

Practical Anthropology

Author(s): Bronislaw Malinowski

Source: *Africa: Journal of the International African Institute*, Jan., 1929, Vol. 2, No. 1 (Jan., 1929), pp. 22-38

Published by: Cambridge University Press on behalf of the International African Institute

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1155162>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

and Cambridge University Press are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Africa: Journal of the International African Institute*

PRACTICAL ANTHROPOLOGY

By BRONISLAW MALINOWSKI

I AM starting from the question: is there any specific task for the Institute so that it shall not duplicate the work of scientific societies or political and educational organizations already existing? The Institute stands in the first place for the practical application of scientific knowledge. It can reach on the one hand various Colonial interests in their practical activities, while at the same time it has at its disposal the knowledge of theoretically trained specialists.

I think that in the very combination of practical and theoretical interests lies the proper task of the Institute. There is a gap between the theoretical concerns of the anthropology of the schools on the one hand, and practical interests on the other. This gap must be bridged over, and in doing this the Institute can make itself very useful.

The practical man is inclined to pooh-pooh, ignore, and even to resent any sort of encroachment of the anthropologist upon his domain. On the other hand it is not always easy to advise the colonial administrator or missionary just where to find the anthropological information he requires. Now I think that the gap is artificial and of great prejudice to either side. The practical man should be asked to state his needs as regards knowledge on savage law, economics, customs, and institutions; he would then stimulate the scientific anthropologist to a most fruitful line of research and thus receive information without which he often gropes in the dark. The anthropologist, on the other hand, must move towards a direct study of indigenous institutions as they now exist and work. He must also become more concerned in the anthropology of the changing African, and in the anthropology of the contact of white and coloured, of European culture and primitive tribal life. If the Institute becomes a central exchange for practical and theoretical interests, and helps to put them in contact, it will fulfil an important task.

A summary of this article in French will appear in the April issue of 'Africa'.

It is then the thesis of this memorandum that there exists an anthropological No-man's-land; that in this are contained studies of primitive economics, primitive jurisprudence, questions of land tenure, of indigenous financial systems and taxation, a correct understanding of the principles of African indigenous education, as well as wider problems of population, hygiene and changing outlook. Scientific knowledge on all these problems is more and more needed by all practical men in the colonies. This knowledge could be supplied by men trained in anthropological methods and possessing the anthropological outlook, provided that they also acquire a direct interest in the practical applications of their work, and a keener sense of present-day realities.

SCIENTIFIC CONTROL OF COLONIAL CO-OPERATION

By the constitution of the Institute all political issues are eliminated from its activities. This can easily be done by concentrating upon the study of the facts and processes which bear upon the practical problems and leaving to statesmen (and journalists) the final decision of how to apply the results.

Thus the important issue of direct versus indirect rule needs careful study of the various processes by which European influences can reach a native tribe. My own opinion, as that of all competent anthropologists, is that indirect or dependent rule is infinitely preferable. In fact, if we define dependent rule as the control of Natives through the medium of their own organization, it is clear that only dependent rule can succeed. For the government of any race consists rather in implanting in them ideas of right, of law and order, and making them obey such ideas.

The real difference between 'direct rule' and 'indirect or dependent rule' consists in the fact that direct rule assumes that you can create at one go an entirely new order, that you can transform Africans into semi-civilized pseudo-European citizens within a few years. Indirect rule, on the other hand, recognizes that no such magical rapid transformation can take place, that in reality all social development is very slow, and that it is infinitely preferable to achieve it by a slow and gradual change coming from within.

A scientific study of facts in this matter would reveal clearly that 'direct rule' means in the last issue forced labour, ruthless taxation, a fixed routine in political matters, the application of a code of laws to an entirely incompatible background. And again as regards education, the formation of African baboos and in general the making of the African into a caricature of the European.

The political indirect rule which was the guiding principle of Lord Lugard's political and financial policy in Africa should be extended to all aspects of culture. Indirect cultural control is the only way of developing economic life, the administration of justice by Native to Natives, the raising of morals and education on indigenous lines, and the development of truly African art, culture, and religion.

But whether we adopt in our practical policy the principle of direct or indirect control, it is clear that a full knowledge of indigenous culture in the special subjects indicated is indispensable. Under indirect or dependent control the white man leaves most of the work to be done by the Natives themselves but still has to supervise it, and if he does not want to be a mere figurehead, or blunderingly to interfere in something which he does not understand, he must know the organization, the ideas and the customs of those under his control. The statesman, on the other hand, who believes in direct control and who wants rapidly to transform a congeries of tribes into a province of his own country, to supersede native customs and law by his civil and criminal codes, needs obviously also to know the material on which he works as well as the mould into which he is trying to press it.

THE NEW BRANCHES OF ANTHROPOLOGICAL INQUIRY

Let us scrutinize some of these subjects which the practical statesman must know if he wants to frame his broad outlines of policy; which the Resident or Commissioner has to understand if he is to administer this policy, which in fact are the real subject-matter of the relations between coloured and white in Africa.

The political organization of a native tribe is obviously one of the first things to be known clearly. Now the political organization of an African people may be of an advanced kind, implying a sort of monarchy, with extensive traditions and genealogies, with great

ceremonial and ritual, a developed system of finance, military organization and various judiciary functions. Such native states can be allowed to run on their own lines but they have to be first expurgated and then controlled. Now it is essential to touch as little as possible of the established order, and yet to eliminate all elements which might offend European susceptibilities or be a menace to good relations.¹ Such knowledge obviously ought to be obtained. As a matter of fact in territories such as Nigeria and Uganda, this knowledge had to be actually acquired by the first administrators.

That type of study, however, is really a piece of anthropological field-work for which the trained anthropologist has developed devices and methods which allow him to observe, to write down his observations and to formulate them much more rapidly than a layman can do, exactly as the trained geologist sees details and reads on the face of the earth important geological principles completely hidden from the most intelligent but untrained observer.

What is then the trouble, and why has the anthropologist been little used and of little use? The answer is that, although the methods and technique of anthropological observation are the only ones by which a competent knowledge of primitive social problems can be reached, yet the interests of anthropology have been so far in a slightly different direction. The institution of primitive kingship, for instance, has been studied by the circular route via classical antiquity. Current anthropology has been interested in savage monarchies through the interest which centred around the priestly king of Nemi. The ritual mythological aspect of savage monarchies, the dim quaint superstitions concerning the king's vitality; connexions between this and magical potentialities; these have been studied, and problems of paramount theoretical importance they certainly are. But our information as to the actual way in which primitive politics are worked, the question, what forces underlie the obedience to the king, to his ministers; the mere descriptive and analytical study of what might be called the political constitution of primitive tribes, of these we are largely ignorant. At best such information has been supplied to us as a

¹ An enlightened anthropologist or statesman has to take count of European stupidity and prejudice quite as fully as of those of the African.

by-product of the other, the antiquarian study of the institutions, and not through the direct practical or theoretical interest in the mechanism of primitive politics.

THEORY OF PRIMITIVE LAW

One of the subjects which is obviously of primary interest to the practical man is the law of his tribe.

Now in this subject remarkably enough he cannot receive much help from the dominant anthropology of the school because this very subject has been singularly neglected by anthropologists. Those who have studied it produced an extraordinarily unsatisfactory theory which led rather to obscure the issue, to prevent the field workers from seeing the relevant facts, than to enlighten us.

The dominant idea of the continental school of jurisprudence (Bachofen, Post, Bernhöft, Kohler, Durkheim) is that in primitive societies the individual is completely dominated by the group—the herd—the clan—the tribe, and that he obeys the laws and customs of his community with an absolute and passive obedience. Now as modern research is leading us to see, such an assumption is entirely unwarranted. (Cf. for instance the present writer's *Crime and Custom in Savage Society*, 1926.)

First of all we are beginning to see that behind the apparently chaotic welter of savage rules, there can be distinguished certain clear principles, and that the rules themselves can be adequately classified. The savage has his own criminal law, and he has what corresponds to our civil law. He has, that is, a definite system of principles which govern individual or communal rights to land, manufactured objects, or articles of consumption. He has definite, nay at times elaborate, systems of inheritance in goods and of succession in office.

These general principles are deeply connected with the organization of his tribe. This again, far from being a simple subject-matter, can only be understood after patient training in the principles of primitive sociology and after some experience in anthropological field work. And here in the study of primitive organization, of kinship, of the family, of the village community and of the tribe we come to better trodden fields of anthropology.

There is a well defined branch of our learning already in existence which is concerned with such things as 'classificatory' kinship, the organization of the clan and of the local group, and the various problems associated with matrilineal or patrilineal descent. This branch of anthropology is, however, still largely dominated by what might be called sensational or antiquarian interests. It is still very largely concerned with the explanation of customs which appear to us strange, quaint, incomprehensible. The *comvade*, the avoidance of the mother-in-law, the disposal of the after-birth, and the quaint usages associated with the relation between two cousins—all these have received a considerable amount of attention. But the broad and bigger problems of social anthropology are still somewhat in the shadow. We know much more about the so-called anomalous forms of marriage or classificatory exaggerations of kinship than we know about the organization of the family. Take such excellent books as Rattray's on the Ashanti, Smith and Dale on the Baila, E. Junod's on the Thonga, and you will find a strange disproportion between the attention given to the everyday facts of life and the singular, between the treatment of the ordinary and the quaint; the family, for instance, and the more abstruse forms of kinship. Now I maintain that the study, for instance, of how the character of an individual is formed within the family circle at first and then within the local group, and again through a course of initiations later on; the problem, that is, of character formation in the routine of native life-history, is one which can be treated anthropologically and is of primary importance theoretically. So far this problem has been almost completely neglected by anthropologists in theory and observation. I also maintain that the institution of the family is the dominant factor in most social systems, rather than those phantastic kinship anomalies so beloved of the speculative anthropologist. I have devoted to this contention two volumes so I need not expatiate on it here.¹

In the study of individual character formation the observer would

¹ Cf. my *Family among the Australian Aborigines* 1913, and *Sex and Repression in Savage Society* 1927); also my articles s.v. *Kinship and Marriage* in the forthcoming issue of the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, 1929, as well as a book on *Primitive Kinship*, now in preparation.

find also a revelation of the deep-seated moral and legal forces and the various native sanctions which make a law-abiding citizen out of a so-called savage. If anything has been proved by recent anthropological research and colonial practice it is the truth that you cannot with impunity undo or subvert an old system of traditions, of morals or laws and replace it by a ready-made new morality and sense of right; the result invariably will be what might be called 'black bolshevism'.

In all this again it is the changing Native and not an untouched savage whom we would have to study. In fact, the real practice of a modern field worker should become to study the savage as he is, that is, influenced by European culture, and then to eliminate those new influences and reconstruct the pre-European status. I think it will be much sounder, even from the purely scientific point of view, if this process of elimination were not done in a mysterious manner, in the dark so to speak, but if in our field work we collected the full data as they now appear, presented them in this form, and made our reconstruction of the past above board, in the open.¹

I want to make it quite clear that I am not indiscriminately criticizing old anthropology or trying to revolutionize it. From the very beginning the comparative methods of old anthropology have produced work and special studies of the greatest importance for the practical man. Niebuhr's monograph on Slavery, Steinmetz's work on Primitive Jurisprudence, the above quoted works on savage kinship supply us with excellent material for that new branch of anthropology here advocated. They will have only to be slightly modified, and more observations will have to be collected from the point of view of how institutions function, and not how they 'originated' or 'diffused'.

THE EFFECTIVE STUDY OF PRIMITIVE LANGUAGES

One of the matters in the reorganization of old anthropological point of view which seems to me of primary importance is a closer co-operation between the study of its several aspects which, so far, have

¹ Even in their study of the fully detribalized and yankified Indian, our United States colleagues persistently ignore the Indian as he is and study the Indian-as-he-must-have-been some century or two back.

been kept in watertight compartments. One of these, the study of primitive languages, seems to me specially important to consider.

There is no doubt at all that a knowledge of the language of his tribe is one of the most essential parts of the equipment of an administrator, a missionary or a teacher. Now it is clear that when teaching the vocabulary of some African tribe it is quite impossible to translate some of the most important terms into English. All words which cover the native social order, all which express religious beliefs, moral values, or specific technical or ritual proceedings can only be rendered accurately by reference to the social organization of the tribe, their beliefs, practices, education and economics. The study of a native language must go hand in hand with the study of its culture.

Its grammar cannot even well be taught except with the help of social anthropology. There are grammatical phenomena, as for instance, the classificatory particles of the Bantu languages, and of some Melanesian tongues which cannot be explained except in terms of savage customs and institutions. Again, the sociological differentiations in linguistic usage between the various ranks of society cannot be treated except as part of sociology. The various pronouns of possession in Melanesia, some modifications of verb and noun, are deeply correlated with the practice to which the language is put within its various cultural contacts, and to separate the study of language from the study of culture means merely a waste of time and an amateurishness in most aspects of the work. A close co-operation between linguistic teaching and anthropological training seems to me of the greatest importance in any curriculum prepared for colonial cadets and similar people, and yet unfortunately all the organizations of our universities are completely inadequate from this point of view. The Institute here again could give practical help by embracing the cause of this new effective anthropological method in linguistic teaching.

THE ANTHROPOLOGICAL ISSUES OF LAND TENURE

To take another subject of paramount importance, namely, land tenure in a primitive community. The apportioning of territory must be one of the first tasks of an administrator, and in doing this he has

first of all to lay down the broad lines of his policy and then see that they are correctly carried out by his officers.

It is easy to see, however, that even the broad lines of policy are not easily framed unless we start with a scientific knowledge of the subject. Rights of conquest, historical prerogatives, rights stipulated by 'treaties with native chiefs' have been claimed by those interests which demand a maximum of land for European uses. Again, on the other side, those trying to safeguard native interests invoke very often the rights of primitive populations and insist that at least a 'necessary minimum' should be reserved for the Natives. But, whichever point of view is really taken, the whole problem remains a groping in the dark as long as we are not able to ascertain what the necessary minimum for the Natives can be.

Lord Lugard repeatedly insists on the great difficulties in both the theory and practice of dealing with land tenure.

'The absence of any definite sustained policy in regard to land in these dependencies (West Africa) seems to have arisen from the failure to investigate the system of native tenure. The legislators, though desirous of giving due weight to native custom, were not apparently familiar with it, and we find that the various findings relating to land are couched in terms often quite inapplicable to native tenure, and the lease and other instruments are often drawn up on an English model.'¹

And yet when two Committees between 1908 and 1915, one after the other, were appointed to investigate the subject of land tenure in the whole of West Africa, and collected an immense amount of evidence, the work of the Committees aroused such an upheaval of native public opinion that the reports were never published.² We seem therefore to be here between the devil and the deep sea, since ignorance seems to be a complete handicap in dealing with this problem, and yet often ignorance seems to be bliss compared with knowledge which is both difficult to obtain and dangerous to use.

Here I venture to suggest that if the whole question had been investigated, not by a politically appointed committee, but by two

¹ *Dual Mandate*, p. 304.

² It must, however, be noted that the work of the Committee was brought to an end by the outbreak of war in 1914.

or three anthropologists, they would have done the work in far shorter time, with far less expenditure, and would have done it competently and usefully. I have not seen the reports of the West African Committee, but I have seen similar work done in the territory of Papua and the results discussed by administrators, missionaries and planters. I have found in the first place that wherever I checked the findings of one of these 'practical' men they were essentially erroneous. As Lord Lugard rightly points out in the above quotation, the European lawyer is likely to distort native conditions by forcing them into terminology borrowed from European law. The untrained European, on the other hand, uses such words as 'communism', 'individualism,' 'private property,' 'tribal property' and what not, without giving them the slightest intelligible meaning, or understanding himself what he is talking about.

It is only that anthropologist, who specializes in the study of primitive legal ideas and economic conditions, who is competent to deal with this question. Problems of ownership must always be approached from the point of view of actual use. In dealing with land tenure it is futile to summon, as political committees usually do, a number of witnesses and just ask them simply what is their form of ownership, or, worse, what in their opinion ownership should be. Land tenure among primitive peoples is always very complex, and it is impossible for an untrained person not to be misled into some entirely inadequate translation of native ideas into his own terminology. A number of contradictory statements are invariably obtained by the amateur simply because, as a rule, the land is used by various people and the uses of the land are associated with the native systems of kinship, often a mixture of mother-right or father-right, utterly incomprehensible to the untrained European. And again, Natives will stress at times the more utilitarian aspect of ownership and then bring to the forefront some magical or mythological rights. Even these latter, however, cannot be ignored in practice because the Natives value them extremely, and because a misunderstanding arising out of some injury or insult to a sacred spot or sacred object might give rise to serious trouble. (Cf. for instance *The Golden Stool of Ashanti*.)

The correct procedure is to draw up a map of the territory, showing

the lands which belong to each of the several communities, and the individual plots, into which it is divided. Then instead of inquiring in a wholesale manner into 'ownership' it is necessary to study how each land unit is used, and to find out the details of each of the more or less practical and also all the mystical bonds between a plot of land and the various people who claim some right to that plot.

Such an inquiry would not easily alarm the Native. He would often be not even aware that you are trying to take a survey of land tenure. In the second place such a survey would not only reveal the real legal rights of the individuals, it would also answer the often more important question of how the lands are used and what is the 'indispensable minimum' which must be reserved for them. Finally, since the anthropologist has no vested interest in this question, nor any bias connected with his research, since his aim is and will always be accuracy and fullness of detail, he is the most likely person to give the administrator what is really needed, an entirely unbiased and impartial account of the actual state of affairs.

It is not only between white and coloured interests that there is an issue, but also between the interests of the various Natives, the chief versus the community; the village community versus the clan; the tribe as a whole versus this or that section; and it is impossible to deal adequately and fairly with any of these questions without that impartial cold-blooded passion for sheer accuracy which the anthropologist can provide.

PRIMITIVE ECONOMICS

Land tenure is but one problem of the primitive economic system of the tribe, and if this one problem is so complicated, it is clear that the whole system will not be easy to understand or to handle. In fact the knowledge of what might be called the economic organization of a community is essential in a number of practical problems, such as those associated with improved hygienic conditions, with labour, with education, with the abolition of slavery and forced labour, and last but not least, with taxation.

The substance of serious anthropological work must consist here in the sociological analysis of primitive production and consumption;

the types and phases of economic activities; the relations between the economic and the religious aspect, between certain forms of magic even and the practical arts. The facts have to be observed and studied as they now exist and work, and not as a pretext for reconstruction and hypothesis—anthropology should aim at the understanding and explanation of economic processes rather than the establishment of ‘origins and stages’ or ‘diffusions and histories’.

The honest anthropologist will have to confess at once that as subject-matter primitive economics has been neglected both in observation and in theory. Forms of labour and exchange, the way in which the wealth is ‘capitalized’, that is, pooled or transformed into more permanent values, the psychology of gift and exchange, all these are headings difficult to find in any record of field work or text-book of anthropology.¹

From the practical point of view questions of labour are in the forefront. Any discussion of this subject should start with a sociological definition of labour. To identify labour with activity in general (as has been done recently in a somewhat unsatisfactory text-book on *Primitive Labour* by L. H. Buxton) is incorrect, for there are various activities, above all, play and games, which are not labour in the economic sense. Not all cultural types of behaviour can be classed as labour.

In the first place labour must be defined in that it achieves something tangible and useful which serves to the satisfaction of man’s essential wants. The search for food and its preparation, the procuring of material for housing, clothing, weapons, and direct objects of use constitute the most important types of labour. Even the lowest savages, however, provide certain material goods which are not for direct

¹ Some useful preliminary work on primitive economics has been done, above all in Germany. The names of E. Hahn, H. Schurtz, K. Bücher, R. Thurnwald and Max Weber will occur at once to the anthropologist. Recently a book has been published in English under the title *Primitive Economics* by R. W. Firth, which fills an important gap, and it is hoped will start a more intensive interest in these problems. This book also contains an excellent bibliography. Cf. also my *Argonauts of the Western Pacific*, 1922, where a native system of exchange has been described, and articles: Primitive Economics (*Economic Journal*, 1921) and Labour and Primitive Economics (*Nature*, 1926).

consumption and really belong to the primitive forms of capital: implements, arrangements for storing and preserving food, traps, hunting weapons and so on. To define the 'savage' as has been done by a recent writer as a man who 'has no means of acquiring more wealth than he can carry about with him, on his person, or on the persons of his family' is misleading. Further, often among the lowest savages there is work devoted to the production of what might be called luxuries, objects of art and monuments of culture, personal ornaments, paintings, rude sculpture, and objects serving for cult and ritual. Labour should be defined as a purposeful form of systematic activity standardized by tradition and devoted to the satisfaction of wants, the making of means of production, the creation of objects of luxury, value and renown.

This definition, though it sounds very academic and divorced from practical possibilities, allows us at once to draw one or two useful conclusions. We have distinguished labour from other activities by its purpose. The question directly emerges: what is it that in primitive culture drives man to strenuous, prolonged, and often unpleasant effort? The problem of labour can be treated only against the background of the psychological problem of value. What are the effective incentives to effort? In what way are they related to the individual, and how far are they transformed by culture? We see thus, that exactly as it would be useless to investigate land tenure without asking to what uses land is being put, so it is impossible to understand native labour except as part of the problem of their system of values, incentives, and utility. Early forms of labour are obviously correlated with the manner in which economic value comes into existence. The wise entrepreneur and administrator will be interested to know what were the old tribal values and what forms economic ambition took in their area.

To give a concrete example: Among the North-Western tribes of North America most interests centred around the production of certain objects which in a singular and complicated manner satisfied the ambitions and the aesthetic feeling of the owner. The production of these objects forced those people to work intensely and kept them up to a certain pitch of industrial activity. Again, these objects were

indispensable to the organization of their family and marriage, of their chieftainship and clan system. A wise system of administration would have got to understand the native economic system and tried gradually perhaps to replace it by new incentives to labour, new values, and new economic wants. The essentially unwarranted act of the Canadian Government, who abolished the institution of the *Potlatch*, has in every respect completely disorganized the life of the Natives, and it has produced most untoward economic consequences.

As we know from all parts of the world, a completely detribalized community, if it is not to die out, is extremely difficult to manage. We have here an example of how an unscientific spirit leads to serious practical errors.

As an offset to this I would like, from personal experience, to mention the case of North-Western Melanesia, where white traders were compelled to reorganize native industries and produce by native labour objects of native value, and through this obtained indirect control over native economic production. (Cf. also Prof. Seligman's article on Applied Anthropology in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*.)

Forced labour, conscription or voluntary labour contracts, and the difficulties of obtaining sufficient numbers—all these form another type of practical difficulties in the colonies. The chief trouble in all this is to entice the Native or persuade him to keep him satisfied while he works for the white man; and last but not least to prevent the period of work having bad consequences on his health or morale as well as on the temporarily depleted village and home.

In all this the main question again is how to make a man of a different culture satisfied with work. The simplest experience teaches that to everybody work is *prima facie* unpleasant, but a study of primitive conditions shows that very efficient work can be obtained, and the Natives can be made to work with some degree of real satisfaction if propitious conditions are created for them. And another anthropological generalization teaches that satisfactory conditions of work are obtained only by reproducing those conditions under which the native works within his own culture. In Melanesia I have seen this applied on some plantations. Use was made of such stimuli as competitive displays of the results, or special marks of distinction for

industry, or again of rhythm and working songs. Again the arrangement of work in gangs corresponding to indigenous communal labour produced the desired effect, but all such things must never be improvised—an artificial arrangement will never get hold of native imagination. In every community I maintain there are such indigenous means of achieving more intensive labour and greater output, and it is only necessary to study the facts in order to be able to apply efficient incentives. (Cf. here also the interesting work of K. Bücher, *Arbeit und Rhythmus*.)

A great many points could be made on the subject of labour—its incentives, its stimulation, its communal arrangement, its wider organization within the whole tribal system. I should like to add here that on these points as everywhere else the anthropologist doing the work under this new view-point, which the Institute might develop, should not merely try to reconstruct native culture as it existed or exists independently of European influence, but study the social and mental phenomena which Western culture produces in the African.

THE ANTHROPOLOGY OF THE CHANGING NATIVE

A new branch of anthropology must sooner or later be started: the anthropology of the changing Native. Nowadays, when we are intensely interested, through some new anthropological theories, in problems of contact and diffusion, it seems incredible that hardly any exhaustive studies have been undertaken on the question of how European influence is being diffused into native communities. The anthropology of the changing savage would indeed throw an extremely important light upon the theoretical problem of the contact of cultures, transmission of ideas and customs, in short, on the whole problem of diffusion.

This anthropology would obviously be of the highest importance to the practical man in the colonies. Finally, since we are witnessing one of the greatest crises in human history, namely that of the gradual expansion of one form of civilization over the whole world, the recording of that event is an essential duty of those competent to do it. Now it is really the anthropologist, accustomed as he is to deal with the simple mind and to understand simple cultures who

ought to study the problem of the westernization of the world. Remarkably enough, however, so far, most contributions on that subject have been made by enthusiasts, while the specialist in his field work still tries to close his eyes to the surrounding reality and reconstructs laboriously a savage who does not exist any more—who, in Melanesia ceased to exist a generation ago, in Africa some two generations ago, and in North America perhaps one hundred years or more. If the Institute succeeds in creating this new branch of anthropology, the study of the diffusion of Western cultures among primitive peoples, and if this is undertaken with as much theoretical zeal and direct interest as the reconstructive study, then the Institute will do a great service to anthropology and to the practical man as well.

To sum up these somewhat diffused considerations; the Institute could fulfil an important practical function: (1) By bridging the gap between theoretical anthropology and its practical applications. (2) It should insist that a series of new or only partially considered subjects should be placed into the forefront of anthropological studies; the problems of population and of a demographic survey of primitive tribes; the study of the social organizations, above all, of its fundamental institutions, the family, marriage, and educational agencies in so far as they mould the character and the social nature of the individual; the somewhat neglected subjects of law, economics and politics as we find them at work in primitive communities; finally, the study of what might be called sociological or cultural linguistics: these are subjects of primary importance which can only be studied anthropologically if they are to be practically useful. (3) The study of all these questions ought to be stimulated from the practical side by linking them, not in a political, but in a merely analytical spirit to such questions as increase or decrease and shifting of populations, direct versus indirect rule, the creation of European schools, the introduction of taxation, and of labour. Only when the practical man becomes aware that he must not flounder and grope in the dark, that he needs anthropological knowledge, can he become useful to the specialist, and in turn make the latter useful to himself. (4) The study of the diffusion of European

culture into savage communities, the anthropology of the changing Native must be established as an important branch of work. The anthropologist as he is now is better equipped than any one else to undertake this study, but here again he must enlarge his interests and adapt them to the practical requirements of the man who works with and for the Native. (5) Finally, as regards the directly practical assistance which could be given by the Institute in this matter: (*a*) The work in this modern, as it calls itself, functional School of Anthropology might be encouraged by the Institute. (*b*) The Institute in co-operation with the learned societies and universities could be instrumental in organizing field work on the lines here indicated in Africa. (*c*) The Institute might take in hand the question of anthropological training of colonial cadets, especially the functional anthropology dealing with African communities as they exist to-day. (*d*) Finally, the Institute could be a general meeting-place or central exchange between the practical and theoretical interests in anthropology.

BRONISLAW MALINOWSKI.