

trasting types, and intensively in the elucidation of fundamental problems in anthropology and the allied social sciences.

'One of the main difficulties an anthropologist has to accept as part of his fate is that in his research work he cannot make use of a laboratory technique such as is common to the physical and natural sciences, and even to some extent to psychology. He cannot therefore, in a corner of a "lab", try out experiments over and over again to test his hypothesis until he gets a satisfactory result. It follows that an anthropologist cannot take his colleagues to his research work—he has to bring it to them, in terms of his own observations and collected data. This makes necessarily for a much more individualist attitude towards research, and perhaps accounts for the apparent lack of co-ordination in the research field, where each successive research worker picks out his own area and dominant problems, and works away at them in more or less splendid isolation.

'This kind of situation, in a science where shortage of trained man-power is the outstanding characteristic, lends support to Dr. Evans-Pritchard's plea for centralising research in the universities. A few years ago<sup>1</sup> an article in the *British Medical Journal* discussed the relation between strategy and tactics in research, and emphasised the need for a co-ordinated planning of the field as the strategic measure necessary before the tactics could be brought into play. It is this strategic planning which should be the role of the universities in a relatively new science such as anthropology, especially as the time factor—the rapid disappearance of certain primitive societies—cannot be ignored. Having said this, and perhaps gained general agreement to the idea, one has to recognise immediately the absence of co-ordination between the universities both in covering the field from the angle of teaching facilities and in planning research.

'There are signs that some such co-ordination in research may be achieved in the strictly colonial field through the Social Science Research Council of the British Colonial Office. But Dr. Evans-Pritchard has warned us that the colonial governments have their eyes mainly, and quite naturally, on practical problems, and the tendency will therefore be to give greatest encouragement to research which seems to yield fairly immediate practical returns.

'The familiar use of a phrase like "practical problems" can sometimes obscure an important issue. The general line of Dr. Evans-Pritchard's lecture was the application of anthropology to the problems of colonial governments *vis-à-vis* primitive peoples. An essential element in such problems is that of the changing primitive society, and this is at the same time a fundamental research problem and a practical issue. Dr. Evans-Pritchard sees the urgent problems mainly in the field of administration. In one sense, of course, administrative officers are responsible for all types of change and adjustment in the lives of primitive peoples. But officials and other workers in the fields of agriculture, education, public health, and welfare are even more directly concerned with the results of their influence on primitive life, and in their training the importance of anthropological knowledge is often ignored. It is true that the administrative officer has more opportunity of seeing tribal life as a whole. But the fact that agricultural officers, by insisting on new methods of cultivation, may be upsetting the whole balance of a primitive economy, is surely all the more reason why they should understand the interrelatedness of all aspects of tribal life, and the consequences of drastic economic and social changes, through having had some anthropological training.'

### *Another View of Applied Anthropology*

DR. S. F. NADEL is well known to readers of *Africa*. After holding a Research Fellowship of the Institute and producing *A Black Byzantium* as a result of his work in Nigeria, he was

<sup>1</sup> 17 April 1943.

appointed Government Anthropologist in the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan. During the war he served as Civil Affairs Officer in the British Military Administration of Eritrea and subsequently became Deputy Chief Secretary in the British Military Administration, Tripolitania. As a result of his experience he has formed certain convictions which he has expressed in a letter to the Editor. With his permission we quote some extracts.

‘As you know I have been both an investigator and adviser of colonial Governments, and, during the war, an administrator as well. If to me the fusion of anthropological research and “social engineering” (as Malinowski once called it) appears at once congenial and justifiable, it would yet offend the more purist anthropologist. What I have come to accept tacitly may therefore need justification in terms of general principles.

‘Such justification is possible—up to a point. I would begin by pointing out that purely objective, “a-political” social science is nothing better than a fiction. The observer and student of society, past or present, in approaching his material cannot escape being influenced by his own cultural background, and by the values and convictions it entails. . . . If, then, these pitfalls of subjectivity are unavoidable, should we not admit them fairly and openly? In other words, are we not bound, in justice to those who read our books and study the results of our fieldwork, to proclaim our political creed since it holds the key to the evaluating, critical attitude which must colour our research? Once this is admitted, it is only a short step from the involuntary social criticism of the scientific observer to the open and considered criticism of the “social engineer”. The former can still remain theoretical and “disinterested”; the latter is practical, constructive, and often, not unjustly, partisan. Thus the issue is reduced to one of individual outlook and individual readiness to take responsibility. The anthropologist must decide whether he is prepared to advocate his views in terms of concrete action; or whether he will be content with presenting them in a detached, would-be objective form, even to the extent of denying their practical applicability. . . .

‘If the fundamentally subjective nature of social research is admitted by some, it is hotly denied by others, and no arguments have yet convinced the disciple of “pure science”. In anthropology, he prefers to restrict his field to the structural, purely formal features of society rather than endanger his purism. He, in fact, achieves a wholly “objective” picture—of an emasculated, unreal social organism, defined by quasi-mathematical interrelations and bereft of the living tissues of human desires, needs, fears and conflicts. The purist anthropologist (first cousin to the pure economist) may feel amply recompensed; others, myself among them, will consider this too great a sacrifice, and a needless one. Once again, we are faced with a divergence of individual convictions. . . .

‘Where I stand personally needs no amplification. I have stated my views clearly in the introduction to my *Black Byzantium*. Perhaps I would now go even farther; for there I required of the anthropologist merely the attitude of the “disinterested” critic, and allowed the practical man (administrator, &c.) the latitude of “take-it-or-leave-it”. I now feel that the anthropologist must be more pragmatic in his criticism and more specific in his recommendations; he must, too, accept fuller responsibility and, perhaps, a greater share in the planning of changes and reforms.

‘My convictions are, of course, partly the result of my personal experiences. I found, time and again, that it is not enough if the anthropologist merely outlines, from a detached viewpoint, desirable changes and developments. He, as the student of society, must be active in the concrete planning, and be available with advice, or renewed inquiry, as the plans progress step by step. The administrator and technician cannot always by themselves translate the results of sociological research into blueprints for specific action; and the anthropologist in turn must learn more about the practical obstacles which his schemes might encounter, so as to adjust his conclusions and re-draw the blueprints.

'But there is also, behind all this, a more general reflection. The theorist and the practical man have been separated too long in the field of social research. We anthropologists, especially, are a bit like the doctor who discovers new cures in his laboratory but declines to apply them to the sick. Thus our researches are too readily held to be purely scholarly efforts, and the work of the "social engineer" must go without our help. Much is heard to-day about the need for scientists to share in the planning of society. Who is more urgently needed than the social scientist? And what field of social planning is more eligible than that of native society?'

### *A Handbook on Cyrenaica.*

DR. E. E. EVANS-PRITCHARD writes this note on the Handbook (issued by the Printing and Stationery Services, M.E.F., 1944-6) of which he was the editor.

'Although this book, which has appeared in a number of separate parts, is not for sale or available to the general public those interested in North Africa should know of its existence. It will doubtless always be possible for them to consult a copy. The Third British Military Administration of Cyrenaica was fortunate in finding a number of experts in Cyrenaica itself and in being able to draw on Cairo for others. Cumming, on loan from the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan, was the author of a history of Kassala. Weir, also from the Sudan, was a brilliant Arabist and an authority on the Beja languages. Myres was by profession an Egyptologist. To supplement our local talent we were able to obtain the co-operation of civilian specialists from Egypt and three of them paid short visits to Cyrenaica: Dr. Adams, dean of the Oriental Section of the American University at Cairo, Mr. Little, head of the Geological Survey of Egypt, and Prof. Rowe, curator of the Graeco-Roman Museum at Alexandria. Two other specialists who wrote for us were Prof. Atiya, Professor of Mediaeval History at the Farouk I University at Alexandria, and M. Drioton, Director of the well-known Egyptological Museum at Cairo. Pressure of work has so far prevented Prof. Rowe from finishing his part of the Handbook. The parts are listed below:

'I. Geology, by Mr. O. H. Little; II. Prehistory, by Major O. H. Myres; The Pharaonic Period, by M. Étienne Drioton; III. The Classical Period, by Professor A. Rowe; IV. The Christian Period, by Professor A. S. Atiya; V. The Modern History of Cyrenaica (*a*), by Brigadier D. C. Cumming, O.B.E.; VI. The Modern History of Cyrenaica (*b*), by Brigadier D. C. Cumming, O.B.E.; VII. Tribes (Habitat and Way of Life), by Major E. E. Evans-Pritchard; VIII. Tribes and their Divisions, by Major E. E. Evans-Pritchard; IX. Kufra Oasis, by Captain K. D. Bell; X. The Sanusiya Order, by Dr. C. C. Adams; XI. Italian Colonisation, by Major D. H. Weir.'

### *Obituary*

THE REV. Adolphe Jalla, C.B.E., doyen of the French Protestant Mission in Barotseland, died at Mabumbu on 17 January 1946, at the age of eighty-two. He joined M. Coillard, founder of the Mission, in 1889, so that his missionary career covered 56 years—a remarkable record in view of the insalubrity of the climate. He witnessed, and aided in, the development of the Lozi language by a blending of Sotho (introduced by the Makololo conquerors) with the indigenous Lui; and into this new form of speech he translated the whole Bible. He was the author of *Pionniers parmi les Marotse*, published in 1904.