knowledge held by the mass of the people at the local level was still widely considered by most Europeans irrelevant, undesirable, false, even Satanic. This dilemma was largely resolved by anthropological and, later, historical research, which increasingly presented African peoples as at least morally equal to their European rulers and soon discarded the view of African cultures and religions as 'primitive' and of no inherent interest. Even so, much of the knowledge being acquired by anthropologists and held by them to be valuable as knowledge in its own right was long considered 'impractical' and pointless by both administrators, missionaries, and traders.

The Institute, with its growing anthropological emphasis, was in an ambiguous position, caught between the assumptions and policies of the colonial rulers, of most missionaries, of European academics, of local African elites, and of the mass of the people whose welfare the Institute's founders saw as their role to assist. This process was reflected in the Institute's original programmes, in particular its encouragement and publication of grammars, vocabularies, and orthographies. However, during the 1930s the Institute became increasingly linked to developments in the field of anthropology, its journal becoming more concerned with detailed ethnographic accounts in which mission activities and administrative problems were de-emphasized. The leaders of the Institute would appear to have come to see themselves as pioneers determined to help the downtrodden peoples of Africa by their support of anthropology, then the only scientific discipline sensitive to the subtleties and indeed the beauties of 'indigenous' African cultures. This view may not have been stated all that determinedly, but to read through the issues of *Africa* of the period gives that impression rather clearly. In addition, during this time the membership of the Council was steadily changing from a majority of missionary and colonial officials to that of academics.

To do this required greater knowledge of who were the continent's inhabitants. The Institute's leaders and members came increasingly to accept the colonial administrators' views on the classification and characteristics of African peoples, whom they saw as living in long-lasting or even permanent groups they called 'tribes'. Much has been written arguing that 'tribes' were 'invented' by the administrators, and anthropologists are still regularly accused of being 'the

handmaidens of colonialism' in that by accepting 'tribal' identities they gave intellectual authority to colonialism, an ignorant and self-serving accusation especially attractive when spiced by racism. Many, perhaps most, African peoples used no specific names for themselves nor were they all very long-lasting, but continually forming and reforming by migration, by wars and conquests, and by colonial changes. However, administrators 'invented' names for them as being permanent and so 'traditional', thereby usually amalgamating small groups into larger ones and dividing many large groups that lacked single political authorities. But most of these groups, however named and whatever their size, recognized themselves and one another as existing on the ground and were hardly 'invented' by outsiders. Administrators drew boundaries between local language groups and clusters as defined by missionary linguists: they could thereby control population movements of peoples who had hitherto always moved slowly from one area to another. They also created 'chiefs' for groups that had no overall political authority, thereby introducing new forms of authority dependent upon and representing the colonial administrations. They could organize taxation and construct legal systems based on various mixtures of 'tribal' and colonial laws. By naming groups, creating fixed boundaries, and instituting 'chiefship' where none had existed before, they gave independent cultural and political identity to every 'tribe'; thereby obliterating or blurring the complexities and histories of the complex and fluid relations between them. Urban areas hardly featured except as centres of administrative and industrial control (and were mostly given European-based names as new colonial creations). Most smaller rural 'tribes' were thus left outside the new colonial centres of power and disregarded as 'traditional', unchanging, and powerless. This became a period of straightforward and often simplistic 'ethnography' based on research within Africa, the description of the social units then known as 'tribes', and the completion of the overall 'tribal' map of Africa, usually without the emphasis on their internal workings, structures, and histories that were to become so important in later research. The Institute's areas of concern (and those of anthropology) reflected this development and became largely restricted to the 'tribal' level, which it perhaps justifiably regarded as largely ignored by those exercising effective administrative and religious control, and which affected most anthropological study for many years.

The first phase: research and money

The Institute of this first period had to build an international reputation if it were to be successful. Edwin Smith, an influential Council member with long mission experience, wrote that 'propaganda, in the best sense...is essential for the success of the Institute'. Its secretary-general, Hanns Fischer, became its ambassador visiting other European countries. Until the second World War annual Council meetings were held five times in London, three times in Paris, once in Brussels (which was interrupted by a sudden order from King Leopold III for the members to rush to his palace to discuss the Belgian Congo), once in Rome (where the members were received by both the Pope and by the Head of State, Benito Mussolini, who regretted that he was unable to accept their invitation to dinner - this was before his invasion of Abyssinia), and once in Berlin (where they were harangued by the Prussian Foreign Minister that they should use their influence for the restoration of former German colonies). On other occasions the members of the Council were given tea on the terrace of the House of Lords, perhaps an indication of where they placed themselves in the order of things.

The immediate problem was money. It was to come mainly from the United States where the 1930s were a time of growing interest in African education, linked to that in education for the African-American population. The Institute approached the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial Foundation for funding and in 1931 received \$50,000 a year for a five-year programme of what were called 'expeditions' into Africa (an indication of how the members regarded those whom they wished to study) to learn about 'the factors of social cohesion in original African society...and the formation of new social bonds', a marked change of direction from the earlier stress on education. In addition, the Carnegie Foundation gave substantial contributions for publication expenses.

A key figure became the anthropologist Bronislaw Malinowski, professor at the London School of Economics, not himself an Africanist but an early member of the Institute's Executive Council. He quickly saw the potential of the still rather confused aims of the Institute, and seems to have been determined to take over its academic leadership as the leading functionalist anthropologist in the country strongly supported by the then director, J.H.Oldham. He had obtained Rockefeller funding for his famous seminar, attended by almost all the later leaders in his discipline in Britain. He obtained additional Rockefeller money for the Institute's plan of

research, which would lead, in his words, to the study of 'the anthropology of the changing Native' and would be 'of great service to anthropology and to the practical man as well', thus attempting to resolve that long-lasting and difficult conflict of interest. Malinowski's seminar in effect became the Institute's 'research team' as the Council called it. The members of the seminar who were funded for African research by the Institute came from many countries and included Meyer Fortes, Isaac Schapera, Hilda Beemer (later Kuper), Monica and Gordon Wilson, all from South Africa; Jomo Kenyatta from Kenya; Siegfried Nadel from Austria, Kalervo Oberg from Finland, Sjoerd Hofstra from The Netherlands, Gunter Wagner from Germany, Phyllis Kaberry from Australia, and Lucy Mair and Audrey Richards from Britain. This 'team' of anthropologists was hardly made up of diehard British colonialists, as has so often been claimed, and they were to lead the anthropological innovators as against the more old-fashioned ethnologists who held most of the senior academic posts in their various countries. There were missing only three of the most important modernizers, Evans-Pritchard (a member of the London School of Economics seminar but not funded by the Institute), Max Gluckman, and Daryll Forde, neither members of the seminar.

Despite the fame of his seminar, Malinowski's own theories on 'culture contact in Africa' were naive and had little influence on the research itself. But he controlled the Institute's research funding and retained the core links with the United States, continually worried lest his old rival, Radcliffe-Brown, then at the University of Chicago, would replace him as recipient of funding by American foundations.¹² Tradition has it that this period was one of considerable dissension as to the Institute's aims and methods, with Malinowski opposed to the figures who had long exercised authority whom he regarded as outmoded evolutionists and diffusionists. This dissension ended in a personal sense only with Malinowski's move to Yale University in the United States in 1938. All the same, he enabled the Institute to influence the nature of anthropology during the later 1930s by becoming its leader in 'modern' African research in the sense of analysis of social systems rather than of the mere history of cultural traits. Most of the resulting publications were not to appear until after the second World War, but there were a few. Outstanding among them was the publication by the Institute in 1940 of Fortes and

¹²The Institute published a Memorandum, *Methods of Study of Cultural Contact in Africa*, with an introduction by Malinowski, but it never had much importance. See P.H.Kaberry 1928.

Evans-Pritchard's edited *African Political Systems*.¹³ This was a landmark in that it changed the views held of Africa by anthropologists and, if they read it, by historians and political scientists. It moved Africanist anthropology from the listing of items of cultural behaviour to the analysis of expression of underlying structural relations of order and power as they developed over time, and marked the Institute as a leader in the field.

To read *Africa* for the last years of the 1930s and the war years is to realize that this was a period for the Institute of change from a body concerned largely with education and languages in an assumed static world of empire and colonialism into one ever more concerned with the knowledge of the 'Africa' as it was actually becoming. The Institute was taking a lead in research and understanding of that actuality with its 'team', and its journal and publications were far in advance of most others of the times. But during the war itself it showed signs of decline of purpose and understanding of direction of aims – as of course did other scholarly institutions of the time in Europe. The first period of the Institute's history came to an end.

The ending of the colonial context

The second World War brought a halt to almost all active research in Africa and changed the nature of European colonialism and of African societies and their cultures forever. Colonial administrations realized that their former seemingly static world had gone and that a new and unexpected one was beginning. During and immediately after the war the old type of largely military officers, interested in political control (and exemplified by Lugard himself) gave way to those with civilian backgrounds, who had some education about Africa (including some with some anthropological and historical training). The popular view of colonial administrators drinking their pink gins between bouts of bullying 'Natives' is a caricature of generally intelligent and well meaning people faced with the irresolvable dilemmas of an ultimately immoral and often brutal system in which they were involved but found difficult to understand. Christian missionaries realized that their charges were no longer content to be offered an alien faith: it now belonged as much to them as to non-Africans and throughout non-Muslim Africa both Catholicism and Pentecostalism were becoming widespread. And new political leaders

¹³To become the Institute's best-selling publication. Evans-Pritchard published his famous *The Nuer* in the same year, but with the Clarendon Press, Oxford.

were gaining strength through bodies such as the West African Students' Union in London, and the African student associations in France. Some colonial countries founded or revived local universities, which became involved in their own local research as well as in direct teaching.

African peoples themselves had become more aware of their own strength and of a common identity. During the war the many thousands of African soldiers, fighting in Africa, the Far East, the Middle East, and Europe, had realized their own abilities and power independent of their European officers, and they soon translated this awareness, and the 'Western' education they had been given when soldiers, to the conflicts and uncertainties of peacetime.¹⁴ A basic question for colonial administrators, missionaries, and the African peoples themselves, was whether and when the last would or could assume independent political responsibility of a kind acceptable not only to their colonial overlords but also to themselves. These processes all helped to change the view of 'Africa' held both outside and within it, and the International African Institute came to take a new and at times a leading role in understanding the changing continent. The centres of power were moving from Europe to Africa itself, and the aims of academic research and of the Institute's intermediary part in it had to recognize that irreversible movement.

The Institute had become largely moribund during the war, although it continued to publish its journal except for the years 1939-42. Its Council still met, but most of the original members had died or retired. Its Governing Body virtually ceased to exist, and in any case never had much importance. The second phase of the Institute's history began in 1944 with the appointment of a new Honorary Administrative Director, Daryll Forde, who assumed his role the following year, with Lord Hailey as the Institute's chairman after Lugard's retirement the same year. Forde led the Institute until his death in 1973, and during his long directorship - the second of the Institute's three phases - it became internationally famed and effective in both its research and publications. Forde's leadership also marked the ending of the earlier missionary influence over and at times control of the Institute programmes.

¹⁴These soldiers were given at least basic education, so that at the end of the war, when released into civilian society they provided a powerful category of Western-educated subjects that had been lacking before the war.

Forde was chairman of one of the several British university departments of anthropology that were reorganized at the end of the war, with teaching staff who had done field research during the 1930s and with far larger numbers of students than they had ever had previously. The Institute continued to be housed in London and the influence of British anthropologists was paramount, although those of other countries were given token equality, especially France. In 1945 and the immediately following years in Britain five anthropology departments emphasized the study of Africa: that at University College London, the Institute of Social Anthropology at Oxford (a graduate department only), and a little later the departments at Cambridge, Manchester, and, marginally, Edinburgh. Others, including those at the London School of Economics and the School of Oriental and African Studies, gave greater emphasis to Asia, the Far East, and Australasia. The Americas remained the domain of United States universities, few with African interests. The previous five departments all left pre-war concerns and methods behind and became increasingly interested in structural change, and demanded personal and intensive functionalist field research in Africa.. The 'new' International African Institute reflected these developments and became an important part of them.

By 1950 the first postwar students were beginning field research. Most research in Britain was now funded either through university departments, the newly established (in 1944) Colonial Social Science Research Council, various foundations, or the new research institutes established in Africa: the Rhodes-Livingstone Institute in the then Northern Rhodesia, the East African Institute of Social and Economic Research in Uganda, the Institut Français de l'Afrique Noire with several centres, and others in Lagos, Dakar, Astrida, Kinshasa, and elsewhere. Universities were revived or opened in several colonies, especially British and French, and in South Africa, almost all staffed by Europeans and devoting most effort to a generally liberal education in the civilizations of the colonial powers themselves. Most included a few anthropologists, linguists, and historians. For some years these universities were linked to and controlled by the metropolitan universities, but each institute and university developed its own views and aims of regional research, mostly in the 'tribal' and 'traditional' areas¹⁵. There were exceptions,

15. See Ajayi, J.F.Ade, *The African Experience with Higher Education*, London, Currey, 1995; and Zeleza, P. and A. Olukoshi (editors), *African Universities in the Twenty-first Century*, Dakar, CODESRIA, 2004.

particularly in southern Africa, where administrative disapproval of urban research soon became clear: anthropologists were stepping too far outside their 'proper' territory. The Institute played an intermediary role mainly by publishing papers and books by university faculty and increasingly by students; its power directly to guide research was diminished, although it did still have some research funds.¹⁶

A basic problem of the time was the general ignorance of Africa. Most researchers going to Africa assumed that the basic social units were still 'tribes', each needing field study by an individual researcher. Choices of where to go relied partly on the surveys of needed research published as Memoranda by the Institute, by Raymond Firth, Isaac Schapera, Daryll Forde and W.E.Stanner, and on other surveys published in its journal, setting out areas and groups of which there was little ethnographic knowledge. It may be difficult today to realize what an ethnographic *terra incognita* was most of tropical Africa at the time: there were maps showing language and administrative boundaries, but except for the Institute's journal and a few monographs on scattered peoples, there was little else.¹⁷

Most of these anthropologists had two immediate aims: to complete the classification of African societies and to learn how they were organized at the time, under colonial rule, and in the recent past. Most accepted, following Evans-Pritchard, that history was a part of ethnography (academic historians came late to the study of local African history as distinct from that of the European colonizers). The period of the 'colonial interlude' was relatively brief: effective colonial impact had started only fairly recently yet it was already coming to an end. The anthropologists' task was in fact immense: there were too few to make detailed study of so many local societies, still the basic unit of research although these were no longer necessarily rural but included groups considered 'industrial', mostly in southern Africa.. Many African peoples foresaw, and often feared, the end of the *modus vivendi* they had come to with their administrators; they turned back to the nostalgic memory of their own claimed histories to

¹⁶For example, Godfrey Lienhardt, Mary Douglas, and Lucy Mair.

¹⁷ Would-be researchers from Britain had to obtain official permission, so that the Colonial Office exercised ultimate control on who went where. I know of no would-be researcher who was ever refused initial entry, although several were later refused re-entry. But my knowledge is here hardly definitive.

prepare themselves for an uncertain future, and for them ethnographic field research (even though almost all by non-Africans) was often considered a source of local historical knowledge and was not at the time resented.

Anthropologists based their work on the analysis of long-lasting social structures and the processes of change within them. It was generally held that any particular community had a single basic structure on which rested all local organization and the understanding of any aspect of cultural behaviour, including local religions. In short, during this second period they studied the nature and exercise of power and authority in small local communities, including such European jural and religious notions as descent group formation, complementary opposition, rights *in rem* and *in personam*, transfers at marriage, forms and means of exchange, status of women as legal minors, descent groups as social persons, the powers of the dead and spirits, myth, sacrifice, beliefs in witchcraft and sorcery, and so on, all far from most earlier ethnological topics. These were very much the days of structural-functionalism, an efficient and fruitful method of research (not a philosophy of society, although that is often claimed for it by its detractors), although it was often rather ingenuously linked to a make-believe colonialist role. This was not the case of anthropologists imitating and so supporting colonial administrations; indeed, the latter usually found little of interest in what they did, and in turn they had little interest in the administrations, a sign of hostility rather than of support, and of the deliberate ignoring of the colonial context of those whom they studied. This research took for granted that members of African societies were intellectually and morally equal to those of Europe even if politically inferior: this often upset colonial administrators, annoyed at these interfering anthropologists who lacked the experience of what they considered to be the 'real Africa'.

It followed that the nature and extent of European knowledge of Africa, and indeed the very definition of 'Africa', were becoming very different from those of the 1920s and even the 1930s, only a few years before: the earlier period of 'invention' of Africa was nearing its completion. There were two relevant factors. One was that many years of administrative propaganda and of mission schooling had led the African peoples themselves, as the objects of study, to be aware of their own societies in their widest dimensions; the other was the rapid development of social anthropology, which affected the Institute, which became markedly more 'anthropological',

with its Council members becoming ever more anthropologists. The Institute came to emphasize 'What has happened in Africa' rather than the earlier 'What has happened to Africa'.

The second phase: Daryll Forde's directorship

After World War II the International African Institute was to grow into something very different from what it had been beforehand. The beginning of its second phase was not merely a resumption of what had gone before, but a reawakening and a rethinking, even though the Institute's general view of Africa and its ultimate aims did not basically change.

Lord Lugard retired from the chairmanship in 1944. In the following years the Institute had a number of Chairmen, chosen by the Director and the members of the Council. The role of Chairman has never been nominal, although the day-to-day work of running the Institute has always been by the director, aided by the secretary, whose power has varied with the identity of the director. The chairmen have all been men who have represented the Institute to the outside world and of course the outside world to the Institute: none have been nonentities. The early chairmen were colonialist grandees: Lugard himself from 1926 until 1944; the influential Lord Hailey, author of *An African Survey* and chairman of the Colonial Research Committee, from then until 1945; Lord Rennell of Rodd from then until his resignation in 1949; Sir John Waddington from 1949 until his death in 1957; the former governor-general of the then Belgian Congo, Monsieur le Gouverneur-General Mueller de Laddersous, a man obviously used to power, until 1967; and then Sir Arthur Smith, the former chairman of Unilever, who took a very active interest in the Institute, until he retired in 1975.

All these chairmen supported the director in planning seminars and other programmes and in finding money; they acted as the Institute's front men of influence outside the universities. In 1975 the Council chose the first academic chairman, Professor Jacob Ajayi of Nigeria, a man of wide reputation and contacts in Africa, Europe, the United States, and UNESCO. He foresightedly but unsuccessfully urged the Council to move its headquarters to Africa where it might more easily attract American and other outside funding. He has been succeeded by two other academics, Professor William Shack, of the University of California, and the present chairman Professor Valentin Y. Mudimbe, a world-famous philosopher born and raised in what

is now the Democratic Republic of Congo.

Everyday planning and administration has always been the duty of the Honorary Administrative Director. As I have mentioned, in 1944 the director became Daryll Forde, since the early 1930s professor of geography and archaeology at the University College of Wales at Aberystwyth, and from 1944 the new professor of anthropology at University College London. He had carried out archaeological research in Brittany and obtained his doctorate under V. Gordon Childe, had done ethnographic field research among the Zuni of the southwestern United States under Alfred Kroeber, and then had turned to Africa with ethnographic research among the Yako people of southeastern Nigeria. He was no narrow Africanist, and was a man of wide learning, brilliance, many enthusiasms, great kindness, and personal charm. He controlled the Institute as well as his department at University College until his sudden death in 1973. He placed the Institute on a new footing and built it into the uniquely important institution that it was to become.¹⁸

Forde realized that greater funding was essential if the Institute were to continue with any chance of success in the changing postwar world. The main problem for the Institute has always been finance. The Institute has had three main sources of income: membership subscriptions, sales of publications, and grants from foundations, African governments and administrations, and very occasionally commercial enterprises. The first two have in general just covered the everyday running costs of the Institute: office and administrative expenses, salaries, insurance, and contingency funds. But they have been inadequate for research and seminars and have barely covered the initial costs of book publication. Much of the administrative expense has been covered by voluntary work by the Institute's chairman, director, council members, and other officers and employees working for little more than nominal rewards. Forde contacted the Ford Foundation in New York which gave him support for many projects, and he maintained close personal contacts with government agencies and universities in Britain and elsewhere which resulted in much help over the years.

¹⁸See past volumes of *Africa* for obituaries of Forde.

His directorship excelled in several main areas. One was in its journal, *Africa*. He edited it himself until 1972, when he asked me to take it over. The associate editor from 1958 was Barbara Pym, who kept me hard at work. Her eyes and ears were always alert, and Forde featured in at least one of her novels, portrayed generously but sharply. She retired in 1974, succeeded by Hazel Holt. The Institute also published a long series of books with the Oxford University Press, London, both ethnographic monographs and collections of papers that gave the Institute an impressive and influential scholarly reputation. As well as Fortes and Evans-Pritchard's *African Political Systems* (1940) they included Radcliffe-Brown's and Forde's *African Systems of Kinship and Marriage* (1950) and Forde's own *African Worlds* (1954), three books that brought together a consistent body of knowledge as well as of theory as basis for future research. As publisher, Forde had very considerable power and influence over new directions in anthropology. He actively sought publications from authors, both senior and junior, and was an indefatigable advisor and editor to younger writers. The history of anthropological research and writing in Britain, and to a less degree in France and elsewhere, owes much to his usually unacknowledged guidance. The Institute had published thirty five monographs by 2007, and more appear annually.

He also established two other series of publications. One was the *Ethnographic Survey of Africa*, initiated in 1950 with funding from the British Colonial Office and the advice of Radcliffe-Brown, then retired and living in London. Each of the volumes was on a particular ethnic cluster and all were based on a common plan so as to provide basic information about the 'tribes' of the continent. Although many volumes were little more than lists of 'ethnographic facts', with little analysis, they brought together what was at the time known data and included useful bibliographies and maps. They were not very exciting reading and soon appeared outmoded in the spate of monographs published during the 1960s and 1970s, whose authors provided theoretically up-to-date analyses of the societies being studied. A second series was titled *African Abstracts*, subsidized by UNESCO and running from 1950 until 1972, each of the volumes comprising abstracts of recently published articles from a wide range of journals. Both series collapsed after Forde's death, when a new director, David Dalby, decided that their sales did not cover their production costs. This decision reflected a change in the general aims of anthropology during the last quarter of the last century, but at the time these series were of very

great novelty and value. A third series, still in production, has been the *African Bibliography*.

Forde also established a series of International African Institute seminars. They were funded by the Ford Foundation and were held at various universities in Africa, with the planning, participation, and involvement of African teachers and students as well as intellectuals of many fields. They were not intended to be occasions for grand display of 'theory' but to disseminate knowledge and to encourage field research by both Africans and European scholars. Here the Institute played a central role in bringing African scholars and their universities into the international Africanist community. The first was held in Kampala in 1959 and the last in Nairobi in 2004. During the later part of Forde's directorship and since his death the Institute became increasingly concerned with a crucial development within Africa. This was the growing importance of African scholarship, linked to the growth of universities within Africa and later to that of an increasingly educated population in general which had barely existed during the Institute's first phase.

There were also two subsidiary programmes, the West African Museums Project, and the series of Lugard Lectures, the first of which was in 1950, by Margery Perham and the latest in 2007 (they are now to be continued on an biennial basis).

Forde died suddenly one evening in 1973. The directorship was then held jointly for a year by Germaine Dieterlen and myself. We were instructed by the Council to keep the Institute running as guardians rather than innovators; the cheques were paid by our then Secretary, Basil Wheeler, and the journal and books continued to appear.

Daryll Forde's death coincided with the change in the nature and aims of Africanist studies. What may be called the 'tribal' period in Africanist research gave way in the final quarter of the 20th century to one marked by political independence of most African countries, by an emphasis on the 'modernization' of their societies and the growing importance of Western-educated classes through the continent, and on the ever-increasing development of Pentecostal Christian churches under purely African leadership. As far as the Institute has been concerned, its achievements have been considerable, based upon Forde's initiatives, even

though at times it seemed that since his death it has drifted without clear guidance, with the appointment of many successive directors, each for only a short period. His death marked the end of the Institute's second phase; the third is still with us.

The third phase: uncertainty in the postcolonial world

Forde's successors, of a later generation than his, held rather different views of Africa and fields of specialization, and both academic, governmental, and foundational contexts and views of the Institute's work were changing. Council members and others of the two earlier phases formed 'generations', knew and usually respected each other, and all were aware of the changing face of 'Africa' and what our present chairman has referred to as its 're-invention' just beginning in the 1970s, but were never in full agreement as to how to deal with the Institute's presumably new role in it. At the first meeting after Forde's death Professor Guy Malengreau, a legal scholar from Belgium, recommended that the Institute be wound down and become a specialist publishing house. He may well have been right, but it was decided to continue and after a year a new director was appointed, the linguist David Dalby of the School of Oriental and African Studies (who in 1978 published the Institute's influential *Language Map of Africa*), first with Sir Arthur Smith as chairman, following in 1975 by Professor Jacob Ajayi.

Dalby decided to reorganize the Council, to widen membership from its European majority and to include members from northern Africa; no more than two were to be permitted from any one country, including Britain and the United States. This policy was an attractive one but was weakened by many members being content to represent their countries at annual Council meetings by sitting at the table but doing nothing to promote research or seminars. In addition, everyday costs rose and forced the Institute to move into cheaper quarters. I resigned as editor of the journal, and in 1980 Dalby himself resigned as director. There followed another year's interregnum, with Michael Crowder and myself as acting co-directors. Successive directors have been Ioan Lewis, Peter Lloyd, David Parkin, Paul Spencer, and the present director Philip Burnham. The journal was taken over by J.D.Y. Peel, then Murray Last, Richard Fardon, and now Karin Barber. An important change that took place after Forde's death was that the council sold its famous library, which had a full-time librarian, Ruth Jones, to the University of Manchester, leading to its demise as an international scholarly resource and centre for local and

visiting scholars.

Despite changes, these last years have seen the continuation of the Institute's basic programmes and view of Africa, as well as several developments in its aims and responses to events and new problems. It has had a more active programme of publications than ever before under the guidance of Dr Elizabeth Dunstan, Robert Molteno, Karin Barber and Stephanie Kitchen. Recently initiated series of publication include 'Classics in African Anthropology', 'Readings in ...', 'Monographs from the IAI', and 'African Arguments', all with wide readerships. The journal has had a wider set of contributors and readers than before (although the old difficulty of finding African authors has persisted). And both the series of African seminars and of Lugard Lectures have been reestablished. The most recent seminar, on the media and identity in Africa, held in Nairobi in 2004, has made an important change: instead of being held in a university it was held in a public hotel so that members of the general public would attend – as indeed they did in large numbers – and the proceedings were on local radio and television. The Institute thus reaches a more general educated and non-academic public than in previous years.

The Institute's programmes have, as always, been a partial response to events in Africa, and so to its image in the eyes of both Africans and others. Recent anthropological and historical work has produced a very different view of Africa from that of earlier periods. Instead of seeing an essentially topographical distribution of societies and communities – the earlier 'tribes' – we now see a patterned distribution of groups and associations linked not merely by propinquity and by common subjection to particular colonial powers and independent governments but by ties of interdependence – industrialization, labour migration, warfare and genocide, disease, poverty, outsourcing, class, stratification, and structural adjustment. The 'tribes' are still there – they were never mere imagination – but rarely as isolates confined within local administrative boundaries. In addition, every ethnography of a group enables it to be given its place in a wider mosaic of interacting groups, of overlapping fields of social relations typically centred on urban areas where conventional cultural affiliations have often only marginal importance. The 'local' no longer stands alone or has any central meaning to its inhabitants, to be studied in terms of spatially and temporally limited societies. The present and the past can no longer be conceptualized in such narrow terms as they were before the end of the 20th century. Today the

Institute's programmes of research, publishing, and seminars have likewise reflected – indeed, are part of – the changes in 'academic' and 'practical' concern in African societies, cultures and languages that are taking place throughout the continent. A basic problem, as may be seen from the titles of modern journal articles, has reverted to the earlier one of 'what is happening to Africa?' in place of 'what is happening in Africa?' The membership of the Institute's Executive Council reflects this process, as do the contents of the journal *Africa* and its other publications.

We may now perhaps see the Institute as beginning a fourth and future phase, which may differ from the earlier periods in at least two ways. One is that although Africa has formerly been going through the period of early independence and linked changes in anthropological and other research (by ever-increasingly numerous disciplines) concerned with 'modernization', the continent has undergone – and continues to undergo – a series of what are usually seen as disasters. Some are political – Rwanda, Sudan, and elsewhere – while others are more social and cultural – AIDS and other medical problems, and always growing poverty and hopelessness, especially as part of the process of 'globalization' and structural change: the problems of research now are very different from those of only a few years ago. The Institute's programmes of publication, in particular, have been quick to adjust to these developments and to emphasize the new importance of ensuring that its publications reach readers, writers, and the general public in Africa itself more quickly than before. The world media pay an ever greater role within Africa, the Institute's publications and seminars among them.

The Institute's achievements and the future

The International African Institute has been unique since its foundation, as an intermediary institution between Europe and Africa, and between academic researchers and writers on the one hand and administrators, missionaries and priests, entrepreneurs, teachers, and others in Africa on the other, all of whom have included both Europeans and Africans. It has also mediated in a disciplinary sense, between scholars in anthropology, linguistics, and other disciplines on the one hand and on the other those who wish to discard these in favour of the study of modern commercial developments, an example of the longstanding argument over the 'academic' and the 'practical' that still becomes apparent at meetings of the Executive Council. Finally, it has always suffered accusations of being too closely linked to colonialism, due

especially to its close tie to anthropology and suspicion of its playing the role of 'Orientalist' in Africa.

The Institute has survived for several reasons. One is that it has filled a necessary and important role as an intermediary; another is that most of its office holders have been persons of great ability, the most obvious being its chairman from 1926 until 1945, Lord Lugard himself. He played a central role for almost twenty years - he was never a mere observer. He worked closely with his several directors and was always able to represent the Institute to outside bodies while retaining its independence of organization and action. A third was the leadership exercised for a quarter of a century by Daryll Forde.

The Institute has achieved much in its three quarters of a century, during which it has changed in accordance with changes in the idea of 'Africa' held by Africans and non-Africans, as may be seen in its three phases or periods. Whether or not it continues as it is, perhaps becomes a specialized publisher, as Professor Malengreau suggested thirty years ago, or vanishes, the Institute must never forget that it is the only Africanist research and publishing body whose aim has been essentially to study, provide, and disseminate knowledge about African societies and their cultures as they are at the 'grassroots', those people at the bottom of African communities, rural or urban (if these words still have much meaning), without supporting the historical phenomenon known as 'colonialism'. Its journal's editors have managed to maintain this policy. Unlike most other journals dealing with Africa and especially with anthropology, that have come to emphasize so-called 'theory' and solipsistic observation and views about 'The Other', *Africa* has retained the centrality of straightforward study of the everyday actuality of Africa. It has consistently included - and indeed, has emphasized - studies of local and detailed anthropology rather than matters of national governance, colonial history, or commerce. Its programmes of publication and of seminars have been quick to adjust to these developments and to emphasize the importance of ensuring that they reach those in Africa more quickly than ever before. The Institute has been a channel for the understanding of 'Africa' as a place occupied by actual peoples each with its own and unique civilization and culture, yet intimately linked to their neighbours and world society.

References

- Asad, T. (ed.), *Anthropology and the Colonial Encounter*. London, Ithaca Press, 1973.
- Clements, K., *Faith on the Frontier: A Life of J.H.Oldham*. Edinburgh and Geneva, T.TY.Clark and WCC Publications, 1999.
- Dalby, D., 'The story of the Institute', *Africa* 46,1, 1976.
- Evans-Pritchard, E.E., *Witchcraft, Oracles, and Magic among the Azande*. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1937.
- Goody, J., *The Expansive Moment: The Rise of Social Anthropology in Britain and Africa 1918–1970*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1955.
- Kaberry, P.H. (ed.), *Methods of Study of Cultural Contact in Africa*, London, International African Institute, 1928.
- Kuklick, H., *The Savage Within: The Social History of British Anthropology, 1885–1945*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Kuper, A., *Anthropologists and Anthropology: The British School 1922–1973*. London, Allen Lane, 1973.
- Lugard, F. D. 'The Institute of African Languages and Cultures', *Africa* I, 1, 1–2, 1928.
 -----*The Dual Mandate in British Tropical Africa*, fifth edition, London, Frank Cass, 1965.
- Mudimbe, V.Y., *The Invention of Africa*, Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 1988.
- Perham, M., *Lugard*, two volumes, London, Collins, 1956 and 1960.
- Smith, E., *The Study of the Institute: A Survey of Seven Years*. Memorandum XII, 1937.