



**What's in a Name? The Origins of the Royal Anthropological Institute
(1837-71)**

George W. Stocking Jr

Man, New Series, Volume 6, Issue 3 (Sep., 1971), 369-390.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0025-1496%28197109%292%3A6%3A3%3C369%3AWIANTO%3E2.0.CO%3B2-3>

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://uk.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

Man is published by Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland. Please contact the publisher for further permissions regarding the use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://uk.jstor.org/journals/rai.html>.

Man

©1971 Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland

JSTOR and the JSTOR logo are trademarks of JSTOR, and are Registered in the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office. For more information on JSTOR contact jstor@mimas.ac.uk.

©2003 JSTOR

WHAT'S IN A NAME? THE ORIGINS OF THE ROYAL ANTHROPOLOGICAL INSTITUTE (1837-71)

GEORGE W. STOCKING JR

University of Chicago

Two years after the Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland was founded in 1871, Sir John Lubbock's displeasure at its name was still so intense that his wife, ever solicitous of his equanimity, wrote to Mrs Charles Darwin with a suggestion. The primary reason for retaining the 'horrid' word 'anthropological' seemed to be a £700 debt the Institute had inherited from its predecessor organisations. But if Mrs Darwin's husband would head a subscription to pay this off, then it might be possible to change the name 'back to the Ethnological, which was the first & real root of the thing' (Darwin Papers, undated [1873]). To get at the roots of Mrs Lubbock's concern—and of the Royal Anthropological Institute as well—we must go back four decades before that time to the founding of an organisation which was not yet either 'anthropological' or 'ethnological', but rather devoted to 'protecting the defenceless, and promoting the advancement of uncivilised tribes': The Aborigines Protection Society (APS 1899: 8-9).

The roots of the APS in turn are to be found in the crusade led by Evangelical and Quaker philanthropists against the African slave trade and slavery in the British colonies (Coupland 1964; Klingberg 1926), and especially in the activities of Thomas Fowell Buxton (1786-1845) and Thomas Hodgkin (1798-1866). Buxton, who was of Quaker background and Evangelical persuasion, became William Wilberforce's chosen successor as leader of the parliamentary anti-slavery group, and led the campaign culminating in the abolition of slavery in the colonies. Hodgkin, who wore the plain black Quaker dress until his death, was trained in medicine in Edinburgh and served as pathologist at Guy's Hospital, where he did research on the disease which was later given his name, before turning more and more to philanthropic activities in the latter part of his life.

When abolition was won in 1833, Buxton turned his attention with renewed vigour to the situation of blacks in Africa (Buxton 1849: 368 sqq.). He was especially concerned with the situation in the Cape Colony, where the treatment of Hottentots and Kaffirs by British and Boer settlers was a matter of humanitarian concern throughout the 1820's and '30's (Mellor 1951: 228-73). In 1834, frontier fighting between armed Boer commandos and Bantu tribesmen had led to the Sixth 'Kaffir War', and in this context Buxton succeeded in getting established a Parliamentary Select Committee on Aborigines to investigate not only the Kaffir War, but the general question of 'what measures ought to be adopted with respect to the Native Inhabitants of Countries where British Settlements are made, and to the Neighbouring Tribes, in order to secure to them the due observance of justice and the protection of their rights; to promote the spread of Civilization among them, and to lead them to the peaceful and voluntary reception of the Christian Religion' (ASC 1836-7: I, iii).

Over the next several years witnesses from South Africa, Canada, British Guiana, Australia, New Zealand and the Pacific Islands offered more than a thousand pages of testimony to what Buxton described as 'that desparate and wide-spread villainy, which has rendered the intercourse of the civilised and Christian man with the savage little else than one uniform system of cruelty, rapacity, and murder' (Buxton 1849: 432). When the Select Committee had completed its work in 1837, Thomas Hodgkin took the lead in reorganising the informal group that had supported its activities into a permanent body that might exercise 'an unremitting caution and vigilance in reference to all schemes of colonization which may be proposed, and all measures that may yet emanate from the Home or Local Government affecting native tribes' (APS 1899: 8-9; APS 1838: 6). The goals of the Aborigines Protection Society were defined by the paradoxical contrast they saw between the behaviour of Britons at home and overseas: between devotion to 'civil freedom', 'moral and intellectual improvement', and the furtherance of 'sacred truth' in England, and the 'injuries we have inflicted, the oppression we have exercised, the cruelties we have committed, the vices we have fostered, [and] the desolation and utter ruin we have caused' in colonial areas (APS 1837b: vi). While they were committed to evangelism abroad as the only 'effectual method to civilise' dark-skinned barbarous peoples, in practice their evangelical role was rather directed to people who were already civilised and Christian. Their 'first object' was to collect 'authentic information concerning the character, habits, and wants of the uncivilised tribes' (APS 1837a: 4). By disseminating this information widely, they hoped to create a public opinion which, 'correctly taught, extensively spread, and expressed with deliberate firmness', would act first on the government at home and then abroad, not to halt European colonisation overseas, but to change its character (APS 1840: 9).

The point, of course, is that while the impulse of the APS was in the first instance humanitarian, some of its central activities were, at least in a broad sense, 'anthropological'. On the one hand, it was involved in the collection of anthropological data, and its early publications contain a good bit of ethnographic material (APS 1839a: 163-72; 1841a: 67-71, 131-45; Dieffenbach 1841). On the other hand, many of its activities might be regarded as 'applied anthropology'. Among these was the preparation of a model 'System of Legislation' which was in effect a programme for directed cultural change 'by persuasion rather than by force' (Motte 1840: 10).

The 'anthropological' aspect of the APS was not of course simply the by-product of its evangelical and philanthropic concerns. Even before the APS was founded, Hodgkin himself had argued before the Philological Society 'the importance of studying and preserving the languages spoken by uncivilised nations, with the view of elucidating the physical history of man' (Hodgkin 1835). The idea that savage man might be the subject of scientific as well as philanthropic interest had not disappeared entirely since the late eighteenth century (cf. Burrow 1966). Aside from occasional articles in various scientific journals, it was more systematically evident in the work of such men as James Cowles Prichard (1786-1848), whose *Researches into the physical history of man* had first appeared as his medical dissertation in 1808 and was successively reworked and expanded over the next four decades (Prichard 1836-47). But although it received marginal recognition in such

groups as the Philological and the Geographical Societies, the study of non-European man still lacked an adequate institutional embodiment in the mid-1830's.

In this context, it is perhaps not surprising that among some of the members of the APS, the scientific impulse seems clearly to have outweighed the humanitarian. Thus when Prichard wrote to Hodgkin at the organisation's anniversary in 1839, he made only a quick bow to its humanitarian goals before turning to the 'curious and interesting problems' of philosophy and science which would be left unsolved 'if the various races of mankind become diminished in number' (APS 1839a: 56-8; cf. Gruber 1970). Later that same year Prichard gave a paper to the British Association 'On the Extinction of Human Races' in which he predicted the extermination of most savage races and argued that, since Christian nations would not intervene to save them, 'it is of the greatest importance, in a philosophical point of view, to obtain much more extensive information than we now possess of their physical and moral characters' (Prichard 1839: 169-70). As a result of Prichard's talk, the Association set up a committee to prepare and circulate an ethnographic questionnaire. In presenting the Committee's report two years later, Hodgkin appealed for support of the activities of the APS, but the questionnaire itself contained little that related to the Society's humanitarian interests (Hodgkin 1841; BAAS 1841). By this time, however, the APS was itself undergoing changes which were to lead to the segregation of its scientific from its philanthropic concerns.

One much later account suggests that a split developed in the APS between the 'student party' and the 'missionary party', and that the former were forced to withdraw (Keith 1917: 14; cf. Curtin 1964: 329-31). Although this view seems oversimplified, there can be no doubt that a conflict, if not of faction, then at least of purpose, developed within the APS, and that this conflict was affected by the general waxing and waning of the Society's fortunes. Shortly after its formation, the Society's prospects seemed bright enough to inspire imitation: the founding, after a visit by Hodgkin to Paris, of the *Société Ethnologique de Paris* in 1839. But although the different name was at first attributed simply to the fact that France had 'few aborigines requiring protection' (APS 1839b: 25; cf. Hunt 1865: xcvi), the early success of the Paris society clearly provided an alternative model (APS 1841b: 31), especially in the context of the somewhat defensive and disappointed tone which creeps into the reports of the APS after the first year or so. The Society had its successes—among them the formation of auxiliary societies in the Port of London which, by appealing to sailors, would excite 'proper sentiments in the minds of those likely to be brought in contact' with aboriginals (APS 1841b: 8). But the more general public response is perhaps suggested by the Society's recurring need to emphasise that it was *not* opposed to European colonisation in principle and it did *not* wish to maintain aborigines 'in the purity of their race' as 'objects of interest in the natural history of man' (APS 1841b: 32). By 1842, there was clearly a feeling that the Society had failed in its original purpose, that the opportunity provided by the Parliamentary Select Committee had been lost, and that some reorientation was necessary. In that same year, the printed statement of the object of the Society was changed: rather than 'protecting the defenceless', it would 'record the[ir] history', and a resolution was passed to the effect that the best way to help aboriginals was to study them (APS 1842: 3, 6).

Despite this reorientation, however, there were some who felt that the natural history of man was not thriving within the APS. One of these was its Secretary Richard King (1811–1876) who had been a pupil of Hodgkin's at Guy's Hospital before going on a two year expedition to the Arctic in 1833. On July 20, 1842, King issued a prospectus for the formation of an 'ethnological' society—adopting the title of the Paris group, which was still new to English usage. The response to King's appeal was at first rather poor, but early the following year Hodgkin invited the group to meet in his home, and by the end of 1843 the new organisation was on a firm enough footing to establish itself formally as the Ethnological Society of London (King 1844: 15–16; ESL 1843). Exactly how much hard feeling was involved in all this is not clear. King spoke of the ethnologists as 'disfranchised' within the APS, and the silence of the official history of the APS on the whole episode would suggest the separation was not entirely amicable (APS 1899). On the other hand Hodgkin—who continued to lead the APS until his death—seems to have felt no difficulty in maintaining a dual affiliation, as did others, including Henry Christy (1810–1865).¹ It is clear, however, that those who entered the ESL had decided it was a good idea to separate humanitarian purpose and ethnological research. Its prospectus suggested that 'to complete the circle of Scientific Institutions' in the British Metropolis, there was need of one 'whose sole object should be the promotion and diffusion of the most important and interesting branch of knowledge, that of man,—ETHNOLOGY'; and the only hint of broader social concern is a reference to Great Britain as a maritime nation with 'numerous and extensive Colonies and Foreign Possessions' (King 1844: 15–16). Furthermore, the formal minutes of the Society's Council, which commence in January 1844, are singularly lacking in discussion of any issues of a specifically humanitarian character (ESL Minutes: 1844–69).

* * * * *

The abandonment of active humanitarian involvement should not imply, however, that the ESL was unaffected by its roots in Quaker and Evangelical philanthropy. In the strict sense, what was doctrine for the APS was at least nominally problematic for the ESL. The motto of the APS was the Latin phrase *ab uno sanguine*—'of one blood'. The professed purpose of the ESL was to inquire 'into the distinguishing characteristics, physical and moral, of the varieties of Mankind which inhabit, or have inhabited, the Earth, and to ascertain the causes of such characteristics'—to see, if you will, whether mankind was 'of one blood' and the 'distinguishing characteristics' of different groups were simply modifications of one original type, or whether they represented differences in original hereditary make-up (ESL 1850: 5). But there was no real doubt in the minds of the leading early figures of the ESL on this question of original human unity. The essential problem of ethnology was in effect to document that unity, to fill the gap between the dispersion of the tribes of man over the earth and the first historical records of each present nation, and in doing so to tie all men together into a single ethnological family tree. The model of explanation was diffusionary and historical, emphasising the environmental influences modifying human physical characteristics; the favoured methodological tool was the comparison of languages to establish affinities between physically dissimilar groups; and the major landmarks

in the 'progress of ethnology' were the establishment of ethnological connexions (Prichard 1847; Hodgkin 1848; Dieffenbach 1848). Thus Prichard, '*facile princeps*' of ethnologists (Carpenter 1848: 487), suggested in 1848 that 'the ethnological fact of greatest moment' that might be inferred from recent studies of cuneiform inscriptions was 'the almost juxtaposition, or the existence in adjoining districts, during the earliest epoch of history, of the three greatest Asiatic families of nations': the Indo-European, the Shemite, and the Turanian (Prichard 1848: 128). Like Buxton, Prichard was a Quaker turned Evangelical, and one has only to study his early writings to see that religious commitment and underlying biblical orthodoxy, if not philanthropic impulse, were the ultimate source of his conviction that all men were one (Stocking in press).

After a slow start, the ESL entered a period of heightened activity in the later 1840's. Between 1848 and 1856 its papers, which had previously appeared irregularly in the *Edinburgh New Philosophical Journal*, were published in four volumes of a *Journal* of its own. Between 1846 and 1851, there was enough interest in ethnology to justify a special sub-section of the yearly meetings of the British Association, and in the latter year it was given status as a section jointly with geography (BAAS 1846-51). In 1852, ethnology was recognised by the establishment of a section at the permanent Crystal Palace Exhibition under the direction of one of the Society's leading members (Latham 1854). The minutes of the ESL in this period suggest that much of their time was taken up with selecting, reading, and publishing papers, as well as with various internal organisational matters—including controversies over financial issues with two erstwhile secretaries (ESL minutes: 20/10/'53; 8/4/'57). One of the recurring treats, for men whose ethnographic experience was largely second-hand, was the evening devoted to the examination of a living aboriginal—often seamen from the polyglot crews of the sailing ships of the period (King 1844: 10). During the early 1850's the members were entertained by Chinese and Kaffirs (ESL Minutes: 14/5/'51); by Eskimos and Polynesians (14/5/'52); and by two Aztec children of doubtful authenticity (4/8/'53).

Throughout this period, the basic anthropological orientation of the ESL remained essentially Prichardian. Robert Gordon Latham (1812-1888), its leading intellectual figure after Prichard's death, was also a medical man with philological interests; and in the next decade he carried on essentially the same tradition of linguistic ethnology, publishing a series of volumes which were standard ethnological works of the period. The continuity of the earlier religiously-based humanitarian and environmental approach to racial differences is evident in an account of three Eskimos off a British whaler by the Society's secretary, Richard Cull (fl. 1840-70). Cull suggested that in the short time since their arrival in England their 'dark, swarthy colour has subsided so as to admit of the vermilion hue of the European becoming apparent'. He went on to argue that the 'poor degraded Esquimaux' was a being of 'hopes, and fears, and aspirations for a future; in short, a man, capable of that true dignity and greatness which we all manifest when, as little children, we submit to receive the teachings of a superior power' (Cull 1854: 215, 225; cf. Cull 1851).

In the middle 1850's, the ESL went into a period of serious decline, which its secretary attributed to the impact of the Crimean War (ESL Minutes: 25/5/'55), but which others attributed to the deadening influence of religion (Hunt 1868a:

432). By 1858 there were only thirty-eight paying members, only seven of whom attended the anniversary general meeting (Keith 1917: 18). When at the very end of the decade the Society began to revive, it was under the impetus of winds of intellectual change in anthropology whose first stirrings had been evident as early as 1850. One such current was a more strictly physical and often more harshly racial approach to human differences. The other was an upsurge of interest in the 'antiquities' of European racial groups.

Concern with the observation and measurement of human physical types went back to the late eighteenth century (Cunningham 1908), and Prichard and Hodgkin themselves carried on such studies (although in clear subordination to the linguistic and historical orientation described above). But in the 1850's there were signs that the physical anthropological approach to man was becoming more important—even the ESL had by this time established its own 'Museum of Crania' (ESL Minutes: 25/5/'55). At the same time, outside the ESL there were writers who were taking approaches to race which rejected environmentalism, which argued 'in the name of science' that the idea of human equality was false, and which even suggested that all men were not members of the same species (Burke 1848-49: 1-8, 29). The most influential of these was Robert Knox (1793-1862), whose brilliant career as anatomist in Edinburgh had foundered in his involvement with the murderous body-snatchers Burke and Hare (Rae 1964). In the 1840's Knox turned to public lecturing, often on topics of race. He later recalled that few at first were able to follow his 'novel point of view'; but he felt that the 'revolutionary epoch of 1848' had changed all that, and argued that with the publication of his *Races of men* in 1850, ethnology had 'entered on a new phasis' (1862: 565-8). Written in explicit opposition to Prichard, Knox's book embodied a darkly Gobinesque view of human history in which he argued that the differences between human races were such that they were 'entitled to the name of species' (1862: 591; cf. Haller 1970).

At about the same time, the study of 'antiquities' received a new impulse in England which was reflected in the translation by the folklorist William Thoms (1803-1885) of J. J. Worsaae's *Primeval antiquities of Denmark*. Thoms hoped that the introduction of the 'three age' system of the Danish antiquaries would help bring order and method into the 'imperfectly developed field' of British antiquities (Thoms 1849: iii, x). One of the first British works to reflect this stimulus was the *Archaeology and prehistoric annals of Scotland*, which the Scottish antiquarian Daniel Wilson (1816-1892) published in 1851. From the point of view of ethnology, the impact of the new antiquarian work was to link together 'prehistoric' Europeans and contemporary savages. In discussing Wilson's work, the president of the ESL found it 'impossible not to be struck with their resemblance to the rude works produced by the aboriginal inhabitants of other parts of the world, whether still existing, as in some parts of Australia, or only known by the relics which they have left, as in various parts of the northern hemisphere' (Malcolm 1851: 96). Within little more than a decade, in the context of a greatly increased time perspective for European prehistory (Daniel 1950: 57-121), this analogy was to become a major factor in the reshaping of ethnology.

One example of the development of anthropological interests in this period can be traced in a series of five notebooks kept between 1845 and 1860 by Joseph

Bernard Davis (1801–1881), one of the early British craniologists. As a young man, Davis had served as surgeon on an Arctic whaling voyage, but by 1845 he had been settled for twenty years as a medical practitioner in Staffordshire. At that time his interests were of a rather traditional antiquarian sort: he went on walking tours to churches and cemeteries, noting local folklore, rubbing brasses, and copying heraldic emblems. But by 1851, when Davis began a second notebook after a lapse of five years, his interests had changed considerably. By this time he was digging barrows under the influence of a gentleman archaeologist named Thomas Bateman (1821–61), who followed the Danish system and maintained the ‘truth of [the] division into stone, bronze and Iron periods, and that the bronze articles and leaf-shaped sword were not Roman, but made in this country’. By now Davis also collected skulls, and was interested in a wide range of ethnological topics, although his racial opinions ran counter to prevailing ethnological orthodoxy. In reading Prichard’s *Researches* (1836–47), Davis was impressed by its encyclopaedic coverage, but argued that ‘it does not appear to me to support the author’s favourite hypothesis’ of human unity, but rather contained ‘abundant materials to refute it’. By 1856, Davis was involved with Dr John Thurnam (1810–1873) in the publication of a collection of *Crania Britannica*. Three years later, in the last notebook, we find references to events which led to a major reorientation in anthropology: the discovery of human artefacts *in situ* with the remains of extinct animals at Brixham Cave, and the verification of similar earlier discoveries by Boucher de Perthes in the Somme Valley (Gruber 1965). Commenting on a paper at the Oxford meeting of the British Association, Davis wrote: ‘This does not involve an enormous antiquity, but may involve much greater antiquity than usually supposed’ (Davis Papers: 1845–60).

★ ★ ★ ★ ★

In this context, the ESL began to come to life again in 1859 and 1860. One later account attributes the revitalisation to the renewed participation of John Crawfurd (1783–1868), who gave numerous papers to the Society in 1859, and in 1860 was elected President (Hunt 1868a: 432; ESL Minutes: 1859; 24/5/60). Crawfurd himself did not represent the new currents; save for his views on human diversity, which had previously made him unpopular with the dominant Quaker group in the Society, he was an ethnologist of the old school, who had come back from several decades in Java and Singapore to write various works on the language and history of the Indian Archipelago. Nor were the new currents represented by the Secretary in this period, Thomas Wright (1810–1877), a rather conservative antiquarian who opposed the three age system and what he considered the subordination of archaeology to geology (Wright 1865). Nevertheless, Wright encouraged discussion of the new flint instrument finds (ESL Minutes: 17/10/60), and by 1861 the Society’s active members included several of the more prominent names in the new prehistoric archaeology, including Henry Christy, John Evans (1823–1908), and Augustus Lane Fox (1827–1900), later to be known as General Pitt Rivers. Even before the Society’s revival several men working in the physical anthropology of Britain—Davis, Thurnam, and John Beddoe (1833–1910)—had become Fellows; and Knox himself, who had been black-balled in 1855, was made an Honorary Fellow in 1858 (Hunt 1868a: 432).

But perhaps the most important new member was a young man named James Hunt (1833–1869), who in a paradoxical and antithetical way was one of the most influential figures in English anthropology in the 1860's. Hunt had inherited from his father a practice in the treatment of stammering, and published several works on human speech, one of which included material on 'the great question of races and languages' (Hunt 1861). Later remarks indicate Hunt's racial views were 'imbibed from the late Dr. Knox' (Hunt 1866: 336; 1868a: 432; cf. Knox 1862: 600). Hunt had joined the ESL in 1856, and in early 1860 became joint secretary along with Wright (ESL Minutes: 13/3/'60). Within three years, however, Hunt had resigned from the ESL to found his own competing organisation.

In retrospect, Hunt justified his departure in terms of differences over the nature of anthropology and its relation to ethnology, but there is evidence to suggest that these differences developed in specific relation to issues of race. The only hint of controversy in the spare minutes of the Society relates to the engravings for an article on the inhabitants of Sierra Leone. In March 1862, Hunt, who had been assigned by the Society to take the first steps toward the publication of a new *Journal* (ESL Minutes: 13/3/'61), reported on the cost of engravings; and after some discussion the matter was referred to a committee, which in addition to Hunt included two Quaker abolitionists, Hodgkin and Christy (4/3/'62). Almost a year later, the minutes noted that 'some differences of opinion' had arisen over the engravings, and the matter was referred to the remaining secretary—Thomas Wright—Hunt's resignation both as joint secretary and from the Society itself having been announced at the very same meeting (5/5/'63). This apparently trivial issue of iconography takes on greater significance when one recalls that Sierra Leone was a colony of freed slaves which had been the special concern of British humanitarians for over seventy years (Curtin 1964), and when one compares the soft and slightly romanticised lines of the engravings which were eventually published (Clarke 1863) with the harsh and almost bestial representations of Negroes in some of the racist works of this same period.

By the time this issue had come to a head, Hunt had already founded the Anthropological Society of London, which met first on January 6, 1863, with eleven people present (ASL 1863).² According to one of them, Hunt had approached some with the idea of founding a 'publishing body'; others with the need for a group devoting its primary attention to 'the anatomical aspects of ethnology'; still others with the need for 'an arena for the free discussion of the various exciting questions which current events [the American Civil War] were bringing into prominence' (Burke 1865: 4–5). Subsequent developments would suggest that what really drove Hunt was the need to create an active, vital organisation which he himself could dominate. However, Hunt quickly developed a philosophical justification for the separation which posed the matter in terms of the basic nature of the study of man.

Following Paul Broca of the recently organized *Société d'Anthropologie de Paris*, which he later spoke of as the model of his own organisation (Hunt 1868a: 434), Hunt defined anthropology in the very broadest terms as 'the science of the whole nature of man', and contrasted it sharply with the ethnology of the last several decades. Ridden by biblical dogma and speculative arguments over the unity or plurality of races, ethnology had treated only 'the history or science of races'. In

contrast, anthropology would treat the great questions of man's relation to animals, his connexion with the physical universe, the laws regulating his physical nature, his psychological characteristics—in short, everything pertaining to his nature. It would of course place heavy emphasis on the distinctions between human races, and would in fact include ethnology as one of its subdivisions. However, it would transcend the ethnology of Prichard, whose works, to the 'disgrace' of science, were 'still the text-books of the day'. Above all, anthropology would be empirical, rejecting unproven hypotheses, and busying itself with the collection of facts. But it would also be practical, uncovering the 'laws [that] are secretly working for the development of some nations and the destruction of others'. Ultimately, it would require government aid and university co-operation in the training of anthropologists, but for the present its growth would depend on the Anthropological Society of London (Hunt 1863a: 2, 8, 9, 12; cf. 1865).

With such a vocation, and with a leader of Hunt's evident dynamism, the ASL grew with amazing rapidity, despite the fact that its internal life was marred by dissension and frequent resignations. Within two years there were over five hundred members, and in 1866 constitutional provisions were made for local branches—at least one of which was in fact established, in Manchester (ASL Minutes: 20/2; 7/6; 1/8/'66; AR 1867: 1). The Society was also involved in an active publication programme, including its own *Memoirs*, a series of translations of foreign anthropological works, an *Anthropological Review* (which included the Society's *Journal*) and an abortive *Popular Magazine of Anthropology*—although the last two were in fact the personal organs of Hunt (Hunt 1868a; Bloxam 1893: vi–vii). During a decade when Darwinism made the nature of man a matter of general public intellectual concern, the growth of the ASL was so phenomenal that even unfriendly observers felt that there was 'nothing like it in any other scientific body in the country' (Burke 1865: 91–3).

In this context it is more than a little odd that the men most closely identified with Darwinism, as well as those we remember today as cultural evolutionists, were on the whole extremely antagonistic to the ASL. Alfred Wallace (1823–1913) and E. B. Tylor (1832–1916) at first had some association with the group, but Wallace later referred to the Society as 'that *bête noire*' (Darwin Papers: ARW to CD, 2/10/'65), and Tylor later would have nothing to do with Hunt (Beddoe 1910: 209). Huxley (1825–1895) sent back a proffered honorary diploma, referring to the Society as 'that nest of imposters' (Lubbock Papers: TH to JL, 3/5/'63). Lubbock (1834–1913) warned the French archaeologist Morlot to have nothing to do with them (AM to JL, 10/25/'63). George Rolleston (1829–1881) spoke of Hunt as a 'Turkey Buzzard' and an 'ignorant charlatan' (Huxley Papers: GR to TH, 1/1/'65). Hunt's resignation from the ASL coincided with Lubbock's election as president, and when Huxley heard the latter news he hoped that 'all the good men and true' would rally round (Lubbock Papers: TH to JL, 3/5/'63). By and large they did, if not as regularly active members, then at least when called upon at times of crisis. Knowledgeable contemporary observers were aware that 'many of the most eminent of the Darwinians' were members of the ASL (Burke 1865: 194); and when Huxley became its president in 1868, Hunt's own journal feared it would become 'little more than a sort of Darwinian club' (AR 1868b: 324).

★ ★ ★ ★ ★

The fact that the Darwinians sided with the 'ethnologicals' in the eight-year struggle between the ESL and the ASL can only be understood in the context of the differences in the character of the two groups. In the past, several factors seem to have obscured these.³ At first glance, the content of their respective publications seems very much the same. Furthermore, throughout their conflict both groups met in the same building on different nights. Some men belonged to both groups, and some who belonged to one read papers to the other. Nor was everyone who participated fully sensitive to the issues that divided them. John Beddoe recalled how he gave a paper to the 'anthropologicals' which elicited inexplicable laughter—it was only later that he discovered that he had innocently but systematically used the tabu term 'ethnological' (Beddoe 1910: 209). A further obscuring factor is the problem of the term 'anthropology', and of Hunt's lengthy dissertations on the 'science of man', many passages of which have such a modern ring that it is hard to believe that their author was vehemently anti-Darwinian. In fact, however, Hunt made it a point to insist on his opposition to Darwin, and that of his Society as well (Hunt 1868b: 77). Like Knox, he was influenced by German and French transcendental biologists; and while he was willing to hypothesise the 'mutability of species', he would not accept the Darwinian mechanism. To Hunt, there was little difference between 'a disciple of Darwin and a disciple of Moses—one calls in natural selection with unlimited power, and the other calls in a Deity provided in the same manner' (Hunt 1867a: 116). Even more importantly, Hunt opposed Darwinism because he saw it as a reassertion of the Prichardian doctrine of the unity of mankind, and he was staunchly diversitarian (or polygenetic) in his views (Hunt 1866).

Quite aside from this explicit anti-Darwinism, the basic anthropological orientation of the ASL was in important ways uncongenial to a developmental view of man. Despite the breadth of Hunt's conception of anthropology, his strongest actual scientific interest was in a rather narrow and static physical anthropology. In a paper he gave 'on anthropological classification' soon after the founding of the ASL, he rejected the origin of man as an insoluble problem at present, and proposed instead 'merely to classify man as he now exists, or has existed since the historical period' on the basis of anatomical and physiological characteristics, and most especially on the basis of 'the form of the cranium' (Hunt 1863b: 382). The same physical anthropological emphasis is evident in the ASL as a whole. Despite the superficial similarity of contents, the proportion of physical anthropological articles is more than three times as great in the *Memoirs* of the ASL as in the *Transactions* of the ESL. Furthermore, the only leading members of the ASL who left any real mark in the history of anthropology were the physical anthropologists Beddoe, Davis, and Thurnam.

In contrast, the orientation of the ESL—save for its tradition of religious orthodoxy—was in some ways quite compatible with the questions evolutionists were interested in. Whereas in Hunt's polygenetic view human races were seen as basically unmodifiable over time, Prichardian ethnology had placed great emphasis on the moulding of human physical type to different environmental circumstances. Similarly, the historical and diffusionist orientation of the older ethnology was easily redirected towards a concern with the development of civilisation—which in the earlier work of Tylor and Lubbock was still couched largely in diffusionist

terms (Tylor 1865; Lubbock 1865). The underlying compatibility of the old ethnology and the new evolutionism is illuminated in an interesting way by a remark which Richard Cull had made in 1851. Discussing the relations between the 'ethnologist' and the 'naturalist', Cull suggested that the former studied 'past history in order to trace descent and origin'. He then went on to ask: 'But who ever heard of a Naturalist studying fossils to trace descent and origin?' (Cull 1851: 105). Within a decade, Darwin had provided an answer to Cull's rhetorical question, and in this context it is perhaps understandable that naturalists concerned with 'descent and origin' should have joined the ESL.

In addition to these differences in basic intellectual compatibility with evolutionism, there are other lines that can be drawn between the 'ethnologicals' and the 'anthropologicals'. One has to do with the politics of race. Here the tone of the ASL was set by Hunt in the first of the Society's *Memoirs*—a compendium of anatomical, physiological, and psychological evidence and opinion which might well stand as archetypical of the traditional racist view of Blacks. Entitled, in obvious paraphrase of Thomas Huxley, 'On the Negro's place in nature', Hunt's paper argued that Negroes were a different species, closer to the ape than they were to the European. Incapable of civilisation, either on their own or through the influence of others, they were better off as slaves in the Confederate States of America than they were as freemen in Sierra Leone (Hunt 1863c: 51–2, 54, 57). Nor was Hunt's paper an isolated manifestation. When Governor Eyre's ruthless suppression of a rising of black farmers on Jamaica aroused a furore among liberals and humanitarians in 1866 (Curtin 1955: 195–6), the response of the ASL was a public meeting at which Captain Bedford Pim gave a paper on 'The Negro and Jamaica'. Pim's racist diatribe was greeted 'with loud cheers' and a unanimous vote of thanks, after which one member of the audience after another got up to offer comments on 'the true art of governing alien races'. One even advocated killing savages as 'a philanthropic principle'—when trouble broke out, there was 'mercy in a massacre' (Pim 1866: 50–1, 63).

The political concerns of Hunt and the 'anthropologicals' were not limited to issues of colonial policy. Closer to home, they engaged Huxley in controversy on the political significance of racial differences between the Irish and the English (AR 1870: 197–216; cf. Beddoe Papers: J. Collingwood to JB, Jan.–June, '70). In general they felt that 'much of the misery we see around us' could be attributed to the illusion that 'our fellow countrymen' were 'beings so advanced in the scale of humanity as to be able to be left to themselves', rather than racial types with inherent psychological peculiarities which a wise government would take into consideration (PMA 1866: 7–8). Characteristically, the leading 'anthropologicals' were opposed to Bentham, Mill and the Westminster philosophy, to John Bright and William Gladstone and the liberal party, to missionaries and to 'social science' reformers—in short, to all who would not see the basic issues of politics, economics, and philanthropy in racial terms (AR 1866a: 113 sqq.). Furthermore, Hunt for one could be quite vitriolic about it, as when he characterised the 'opponents of comparative anthropology' as persons of 'arrested brain growth' and 'deficient reasoning power' who suffered 'from what I will call respectively the religious mania, and the rights-of-man mania' (Hunt 1867b: lix).

The politics of the 'ethnologicals' are much less evident in their publications—

a fact which itself distinguishes the two groups. But in several important cases it is clear that they held just those views that Hunt so bitinglly attacked. Huxley was a leader in the attack on Governor Eyre (Huxley 1916: 1,300 sqq.), and Lubbock became a Liberal M.P. (Hutchinson 1914). Even old John Crawfurd was a staunch opponent of slavery, despite his polygenist views (Crawfurd 1866: 223). And the tone of the Society in general was conditioned by their humanitarian origins and liberal political orientation.

Indeed it is the question of tone, or style—not just in political matters, but in a more diffuse sense—that perhaps most sharply differentiates the two groups. It is not simply that the ‘ethnologicals’ were irritated by the kind of lampooning they received in the pages of the *Anthropological Review*; Huxley, after all, could handle himself quite well in this sort of polemical give and take. It is also that Hunt and the ‘anthropologicals’ in various ways violated the canons of behaviour appropriate to a respectable scientific group. The inner clique of the ‘anthropologicals’ ate together regularly in a group in some respects not unlike the ‘X Club’ or the ‘Red Lions’ of the British Association—except that they called themselves ‘The Cannibal Club’ and were gavelled to order by a mace in the form of a Negro head (Keith 1917: 20; ASL Letters: Cox to Collingwood, 23/6/’66). In an age when such things were a bit more shocking, the Society displayed in its front window an articulated savage skeleton, despite the complaints of the Christian Union across the street (ASL Minutes, 30/3/’66). Nor was the Christian Union the only religious body which the ‘anthropologicals’ succeeded in provoking. Hunt said ‘most of the missionary societies’ of England were ‘in arms’ against the ASL after it devoted four consecutive meetings in the spring of 1865 to an often sharply critical discussion of ‘the benefit of missionary work among savage races’ (AR 1865a: 175; JAS 3: clxiii–ccxciv). It is in this context of free-wheeling provocative discussion of a wide range of controversial topics that one must understand the issue which by some accounts provoked the separation of the two societies: the admission of women to the meetings of the ESL. From the ‘anthropological’ point of view, the issue was the creation of a ‘liberty of thought and freedom of speech’ unequalled in any other scientific society—a forum where one could discuss not only general matters of human anatomy and physiology, but such questions as male and female circumcision, and phallic worship (Burton 1864).

This difference in style is perhaps typified in the personality of Richard Burton—who chaired the first meeting of the ‘anthropologicals’, later served as their president, and is the only one of them save the poet Swinburne who is widely known today. Burton’s life was a fugue on themes of cultural marginality and psychological dualism. At once repelled and fascinated by non-European cultures, he wrote diatribes against the ‘abnormal cruelty’ of the Africans, but joined the King of Dahomey in a *pas de deux* at ritual decapitation dances (Brodie 1967: 211–15). A latent homosexual who maintained a virtually asexual relationship with his morally rigid Catholic wife, Burton was at the same time intimate with such ‘other Victorians’ as Monckton Milnes and H. S. Ashbee, and risked prosecution to publish works which his wife and most of his contemporaries regarded as pornographic. At once lusting after and despising the conventional trappings of gentility, devil-driven in a ‘ceaseless search for identity’, projecting in his own split personality all the tensions underlying the Victorian notion of gentlemanly res-

pectability, Burton was a kind of Victorian outcast-hero, ultimately both knighted and notorious (Brodie 1967: 337). Obviously, such a man could not in any strict sense be 'representative' of the 'anthropologicals', whose membership lists included many fellows 'canvassed for among general practitioners and clergymen in the country' (*Athenaeum* 1868: 210). Yet that such a man should have been so manifestly regarded as the Society's shining ornament must tell something of its character. From the point of view of the contemporary world of science, the 'anthropologicals' were marginal men, and they saw themselves as such: Burton was cheered as 'the great destroyer of the scientific mock-modesty of this age' (AR 1865a: 181).

In marked contrast, the leading Darwinians of the ESL—Huxley, Lubbock, Lane Fox, Evans, Tylor and Francis Galton (1822–1911)—may best be understood in the context of the 'intellectual aristocracy' which has been described as emerging in this period: men of well-to-do Evangelical and non-conformist families who turned to science and letters and who intermarried among themselves to create an intellectual elite which was to endure for several generations (Annan 1955). Far from being marginal to the world of science, they were (or were in the process of becoming) part of the scientific establishment of their day. They were committed to one large heterodoxy—the 'ape-theory' of the origin of man—and they took fairly 'advanced' positions on theological questions. But by and large, they were not inclined to complicate things unnecessarily by adopting extreme positions on extraneous issues, or proclaiming themselves a forum for the free and unrestricted discussion of unseemly topics, or violating the canons of gentlemanly behaviour. They were of course for the diffusion of knowledge, but they were not for the democratisation of science—at least not in relation to the ASL, which outnumbered them by more than two to one, and at one point considered canvassing a list of 8,000 names for prospective members (ASL Letters: J. Collingwood, 1/2/66).

★ ★ ★ ★ ★

In this context of differences in scientific orientation, political attitudes, and organisational and personal style, it is not surprising that relations between the two groups were characterised by recurring conflict, bitterness, recriminations, and the failure of several attempts at reconciliation. One of the major arenas of dispute was the annual meeting of the British Association, where the name of the sub-section devoted to the science of man became a hotly debated issue. In 1864, the 'anthropologicals' tried to get Section E renamed so as to include anthropology as well as ethnology and geography, but failed when the Association's leaders rallied to the support of John Lubbock, who argued that ethnology was 'an older word and a prettier word'—thereby stimulating a considerable amount of etymological research by the 'anthropologicals' (AR 1864: 294–9; cf. Bendyshe 1865; Hunt 1865). In 1865, the 'anthropologicals' went in force to Birmingham to win a separate section, but were defeated by what they called 'one of the most disgraceful pieces of cliquism ever known in the British Association' (AR 1865b: 224–9; AR 1865c: 354–71). Faced in 1866 with the prospect that the power of the scientific establishment would no longer suffice against the sheer force of 'anthropological' numbers, Huxley succeeded in convincing Lubbock before the meetings that they should acquiesce in the creation of a sub-section of anthropology within

the section of biology (Lubbock Papers: TH to JL 1/8/'66; Huxley Papers: JL to TH 2/8/'66; AR 1866*b*: 386). But at Dundee the following year the 'anthropologicals' were set back when the leadership of the Association, apparently anticipating hostility to the brash new science in a conservative Scottish milieu, cancelled the anthropological department at the last moment, and Hunt and his colleagues were forced to hold an impromptu 'Dundee Anthropological Conference' instead (AR 1868*a*: 71-88). The following year, anthropological activity again shifted to a parallel conference, when the International Congress of Pre-historic Archaeology met with the British Association in Norwich (JAS 7: xxiii). When anthropological papers were next given to the Association in 1869, the 'ethnologicals' were once again firmly in control, although the sub-section of 'Ethnology' was shifted from geography to biology (AR 1869).

In the meantime, there had been several unsuccessful attempts to bring about a reunion of the two groups. The first noteworthy one took place immediately after the British Association meetings of 1866 when the ASL, in acknowledgement of Huxley's peacemaking role, asked him to become their president and unanimously expressed their willingness to consider amalgamation (ASL Minutes: 5/9/'66). The negotiations seem to have been cut short by the resistance of John Crawfurd, president of the ESL, who by this time had become quite antagonistic to Hunt (Huxley Papers: Huxley-Hunt correspondence, 10/'66; Crawfurd to TH 6/10/'66). Negotiations were resumed a year later, and they entered a fairly serious stage in 1868, after Crawfurd had died and Huxley accepted the presidency of the ESL on the condition that its Council support his efforts toward ending a separation which by this time was becoming something of a 'scientific scandal' (Huxley 1870; Huxley Papers: TH to J. Hooker 24/10/'68). However, at the last minute the proposed union broke down in bitterness when the Council of the ASL refused to accept the compromise name agreed upon by Huxley and Hunt: 'The Society for the Promotion of the Science of Man' (Huxley 1870; ASL Minutes: 16/6/'68; JAS 6: clxxxix-cxcvii).

In the aftermath of this failure there was a long and nasty exchange of letters in the *Athenaeum* in which one of the negotiators for the ESL (who like some others belonged to both groups) charged the leadership of the ASL with 'charlatanism, puffery and jobbery' in their handling of the organisation's membership and finances. In the course of the exchange, it became evident that Hunt owned and edited the *Anthropological Review*—despite the fact that he had long maintained the pretence that it was in the control of other unnamed 'proprietors', and had on one occasion even apologised to Huxley privately for lampoons which appeared in it 'at the caprice of the Editor' (Huxley Papers: JH to TH, 18/10/'66; cf. Hunt 1868*a*). It was further charged, and seems to have been true, that a good portion of the growth of the ASL consisted of non-paying fellows, some of them elected without even having applied for membership; that the paying fellows were in the position of subsidising these men (and the *Anthropological Review*) by paying for its distribution to them; that the Society was as a result over £1,000 in debt; and that the domination of the 'cannibal clique' made it extremely difficult for the 'independent' members to remedy the situation—with the result that a steady stream of resignations had finally produced a net decline in membership (*Athenaeum* 1868; JAS 6: clxxxii-clxxxix).

In the late spring of 1869, the 'independents' in the ASL reopened the question of union, proposing another compromise title for the united group: the 'Society for the Study of Man in its Widest Interpretation'. Hunt, however, became suspicious at the last moment that Huxley intended to take advantage of dissension within the ASL to 'crush us' (Beddoe Papers: JH to JB, 9/6, 14/6/'69), and the 'cannibal clique' voted to reject any proposal that did not maintain the integrity of the Society's name (ASL Minutes: 1/6/'69, 15/6/'69). Hunt's sudden death that summer seems to have put an end for a time to further negotiations.

Meanwhile Huxley had turned his attention to reinvigorating the ESL, which he felt had suffered under Crawford's leadership (Lubbock Papers: TH to JL, 18/10/'67; Huxley Papers: TH to J. Hooker, 24/10/'68). The internal structure was modified; the annual *Transactions* were converted to a quarterly *Journal*; and a distinction was introduced between special meetings at which more 'popular' topics would be discussed, and ordinary meetings where 'scientific' subjects would be treated in more technical terms, and to which 'ladies will not be admitted' (ESL 1869). During the same period, the 'anthropologicals' were plagued by debt, resignations, and internal dissension. In his last months, Hunt himself was for a while at odds with the 'cannibal clique'; and while things seem to have been more peaceful under his mild-mannered successor, John Beddoe, the organisation's fortunes remained in a state of decline (Beddoe Papers: correspondence from Hunt, spring 1869; J. Collingwood to JB, 24/11, 27/11/'69; 11/1, 16/3/'70). Huxley kept pushing the idea of amalgamation in the face of the suspicions of the 'anthropologicals' (Beddoe Papers: Collingwood to JB 26/5/'70); but it was not until after the Liverpool meeting of the British Association, where for the first time the two groups met in relative harmony within the same sub-section of 'Ethnology and Anthropology', that the basis was laid for rapprochement by Beddoe's election to the Council of the Association (JAI 1872: xxiii-xxv; cf. Beddoe 1910: 209-16).

Even then, it was not until the beginning of the next year that final negotiations were undertaken at a meeting between Huxley, Lane Fox, and four members of the ASL. The name was still a problem, but Huxley came up with a form which recognised the science but not the Society of the 'anthropologicals': the Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland. The new Council membership and the six vice-presidencies were divided evenly; and when several 'anthropologicals' balked at Huxley for president, he suggested Lubbock instead and then convinced him to accept (ASL Minutes 20/12/'70-30/1/'71; Beddoe 1910: 215; Lubbock Papers: TH to JL, 22/1/'71; JL to TH 26/1/'71).

The first meeting of the new group was held on January 31, 1871, but it was five years before the embers of controversy had finally cooled. The first two years were marred by dissension within the Council. The 'anthropologicals', who were more regular in attendance, managed to defeat the 'ethnologicals' on various issues, although in two cases the latter succeeded in reversing the outcome by calling special meetings (RAI Minutes: 29/5/'71, 12/1/'72). Matters came to a head in the preparation of the house list for 1873, when Huxley, on Lubbock's behalf, proposed John Evans for president (Huxley Papers: JL to TH, 13/12/'72). The 'anthropologicals', who had assumed that there would be a rotation in this office, succeeded in nominating instead their own candidate, who had been one of the

most active of the 'cannibal clique' (RAI Minutes: 17/12/72). Rather than accept this, the 'ethnologicals' came in force to the next meeting and revised the house list by nominating George Busk (1807-1886) for president, claiming four of the six vice-presidencies, and introducing a new policy for the Council which virtually wiped out the 'anthropological' representation—a victory which was facilitated by the refusal of ten of the 'anthropologicals' to participate in what they regarded as an illegal meeting (RAI Minutes: 7/1/73). When this change was sustained by a three to one majority in the annual meeting, a group of 'anthropologicals' withdrew to reorganise as the 'London Anthropological Society' under the presidency of their defeated candidate and with the ardent support of Richard Burton (JAI 1874: 502-3; Charnock 1873: 5). But although they published one volume of a journal and continued to meet for more than a year, the recalcitrants eventually succumbed from limited support. By the end of 1875 they had petitioned to rejoin the Institute, and from that point on, the minutes of the next decade indicate no further traces of controversy over the issues which had once been so divisive (RAI Minutes: 23/11/75).

* * * * *

Previous accounts of this controversy have tended to see it in rather limited terms—a pattern set as early as 1875, when the president of the Institute spoke of it as 'entirely of a merely personal character' (JAI 1875: 500). Having spent some effort in reconstructing the details of the whole episode, one may perhaps be permitted to suggest that it had a greater significance in the history of British anthropology. Viewing the matter in the broadest (and deliberately simplified) terms, one can distinguish three different anthropological traditions played out by three different groups of historical actors in a kind of institutional dialectic in which the Ethnological Society is thesis, the Anthropological Society antithesis, and the Anthropological Institute synthesis. While it has not been possible to discuss these three anthropological traditions in detail within the limits of this essentially institutional account, I have attempted to indicate something of their character (cf. Stocking in press). On the one hand, there is an older 'ethnological' tradition which embraces a wide body of data—physical, linguistic, archaeological and cultural—in the solution of the essentially historical problem of relating all human groups to a single original root. On the other hand, there is an emerging 'anthropological' tradition which is more narrowly physical, and whose central problem is the classificatory one of defining human races in the context of a pre-Darwinian tradition of comparative anatomy. Finally, there is the 'evolutionary' tradition, which is interested in the developmental problem posed by the discovery of pre-historic human remains in the context of Darwinian biological evolutionism. We have seen already how these traditions are associated with three groups of actors: the old 'ethnologists' of Quaker-Evangelical humanitarian background; the radically racist and in most cases marginally scientific 'anthropologists'; and the Darwinians within the Ethnological Society—theologically and scientifically advanced, but closely tied to the scientific establishment of their day. And we have traced the institutional dialectic in which the Anthropological Society emerged from the Ethnological (which itself was a kind of dialectical offshoot of the

Aborigines Protection Society), engaged it in conflict for the better part of a decade, and then joined at last in the creation of the Anthropological Institute.

The character of late nineteenth century British anthropology reflects the outcome of this dialectic in at least three ways: in its scope; in its evolutionary assumptions; and in what I can only call its scientific style. Although the word which Hunt adopted from Paul Broca's *Société d'Anthropologie de Paris* became the generic British term, its content was never the same as in France. There, the *Société d'Anthropologie* and the *Société d'Ethnographie* long remained distinct, 'anthropology' continued to refer to 'physical anthropology', and the *Société d'Anthropologie* tended to be somewhat narrowly physical anthropological in character (Bender 1965). In England the terminology changed but the content continued to reflect the more inclusive character of the old ethnological tradition. Physical anthropology was sometimes spoken of as 'anthropology proper', but the interests of the Anthropological Institute embraced a much broader range of studies.

On the other hand, it is clear that the anthropology of the Anthropological Institute was not simply the old ethnology under a new name. The religious assumptions of the ethnological tradition had disappeared. Although the Darwinian 'ethnologicals' were less boisterous than Hunt in their heterodoxy, they too saw man as firmly rooted in the physical universe, and they sought to develop anthropology as a natural science among natural sciences. The Darwinians did not of course owe this to Hunt and the 'anthropologicals'—they were simply reflecting a general intellectual change which had affected the 'anthropologicals' as well. But in more specific ways, the evolutionist viewpoint did reflect the influence, if not of Hunt, then of the polygenist argument which he and other physical anthropologists tended to espouse. The Darwinians did not simply dismiss polygenism out of hand. On the contrary, they took it seriously as a point of view for which there was a good bit of scientific evidence. That Hunt found their compromise unacceptable should not lead us to ignore the fact that some of the more important Darwinians did try to come to terms with polygenism. Huxley argued that Darwin's theory was capable of 'reconciling and combining all that is good in the Monogenistic and Polygenistic schools' (as quoted in Hunt 1866: 321). Wallace had made that attempt in a paper before the ASL in 1864. Reduced to its elements, Wallace's position was that all men had in fact descended from a common root, but that the moment of that single ancestry lay so far in the past that it might fairly be asserted 'that there were many originally distinct races of men' (Wallace 1864: clxvi-clxvii). The point of all this is that the Darwinians incorporated a good bit of racial thinking into what Hunt called their 'new form of monogenism' (Hunt 1866: 327). When E. B. Tylor later reviewed the development of British anthropology in the thirty years after 1850, he noted that this was the period of the rise and fall of polygenism, which he argued had made an important contribution to the development of evolutionary theory by its careful discrimination of racial varieties which existed in 'comparative permanence' (Tylor 1880: 444; cf. Stocking 1968: 42-68).

While Tylor was speaking of the biological evolution of man, a case can be made for the impact of polygenism on ideas of cultural evolution as well. In describing his collection of artefacts General Pitt Rivers (the former Colonel Lane Fox) spoke of their utility in determining the issue of 'the MONOGENESIS or

POLYGENESIS of certain arts: whether they are exotic or indigenous in the countries in which they are now found' (Pitt Rivers n.d.). This is of course no less than the question of 'diffusion' or 'independent invention', and the fact that Pitt Rivers formulated it in these terms is quite suggestive. The cultural evolutionists were of course strongly monogenist, but there is a sense in which it can be argued that they incorporated the idea of plurality of origin in the very notion of independent invention, or as Pitt Rivers phrased it, 'the polygenesis of certain arts'. Of course, for the cultural evolutionist, diversity of cultural origins was not the result of human psychic diversity. Quite the contrary, the similarity of independent inventions the world over was evidence for the 'psychic unity of mankind'. Intent on demonstrating the psychic unity which the polygenists had rejected, the cultural evolutionists did it by turning the polygenist argument on its head and making diversity of cultural origins into evidence of unity of psychic make-up.

Turning to the question of scientific style, here, too, one can see the character of late nineteenth century British anthropology as a reflection of the controversies of the 1860's. In reviewing Tylor's *Researches into the early history of mankind*, one writer suggested that 'thanks to the moderation of the author's views and the propriety of his style, the work is free from those objections which exclude almost every book on "anthropology" from the household library' (*Geological Magazine* 1865: 175). This moderation extended to other issues as well. Tylor later recalled the period of the '60's as one in which anthropologists had taken to 'cultivating their science as a party-weapon in politics and religion', and suggested that the attempt had been 'not only in the long run harmful to the [practical] effect of anthropology in the world, but disastrous to its immediate position'. He went on to suggest that: 'my recommendation to students is to go right forward, like a horse in blinkers, neither looking to the right hand nor to the left' (Tylor 1885: 94).

Organised anthropology in England had started out as part of an essentially philanthropic organisation, the Aborigines Protection Society. In the early 1840's, it had separated itself from practical philanthropy, if not from biblical assumption. In the 1860's it shed the biblical framework and at the same time rejected what might be called the misanthropic alternative of an applied anthropology shot full of racist assumption about the complete incapacity of savages. Having rejected in the 1840's the left hand of philanthropy, it rejected in the 1860's the right hand of political racism. For the next two decades, under the leadership of one after another of the Darwinian 'ethnologicals'—Lubbock, Busk, Lane Fox, Evans, Tylor, Flower and Galton—the Anthropological Institute stayed in the centre of the road. It took for granted the British Empire and the White Man's Burden, but it was not actively concerned with either colonial policy or savage uplift.⁴

★ ★ ★ ★ ★

Here, perhaps, we can offer a final comment on 'what's in a name'. The fact that an *Anthropological* Institute was founded in the same year *The descent of man* was published is surely more than sheer historical coincidence. The previous decade had been one of intense debate over the 'ape-theory', and both the ASL and the ESL, as well as their common battle ground in the British Association,

were important forums in the general debate (Ellegård 1958). Contemporaries had no doubt that what was at issue was 'man's place in nature'—an issue which etymologically is much more adequately expressed by the term 'anthropology' than by the term 'ethnology'. The vehemence with which certain Darwinians resisted the former is thus more than a bit paradoxical. The fact that it had been preempted by a group which was both anti-Darwinian and scientifically unsavoury helps at once to define and to resolve the paradox. The Darwinians, although scientific revolutionaries, were not the sort of men to excite any greater public odium than was absolutely necessary; and the term 'ethnology', whose intellectual currency had been embodied institutionally for two decades, provided a kind of protective colouration. That some of them were sensitive to this is evident in a letter from Huxley to Lubbock in 1867 discussing the possibility that Lubbock might be president of an amalgamated 'anthropological society'. Huxley felt the title of 'President of the Anthropological Society' might be a bit of a hindrance 'when you go in for a seat in Parliament'—as Lubbock had already done unsuccessfully in 1865, and was again to do unsuccessfully the following year (Lubbock Papers: TH to JL, 18/10/67). But by 1871, it was generally recognised that the Darwinian theory had won scientific acceptance, and the publication of the *Descent* aroused no such furore as the *Origin* had done (Ellegård 1958). Lubbock had by then won his seat in Parliament, and the word 'anthropology' had lost a good deal of the negative charge it had in the previous decade. During the year 1874, a 'redemption fund' of the sort Mrs Lubbock spoke of was actually undertaken by the Institute, and the debt inherited largely from the ASL was liquidated (JAI 1874: 506–7; 1875: 473–5). No one, however, seems to have thought to take advantage of this to change the name of the organisation. On the contrary, the president's annual address referred quite casually to 'the progress of anthropological science' (JAI 1875: 500). By this time anthropology, if not a household term, was well on its way to scientific respectability.

NOTES

I wish to thank the following archives and archivists for their gracious assistance in facilitating my research (which was supported by a grant from the Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research, Inc.): the Library of the Royal Anthropological Institute (Miss B. J. Kirkpatrick); the University Library, Cambridge (Mr P. J. Gautrey); the Archives of the Imperial College of Science and Technology (Mrs J. Pingree); the Wills Memorial Library, Bristol (Mr N. Higham); the Rhodes House Library, Oxford (Mr L. B. Frewer); and the Department of Manuscripts of the British Museum. In the case of the first four repositories, I would like also to acknowledge permission to quote the materials used in this article.

¹ The APS had a long and honourable history; its papers, now lodged at Rhodes House, Oxford, contain almost no materials relating to this episode.

² The ASL was not the first group to bear this name. Between 1837 and 1842 there was in London a phrenological club of the same title, which merged ultimately in the Christian Phrenological Society (Davis 1869: 395).

³ The history of the ESL and the ASL has been treated or touched on by a number of writers. The best accounts are Burrow (1966: 118–36) and Keith (1917), but neither is fully adequate. See also Barnes (1960), Gruber (1967), Myres (1944), Reining (1962), Stewart (1959).

⁴ In 1881, a correspondent wrote to the Institute complaining of a massacre of aborigines in Queensland; the assistant secretary was instructed to refer the writer to the APS (RAI Minutes: 26/4/81). Reining (1962) indicates that questions of the application of anthropology to colonial problems were not seriously raised again until the 1890's, and my own research in the RAI Minutes would confirm this.

REFERENCES

(Where no source is indicated, biographical material is from the *Dictionary of National Biography*.)

- Annan, Noel 1955. The intellectual aristocracy. In *Studies in social history: a tribute to G. M. Trevelyan* (ed.) J. H. Plumb. London: Longmans, Green.
- APS [Aborigines Protection Society] 1837a. *Regulations of the Society*. London: W. Ball.
- 1837b. *Report of the Parliamentary Select Committee . . . reprinted with comments by the Aborigines Protection Society*. London: W. Ball.
- 1838. *First annual report*. . . London: W. Ball.
- 1839a. *Extracts from the papers and proceedings*. . . Vol. I. London: W. Ball.
- 1839b. *Second annual report*. . . London: W. Ball.
- 1840. *Third annual report*. . . London: W. Ball.
- 1841a. *Extracts from the papers and proceedings*. . . Vol. II. London: W. Ball.
- 1841b. *Fourth annual report*. . . London: W. Ball.
- 1842. *Fifth annual report*. . . London: W. Ball.
- 1899. *The Aborigines Protection Society: chapters in its history*. London.
- AR [Anthropological Review] 1864. Anthropology at the British Association, A.D. 1864. **2**, 294–335.
- 1865a. Farewell dinner to Captain Burton. **3**, 167–82.
- 1865b. On the prospects of anthropological science at the British Association of 1865. **3**, 224–9.
- 1865c. Anthropology and the British Association. **3**, 354–71.
- 1866a. Race in legislation and political economy. **4**, 113–35.
- 1866b. Anthropology at the British Association. **4**, 386–408.
- 1867. The Manchester Anthropological Society. **5**, 1–27.
- 1868a. The Dundee Anthropological Conference. **6**, 71–88.
- 1868b. The Ethnological Society. **6**, 324.
- 1869. Anthropology at the British Association. **7**, 414–32.
- 1870. Anthropological news: Professor Huxley on political ethnology. **8**, 197–216.
- ASC [Aborigines Select Committee] 1836–7. *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements)*. . . (rep. edn, 1966). Capetown: C. Struik.
- ASL [Anthropological Society of London] Letters. Letters to the Society, 1865–66. Archives, Royal Anthropological Institute.
- Minutes. Minutes of the Society's Council, 1863–71. Archives, Royal Anthropological Institute.
- 1863. Printed minutes of founding meeting. Archives, Royal Anthropological Institute.
- Athenaeum* 1868. Letters between Hyde Clarke, James Hunt, H. Brookes, E. Brabrook, C. Harding. July–Dec.: 210, 239–40, 270–1, 302, 334, 368–9, 402–3, 432–3, 569, 681, 843.
- BAAS [British Association for the Advancement of Science] 1841. Varieties of the human race. Queries . . . addressed to travellers and others. *Report of the eleventh meeting* . . . , 332–9.
- 1846–51. Transactions of the sections. *Reports* [of the sixteenth to twenty-first meetings].
- Barnes, J. A. 1960. Anthropology in Britain before and after Darwin. *Mankind* **5**, 369–85.
- Beddoe, John 1910. *Memories of eighty years*. Bristol: Arrowsmith.
- Beddoe Papers. John Beddoe Papers. University of Bristol Library.
- Bender, Donald 1965. The development of French anthropology. *J. Hist. behav. Sci.* **1**, 139–51.
- Bendyshe, Thomas 1865. The history of anthropology. *Mems. anthropol. Soc.* **1**, 335–458.
- Bloxam, G. W. 1893. *Index to the publications of the Anthropological Institute*. . . London: Anthropological Institute.
- Brodie, Fawn 1967. *The devil drives: a life of Sir Richard Burton*. London: Eyre & Spottiswoode.
- Burke, Luke 1848–49. *The ethnological journal: a monthly magazine of ethnography, phrenology and archaeology considered as elements of the science of races*. . . London.
- 1865–66. *The ethnological journal, a monthly record of ethnological research and criticism*. London.
- Burrow, John 1966. *Evolution and society: a study in Victorian social theory*. Cambridge: Univ. Press.
- Burton, Richard 1864. Notes on certain matters connected with the Dahoman. *Mems. anthropol. Soc.* **1**, 308–21.
- Buxton, Charles 1849. *Memoirs of Sir Thomas Fowell Buxton*. London: John Murray.
- Carpenter, W. B. 1848. Ethnology, or the science of races. *Edin. Rev.* **88**, 429–87.
- Charnock, R. S. 1873. President's address. *Anthropologia* **1**, 4–17.
- Clarke, Robert 1863. Sketches of the colony of Sierra Leone and its inhabitants. *Trans. ethnol. Soc.* **2**, 320–63.

- Coupland, Reginald 1964. *The British anti-slavery movement* (2nd edn). London: Frank Cass.
- Crawford, John 1866. On the physical and mental characteristics of the Negro. *Trans. ethnol. Soc.* 4, 212-39.
- Cull, Richard 1851. Remarks on the nature, objects, and evidences of ethnological science. *J. ethnol. Soc.* 3, 102-11.
- 1854. A description of three Esquimaux. . . . *J. ethnol. Soc.* 4, 215-25.
- Cunningham, D. J. 1908. Anthropology in the eighteenth century. *J. R. anthrop. Inst.* 38, 10-35.
- Curtin, Philip 1955. *Two Jamaicas: the role of ideas in a tropical colony, 1830-1865*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University.
- 1964. *The image of Africa: British ideas and action, 1780-1850*. Madison: Univ. of Wisconsin.
- Daniel, Glyn 1950. *A hundred years of archaeology*. London: Duckworth.
- Darwin Papers. Charles Darwin Papers (Robin Darwin deposit). Anderson Room, University Library, Cambridge.
- Davis, J. B. 1869. Anthropology and ethnology. *Anthrop. Rev.* 6, 394-9.
- Davis Papers. Joseph Bernard Davis Papers. Archives, Royal Anthropological Institute.
- Dieffenbach, Ernst 1841. *New Zealand and its native population*. London.
- 1848. The study of ethnology. *J. ethnol. Soc.* 1, 15-26.
- Ellegård, Alvar 1958. *Darwin and the general reader: the reception of Darwin's theory of evolution in the British periodical press, 1859-1872* (Göteborgs Universitets Årsskrift 44).
- ESL [Ethnological Society of London] Minutes. Minutes of the Society's Council, 1844-69. Archives, Royal Anthropological Institute.
- 1843. Foundation meeting of the Ethnological Society. *Man* 44, 24-5.
- 1850. *Regulations*. London: W. Watts.
- 1869. Report of the council. *J. ethnol. Soc.* (N.S.) 1, viii-xv.
- Geological Magazine* 1865. Review of E. B. Tylor: *Researches into the early history of mankind*. 2, 174-6.
- Gruber, J. W. 1965. Brixham cave and the antiquity of man. In *Context and meaning in cultural anthropology* (ed. Melford Spiro). New York: Free Press.
- 1967. Horatio Hale and the development of American anthropology. *Procs. Am. phil. Soc.* 3, 6-37.
- 1970. Ethnographic salvage and the shaping of anthropology. *Am. Anthrop.* 72, 1289-99.
- Haller, J. S. Jr 1970. The species problem: nineteenth-century concepts of racial inferiority in the origin of man controversy. *Am. Anthrop.* 72, 1319-29.
- Hodgkin, Thomas 1835. On the importance of studying and preserving the languages spoken by uncivilized nations, with the view of elucidating the physical history of man. *Phil. Mag. J. Sci.* (Ser. 3) 8, 27-36; 94-106.
- 1841. On inquiries into the races of man. *Report of the Eleventh Meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science*, 52-5.
- 1848. The progress of ethnology. *J. ethnol. Soc.* 1, 27-45.
- Hunt, James 1861. *Stammering and stuttering, their nature and treatment* (rep. edn, 1967). New York: Hafner.
- 1863a. Introductory address on the study of anthropology. . . . *Anthrop. Rev.* 1, 1-20.
- 1863b. On anthropological classification. *Anthrop. Rev.* 1, 382-3.
- 1863c. On the Negro's place in nature. *Mems. anthrop. Soc.* 1, 1-64.
- 1865. President's address. *J. anthrop. Soc.* 3, lxxxv-cxii.
- 1866. On the application of the principle of natural selection to anthropology. *Anthrop. Rev.* 4, 320-40.
- 1867a. On the doctrine of continuity applied to anthropology. *Anthrop. Rev.* 5, 110-20.
- 1867b. President's address. *J. anthrop. Soc.* 5, xli-xxx.
- 1868a. The origin of the Anthropological Review and its connection with the Anthropological Society. *Anthrop. Rev.* 6, 431-42.
- 1868b. President's address. *Anthrop. Rev.* 6, 72-9.
- Hutchinson, H. G. 1914. *Life of Sir John Lubbock, Lord Avebury*. 2 vols. London: Macmillan.
- Huxley, Leonard 1916. *Life and letters of Thomas Henry Huxley*. 2 vols. New York: D. Appleton.
- Huxley, T. H. 1870. Anniversary address. *J. ethnol. Soc.* (N.S.) 2, xvi-xxiv.
- Huxley Papers. Thomas Huxley Papers. Imperial College of Science and Technology.
- JAI [Journal of the Anthropological Institute] 1872. Proceedings of the Anthropological and Ethnological Societies of London prior to the date of amalgamation. 1, i-clx.
- 1874. Annual general meeting. 3, 499-527.
- 1875. Annual general meeting. 4, 469-502.

- JAS. *Journal* [of the ordinary meetings] of the *Anthropological Society of London* 2-8 (1864-70). bound with *Anthrop. Rev.*
- Keith, Arthur 1917. How can the Institute best serve the needs of anthropology? *J. R. anthrop. Inst.* **47**, 12-30.
- King, Richard 1844. Address to the Ethnological Society of London. . . . *J. ethnol. Soc.* **2**, 9-40.
- Klingberg, F. J. 1926. *The anti-slavery movement in England: a study in English humanitarianism*. New Haven: Yale Univ. Press.
- Knox, Robert 1862. *The races of men: a philosophical enquiry into the influence of race over the destinies of nations* (2nd edn). London: Henshaw.
- Latham, R. G. 1854. *The natural history department of the Crystal Palace described*. *Ethnology*. In *Crystal Palace Library*. London: Bradbury & Evans.
- Lubbock, John 1865. *Pre-historic times, as illustrated by ancient remains, and the manners and customs of modern savages*. London: Williams & Norgate.
- Lubbock Papers. John Lubbock Papers. British Museum.
- Malcolm, Charles 1851. Address delivered to the Ethnological Society. . . . *J. ethnol. Soc.* **3**, 86-102.
- Mellor, G. R. 1951. *British imperial trusteeship: 1783-1850*. London: Faber & Faber.
- Motte, Standish 1840. *Outline of a system for securing protection to the aboriginal inhabitants of all countries colonised by Great Britain*. . . . London.
- Myres, J. L. 1944. A century of our work. *Man* **44**, 2-9.
- Pim, Bedford 1866. *The Negro and Jamaica*. London: Trubner.
- Pitt Rivers, n.d. Flyer describing Pitt Rivers Collection. Archives, Pitt Rivers Museum, Oxford.
- PMA [Popular Magazine of Anthropology] 1866. Anthropology a practical science. **1**, 6-9.
- Prichard, J. C. 1836-47. *Researches into the physical history of mankind*: 5 vols. London: Sherwood, Gilbert and Piper.
- 1839. On the extinction of human races. *Edin. New philos. J.* **28**, 166-70.
- 1847. On the relations of ethnology to other branches of knowledge. *J. ethnol. Soc.* **1**, 301-29.
- 1848. Anniversary address . . . on the recent progress of ethnology. *J. ethnol. Soc.* **2**, 119-49.
- Rae, Isobel 1964. *Knox, the anatomist*. Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd.
- RAI [Royal Anthropological Institute] Minutes. Minutes of the Institute's Council. Archives, Royal Anthropological Institute.
- Reining, C. C. 1962. A lost period in applied anthropology. *Am. Anthrop.* **64**, 593-600.
- Stewart, T. D. 1959. The effect of Darwin's theory of evolution on physical anthropology. In *Evolution and anthropology* (ed.) B. Meggers. Washington, D.C.: Anthropological Society of Washington.
- Stocking, G. W. Jr 1968. *Race, culture, and evolution: essays in the history of anthropology*. N.Y.: Free Press.
- in press. From chronology to ethnology: James Cowles Prichard and British Anthropology, 1800-1850. Introduction to reprint of Prichard, *Researches in the physical history of man*. Chicago: Univ. Press.
- Thoms, William 1849. *The primeval antiquities of Denmark by J. J. Worsaae, translated and applied to the illustration of similar remains in England*. London: J. H. Barker.
- Tylor, E. B. 1865. *Researches into the early history of mankind and the development of civilization*. London: Murray.
- 1880. Annual address. *J. anthrop. Inst.* **9**, 443-58.
- 1885. How the problems of American anthropology look to the English anthropologist. *Trans. anthrop. Soc. Wash.* **3**, 81-92.
- Wallace, A. R. 1864. The origin of human races and the antiquity of man deduced from the theory of 'natural selection'. *J. anthrop. Soc.* **2**, clviii-clxxxvii.
- Wilson, Daniel 1851. *The archaeology and prehistoric annals of Scotland*. Edinburgh: Sutherland & Knox.
- Wright, Thomas 1865. On the true assignation of the bronze weapons, etc., supposed to indicate a bronze age in western and northern Europe. *Trans. ethnol. Soc.* **4**, 176-96.