

INTRODUCTION

ANCESTRAL KNOWLEDGE



Alfred Cort Haddon was written out of the story of anthropology for the same reasons that make him interesting today. He was passionately committed to the protection of simpler societies and their civilizations from colonists and their supporters in Parliament and the armed forces. He grew up in a nonconformist family that was active in humanitarian campaigns, literature, art, progressive education and politics. His grandparents campaigned for the abolition of slavery, his mother was a writer, his father a publisher and illustrator, his brother an artist and two of his aunts socialists and founding members of the Fabian Society. Haddon was partly home-schooled, worked briefly in the family publishing business and studied art part-time before attending Cambridge and graduating in Zoology and Comparative Anatomy in 1879. He secured a teaching job at the Royal College of Science in Dublin after one of his professors lobbied Thomas Henry Huxley on his behalf, and he spent the next twenty-one years working as a part-time Professor of Zoology in the city before taking up a part-time University Lectureship in Ethnology at Cambridge University.

This monograph concentrates on what happened during those twenty-one years and begins more or less with Haddon's decision to switch from zoology to ethnology in 1887. There is an Irish proverb that says *briseann an dúchas trí shuille an chait*, which translates as 'heritage breaks through the eyes of a cat', and this could be used to explain what happened after Haddon

Alfred Cort Haddon
A Very English Savage
Ciarán Walsh

<https://www.berghahnbooks.com/title/WalshAlfred>

Not for resale

decided to undertake an eight-month-long ethnological exploration of the Torres Strait and adjacent parts of New Guinea for the British Museum, even though he was supposed to be studying coral reefs for Huxley. From the outset, the collection of information that James G. Frazer sought on magico-religious rituals filled his journal, sketchbooks and photographs at the expense of data on the structure of coral reefs that Huxley requested in a research brief. Haddon also befriended James ‘Tamate’ Chalmers, a missionary and ethnologist who advocated a native mission and a New Guinea for the New Guineans (Porter 2004), and together they explored parts of New Guinea that had not been fully colonized. On his return to London, he joined a movement of social reformers, utopians and anarchists who looked to anthropology for inspiration in their search for an alternative to dog-eat-dog capitalism. He decided to abandon his faltering career in marine biology in 1889 and go into anthropology instead. He spent the next ten years fighting on two fronts. In Ireland he was opposed by a scientific establishment that deployed anthropology as a practical science in defence of the oldest colony. In England he had to negotiate with anatomists who restricted academic anthropology to the study of bodies and were determined to keep Haddon and his radical ideas out of Cambridge University.

The war on terror has ensured that the word radical has become closely associated with extremism (see Elshimi 2017), but the word has an older meaning that derives from Latin and, in Haddon’s case, describes a desire to bring about a root-and-branch reform of the institution of anthropology in response to his experience of colonialism in Oceania. Haddon approached the problem in two ways. First, he joined Patrick Geddes, Henry ‘Havelock’ Ellis and their anarchist associates in a movement – the very definition of being a radical, according to the Oxford English Dictionary – to deconstruct anatomical anthropology and reconstruct anthropology as an instrument of scientific social reform, although the influence of Freemasonry ensured that this was a philosophical rather than ideological project. Two, Haddon sought to thoroughly modernize ethnography and adopted the slideshow as a form of engaged ethnography. Photography

has been mentioned in passing, but archival material relating to his discovery of the Aran Islands in 1890 would have established Haddon as a pioneer of visual anthropology had his experiments in ethnographic form not been overwritten by anthropologists who assumed a 'hard' science attitude and, according to Margaret Mead (1995), adopted a word-based methodology in the first two decades of the twentieth century. What gets lost as a consequence is Haddon's decision in 1890 to switch from text to photography as the methodological and epistemological basis of his version of ethnology, which he defined as cultural anthropology in his *History of Anthropology*, obliquely in the first edition (Haddon and Quiggin 1910: 128) and unequivocally in the second edition (Haddon 1934: 100). That experiment culminated in the first use of a cinematographic camera by an ethnographer in the field, and I propose that the circumstance of that experiment entitles Haddon to be regarded as a modernist. Furthermore, I propose that his adoption of the slideshow as a form of anticolonial activism positively influenced key players in cultural nationalism and literary modernism in Ireland, and this overturns thirty years of scholarship based on a constructed antagonism between the political effect of Haddon's ethnological experiments and the aims of those movements.

The problem here is that Haddon's advocacy on behalf of colonized civilizations took the form of articles in popular journals and slideshows that have left few traces in the archives mined by disciplinary historians in the 1990s. They zeroed in on Haddon's brief involvement in zoology and used this to set him up as an evolutionist foil for the university-educated social anthropologists who followed him into the field in the first two decades of the twentieth century and produced two ethnographic texts that defined modern anthropology in Britain, A. R. Radcliffe-Brown's *Andaman Islanders: A Study in Social Anthropology* (1922) and Bronislaw Malinowski's *Argonauts of the Western Pacific* (1922). Thus, the twenty-one years Haddon spent in Ireland became a sort of historiographical limbo that ended when Haddon left Dublin as a much-fêted anthropologist in the wake of his second expedition to the Torres Strait and founded the discipline of

anthropology in Cambridge. Ten years of anticolonial activism, formal experimentation and increased marginalization within a hostile academy were forgotten in the process. The reason, I will argue, has less to do with the availability or accessibility of archival evidence than a determination to shoehorn Haddon into a story structured around Thomas Kuhn's (1970) work on scientific revolutions, the lens through which influential historians like Ian Langham (1981), Henrika Kuklick (1991) and George W. Stocking Jr (1995) examined the modernization of British anthropology.

The scale of the error, historiographically speaking, is best described by explaining the subtitle of this monograph. Alexander Macalister, Professor of Anatomy at Cambridge and President of the Anthropological Institute, addressed the split between ethnologists and anthropologists in a sectoral review in 1894. He acknowledged that Haddon was an experienced scientist who had 'become acquainted with savage men and their ways' (*JAI* 23 [1894]: 412), implying in the racist language of colonialism that Haddon had 'gone native' in the field and returned as a very English savage whose interest in the ethics of colonialism belonged in the realm of philosophy, and as such was incompatible with scientific anthropology. Macalister subsequently blocked Haddon's appointment to the first University Lectureship in Anthropology at Cambridge, a disruptive little fact that makes these histories read more like disciplinary folklore, and are treated as such.

Reinstating Haddon in the story of the modernization of anthropology in Ireland and England requires clear thinking about the political significance of anthropology and ethnology in the 1890s. This requires, by way of introduction, the definition of key terms in line with debates that manifested a culture war in organized anthropology. That in turn requires the recovery of narratives that have been written out of the history of anthropology because of a preoccupation with evolution bracketed by race and empire. This leads into a discussion of what Thomas Hyland Eriksen, speaking in a webinar in November 2021, labelled 'structural amnesia'. That phrase summarizes a core theme of my doctoral research, in which I investigated the forgotten spaces

of Anglo-Irish anthropology. The key question was what anthropology meant in a historical context, and the current question of ancestry is bound up in what we think anthropology means in a contemporary context. If Haddon's story tells us anything it is that the assumption that we know what anthropology is and where it came from is false, that the meaning of anthropology was contested ever since the word first entered modern English in the sixteenth century. That search for definition was the first task Haddon set himself after he decided to go into anthropology in 1889, and I have taken this as the starting point of this monograph.

KEY WORDS

In November 1895, Haddon published a short article on 'The Study of Anthropology' in an obscure journal dealing with extramural studies in and around Cambridge. He filed a copy with other newspaper cuttings and Edith Fegan and John D. Pickles listed it under 'Articles and Notes' in their 1978 *Bibliography of A.C. Haddon*. It would be easy to miss the article except that Haddon incorporated it into his introduction to *The Study of Man* (1898), a mishmash of reprinted articles and reports published between 1891 and 1897 that dealt with practical aspects of physical anthropology and folklore collection.

Haddon's file copy of 'The Study of Anthropology' provides the textual foundation for many of the arguments advanced in this monograph, and this reflects the importance I attach to his journalism. I also share the disruptive intent Haddon revealed in the opening paragraph, in which he acknowledged a lack of recognition of the full 'scope and significance of Anthropology' (Haddon 1895a: 25) and the difficulty of approaching such a complex subject 'from a dispassionate point of view'. 'Dispassionate' is the key word here because it suggests conflict, and the timing of Haddon's article is important in this regard. Two months earlier, Haddon delivered an unequivocal critique of the genocidal consequences of British imperialism at a public meeting of the anthro-

pological section of the British Association for the Advancement of Science in Ipswich (BAAS 1895: 832), and his credibility as a scientist first and anthropologist second was questioned in the press. I regard this as a pivotal event in Haddon's story and, for now, it serves to illustrate that Haddon's definition of key words is in essence a definition of the contrary political positions adopted by anthropologists and ethnologists in the 1890s. This, I propose, is the key to understanding his practice as it developed in Ireland in the 1890s and its significance in terms of contemporary debates about the scope and meaning of anthropology.

Haddon wrote:

At the risk of being tedious I think it is desirable to define our terms at the outset. On the Continent the term anthropology is restricted to what we in England term Physical Anthropology or Anthropography, that is, the study of man as an animal. This comprises not only the comparative study of the structural differences between members of different races of mankind, but also the comparison of man with the higher apes. We prefer to retain the word Anthropology for the study of man in its wider aspect. (Haddon 1895a: 25)

He then set out what this meant. Ethnography was 'the description . . . of a small tribe, the natives of a restricted area or a large nation'. Ethnology was the 'comparative study of human groups and ha[d] for its aim the elucidation of inter-relationships of tribes, races and other bodies of men'. Sociology was 'the study of human communities, both simple and complex'. Archaeology attempted 'to reconstruct the ancient history of man from the remains of the past that are brought to light in various ways'. He added that it would be better 'to recover what they thought and believed', as the non-material aspects of a people's existence 'are the most important departments of human life'.

He set out two methods for generating knowledge in this department. The first was the study of culture, but he warned that organizing this around 'a rigorously defined order of evolution' in the stages of culture had its dangers and the comparative method

of studying ‘customs, modes of thought and religion’ had to be used with circumspection. The second was ‘folk-lore’; he preferred the hyphenated form because it was closer in meaning to ‘the lore of the folk’, the folk being traditional communities that survived in more or less developed societies. He dismissed the tendency of some to deride ‘folk-lore’ ‘as being concerned with ghosts, fairy tales and old wives’ superstitions’ and represented it as a reserve of ancestral thought and belief that survived on a local (folk) and global (savage) level. In this context, art – pattern and designs – was ‘replete with human interest, as being associated with some of the deepest and most subtle ideas’. He pulled it all together by stating that anthropology happened wherever people are, not just in the ‘uttermost part of the earth’ but ‘in our own nurseries, the playground, on the village-green – even in our cities.’

As a body of text, ‘The Study of Anthropology’ amounts to a little less than an A4 page of typescript and cannot be compared with Radcliffe-Brown’s *Andaman Islanders* or Malinowski’s *Argonauts of the Western Pacific* in terms of foundational texts. That is not my intention, however. Haddon published the article to put his vision of what modern anthropology could be into the public domain and, on that basis, I treat it as a manifesto. Haddon probably wrote it in 1890 after Ellis commissioned a study of anthropology as the epistemological anchor for the Contemporary Science Series, a collection of utopian, anarchist and reformist treatments of subjects relevant to scientific social reform. That places Haddon in the vanguard of advanced thinking on anthropology and the text, despite its brevity, lives up to this in terms of its modernity. Haddon humanized and socialized anthropology, deterritorialized the ethnographic ‘field’ and incorporated an anthropology of affect in the study of the imaginative lives – art, craft and dance – of *other* civilizations, the very terms used adding an agency to the ethnographic subject that was groundbreaking at a time of imperialist expansion and genocide in the colonies. Furthermore, Haddon included sociology as a major area of study and tagged his explanation with a reference to Pëtr Kropotkin’s theory that the study of social organization proceeds

from the simple to the complex. Kropotkin was an influential Russian anarchist living in exile in London and Geddes introduced Haddon to Kropotkin's work in 1889. Haddon also substituted the modern concept of development as an explanation for the difference between simple and complex societies, explicitly rejecting a hierarchy of civilization, the orthodox taxonomy of evolutionary stages in culture and the comparative method used to study them.

Beyond the document itself, Haddon and his network thought of anthropology and sociology as interchangeable terms closely linked to a revamped version of political economy. In 1903, Geddes wrote a letter to Haddon in which he acknowledged that Haddon had 'approached sociology through anthropology' while Geddes had approached 'anthropolo. through socio.'. That letter started a process that culminated in Haddon and Geddes joining a working group that organized the inaugural meeting of the Sociological Society, the occasion, according to Chris Renwick (2012: 128–40), of a showdown with Galton and his Eugenics movement. This also explains the 'we' of 'we prefer', 'we' being a heterodox network of utopians, feminists, socialists, anarchists, revolutionaries and third-way reformists that Geddes created in the 1880s and Haddon joined in 1890. 'We prefer' was also a wonderfully understated acknowledgement of the culture war that split the small community of three hundred or so individuals that populated organizations active in the field of anthropology in Ireland and the UK. Haddon usually referred to this as 'Anthropology', and I use 'organized anthropology' for the sake of clarity. Haddon's membership of the Anthropological Institute, Folk-Lore Society and Royal Society of Antiquaries of Ireland was indicative of Anthropology in 'in its widest aspect', and he demonstrated what this meant in practice in an ethnographic survey of the Aran Islands in 1892 (RIA 3,2 (1891–93): 768–830), when he combined geography, anthropology, sociology, political economy, archaeology, folklore and ethnology under the organizing formula of 'Place-Work-Folk', which Geddes adapted from a synthetic, social survey model developed by Frédéric Le Play in France.

Haddon's manifesto had no effect on the trajectory of anthropology in the short term. In 1898, Cambridge University created the first University Lectureship in Anthropology in the Department of Anatomy and conceded a freestanding, part-time University Lectureship in Ethnology in 1900 after Frazer organized a lobby in support of Haddon and redefined anthropology-in-its-widest-aspect as ethnology. Ten years later, Haddon and Quiggin published the first history of anthropology in book form and defined ethnology as an alternative designation for those branches of cultural anthropology that 'deal with comparative sociology and magico-religious data' (Haddon and Quiggin 1910: 128), while anthropology retained the same meaning it had when it entered modern language in the sixteenth century as *Anthropologium*, a Latin word meaning the study of 'man's bodily structure' (ibid.: 6), which, of course, incorporated an evolutionary version of comparative anatomy. Haddon and Quiggin merely restated what Haddon proposed in 'The Study of Anthropology', but the implication of their argument goes against the grain of subsequent histories. The intention of this monograph is to trace the history of that argument and use it to construct a new version of Haddon's contribution to the modernization of anthropology and, by way of conclusion, to situate his preference for anthropology in its widest aspect within contemporary debates about the restriction of the scope of anthropology in a neoliberal academy.

CHANGING THE NARRATIVE

Representing Haddon as a progressive and formally innovative modernizer required forgetting large parts of his story as it has evolved to date, hence the absence of a conventional literature review. I disregard Haddon's background in zoology and drop Huxley from the role of a mentor who shaped Haddon's understanding of anthropology. I replace him with a heterodox network of mentors and collaborators, the key actors being William Henry Flower, James 'Tamate' Chalmers, James G. Frazer, Pat-

Alfred Cort Haddon
A Very English Savage
Ciarán Walsh

<https://www.berghahnbooks.com/title/WalshAlfred>

Not for resale

rick Geddes, Henry ‘Havelock’ Ellis and Laurence Gomme – all men, but this was the nature of the power structures in organized anthropology in the 1890s. Haddon challenged discrimination on grounds of gender through his collaborations with Alice Shackleton, Clara Patterson and Alison Hingston Quiggin, as well as his articles on gendered science in his column in the *Irish Daily Independent*. Moreover, the influence of Elizabeth Cort, Caroline Haddon and Caroline Waterman is highlighted as I shift the epistemological focus from science to art, philosophy and political activism and introduce Haddon’s family as the primary influencers in this context. I highlight his reading of Kropotkin as a major influence on his understanding of the task of the ethnographer and the purpose of ethnology. I also acknowledge Haddon’s initiation into Freemasonry as a triggering event in terms of his switch from zoology to ethnology in 1888, that is, from science to art and philosophy, a route prepared by Frazer. Finally, I move the site of intellectual and practical development away from Cambridge in the wake of the 1898 anthropological expedition to the Torres Strait and back to the Aran Islands in the wake of his first expedition ten years earlier.

The key events in this new narrative include:

- 1887 Working with Flower and Samuel McFarlane on the ethnological component of his oceanographic expedition to the Torres Strait.
- 1888 Abandoning marine biology more or less as soon as he arrived there.
Meeting Chalmers.
- 1889 Co-curating an exhibition with Flower at the British Museum in October.
Deciding to go into anthropology in December.
Linking up with Geddes and reading Kropotkin and Elie Reclus.
- 1890 Adopting the magic lantern as an instrument of anti-racism activism.
Collaborating with Ellis on *The Study of Anthropology*.

- Visiting the Aran Islands for the first time during a government-funded survey of fishing grounds, discovering instantaneous photography and losing his job as a government scientist.
- 1891 Setting up an anthropometric laboratory in Dublin in partnership with Daniel J. Cunningham and Francis Galton.
- 1892 Writing a critique of imperial policy for popular journals. Experimenting with a social survey model in the Aran Islands and, paradoxically, becoming a craniologist. Losing his job as a lead ethnographer for the Anthropological Laboratory.
- 1893 Mobilizing a popular ethnographic movement in Belfast. Conducting an ethnography of singing games with Clara Patterson.
- 1895 Leading an insurrection by anticolonial ethnologists in Ipswich.
- 1898 Breaking a BAAS embargo on funding for a second expedition to Oceania.
- 1898 Filming the last dance of the Malu Zogo-Le.
- 1899 Publishing a photographic manifesto in *Notes & Queries on Anthropology*.
- 1900 Becoming a part-time teacher of ethnology at Cambridge.

The key drivers of change include (1) his first experience of the Malu cult in 1888, (2) his collaboration with Geddes and Ellis, (3) conflict with the British Administration in Ireland during fisheries research in the Aran Islands in 1890, (4) his adoption of the slideshow as his primary ethnographic method between 1890 and 1895, (5) a confrontation with Huxley that forced him into the skull-measuring business in 1892, and, finally, (6) his anti-colonial speech in Ipswich and the sanctions that followed in the wake of a very public controversy.

This, then, is a story with many plots and subplots, too many in fact to cover in the space allowed. There are, however, four consistent threads that tie all these events together, and these are

(1) Haddon's profound commitment to anticolonial activism, (2) his relentless experimentation with ethnographic form, (3) his fascination with the meaning of art and dance across space and time and (4) his involvement in the skull-measuring business in Ireland. The last is, from a historiographical perspective, extraordinarily problematic in terms of making the case that Haddon was a modernizer, and the structure of this monograph pivots around this question. Some background will explain why.

I first encountered Haddon in 2009 when I discovered a photograph of Haddon and Charles R. Browne, who was measuring Tom Connelly's skull in the Aran Islands in 1892 (Figure 6.1). Browne pasted the photograph into an album in 1897, one of three albums in the Manuscript Library in TCD that hold the photographic archive of the Irish Ethnographic Survey (see de Mórdha and Walsh 2012). I had just curated an exhibition of John Millington Synge's photographic documentation of life in the Aran Islands in 1898 (see Bruna 2017: 61–62) and Browne's albums provided an opportunity to compare the record of an anthropologist with that of a literary modernist. The photograph of Connelly submitting to measurement initially confirmed a narrative of an English 'head-hunter' and his Irish proxy searching for Irish aborigines. However, Browne's sustained and systematic documentation of social conditions in remote communities in the west of Ireland was unique, and Dáithí de Mórdha, an ethnologist descended from people Browne surveyed in Dún Chaoin in 1897, and I selected fifty photographs and showed 'The Irish Head-Hunter' exhibition in the same communities, terminating the tour in the Haddon Library in 2013.

In preparation for the opening, Aidan Baker, the Haddon Librarian, searched for Haddon's copy of 'The Ethnography of the Aran Islands' and discovered a file of material from an earlier survey of the islands. The file was separated from the rest of his papers in 1913 and contained a ten-page extract from a journal he kept while working on a survey of fishing grounds in 1890, filling a gap in the papers held in Cambridge University Library. His fascination with the people and their way of life contrasted sharply with the tables of anthropometric data that dominated

the ethnography he wrote with Browne two years later. This gap widened in 2014 when a search of the Anatomy Museum in TCD uncovered a box of photographs that Andrew Francis Dixon took in the company of Haddon in 1890. There was nothing in any of the material recovered to suggest that Haddon had any interest in skull-measuring, and the focus of research switched to the Irish component of the Haddon Papers in an effort to find out why he measured Tom Connelly and twenty-six other islanders in 1892.

Haddon's 'Irish' papers were uncatalogued at this time and it appeared that they were rarely consulted. For instance, a search in 2017 for the manuscript of Haddon's 1891 critique of the Imperial Institute revealed that it had been misfiled, possibly after Stocking transcribed it in the 1970s (see Stocking 1995: xix; Stocking and Haddon 1993). This illustrates how much of what was written about Haddon was based on primary research undertaken by Stocking. Indeed, Stocking's mining of anthropological archives and personal papers in Britain prompted James Urry (1989: 364) to describe him as the 'doyen of studies of the anthropological past', who, according to Clifford Geertz (1999: 305), had 'an enormous impact on the way anthropologists see themselves and their profession'. It is hardly surprising then that Stocking's 1995 study of the emergence of modern anthropology in *After Tylor*, supplemented with Quiggin's 1942 biography, provided a road map for my research in Cambridge.

Discrepancies quickly emerged between significant aspects of Stocking's treatment of Haddon and the source material in Cambridge. For example, Stocking (1995: 105–6) quoted a draft of a letter Haddon wrote in May 1891 in response to a letter Ellis sent offering to support any movement to reconstruct anthropology and asking Haddon to write a study of anthropology for the Contemporary Science Series. Haddon's draft consisted of little more than a series of quick notes that summarize information from a range of viewpoints and relied heavily on analogy and quotation to address Ellis's request for a biological treatment of anthropology. Geddes put Ellis in contact with Haddon, and 'biological' can be interpreted as a metonym for biosociality and, as such, refers to the latter's interest comparative sociology. Stock-

ing, however, missed this, bypassed the study of anthropology, and considered instead *Evolution in Art*, which Ellis reluctantly agreed to as a substitute in 1891. Haddon summarized the idea of this book in ‘The Study of Anthropology’. He stated:

The origin, evolution and migration of designs and patterns is a fascinating subject, and is repleted with human interest, as being associated some of the deepest and most subtle ideas. (Haddon 1895a: 25)

Stocking (1995: 106), however, concluded that ‘Haddon insisted on casting his arguments in “biological” terms’, and so consolidated the trope of a former zoologist with a biological understanding of the study of culture. Taken in context, Stocking would have seen that Haddon, Geddes and Ellis used evolution as a metonym for the human capacity to adapt and innovate and, in a post-evolutionist environment, tried to harness this natural force as a driver of scientific, social reform. Ellis presented their arguments in the Contemporary Science Series, which he launched in 1889 with *The Evolution of Sex* by Geddes and Thomson.

There are other examples of similar discrepancies. Haddon pitched an article to a few popular journals in 1891 in which he critiqued the link between racism, genocide, colonial administration and imperial policy. He proposed a bureau of ethnology that would act as a humanitarian agency and end a policy that actively facilitated colonists who exterminated ‘slowly or rapidly, unintentionally or by force the inhabitants of the countries we annex’ (Haddon MS 1891, Critique of Imperial Institute: 10). Haddon pulled no punches. He declared that ‘the general public, the legislators & the executive’ were complicit in these acts of ‘legalized murder’. Stocking published a transcript in the *History of Anthropology Newsletter* in 1993 and commented that ‘Such language was used by the founders of the Aborigines Protection Society’ (Stocking and Haddon 1993: 3), which, incidentally, is not surprising given that Cruft (1915: 55) admired John Haddon and Elizabeth Cort’s involvement in the anti-slavery movement that led to the formation of the Society in 1837. Stocking (1995: 101–3) ed-

ited this comment out of his analysis in *After Tylor* and concluded that the proposal was a scheme for ‘enlightening imperial self-interest’. Stocking wasn’t alone. Henrika Kuklick (1991: 50) first interpreted Haddon’s proposal as ‘a systematic basis for enlightened colonial administration’ and this line of argument became an academic trend when repeated by James Urry (1993: 103) and Stocking. Greta Jones (1998) added a variation to the theme. She also consulted the same sources as Stocking and argued that Haddon and John Millington Synge operated in contested cultural and political territories that coincided geographically with the Aran Islands. Her description of Haddon as a ‘Darwinist evolutionist par excellence’ (ibid.: 195) was authoritative and, therefore, influential in generating a common sense that Haddon’s biological project was the antithesis of Synge’s literary modernism and, in subsequent scholarship, Douglas Hyde’s cultural nationalism (see for example Beiner 2012; Ó Giolláin 2017). Emilie de Brigard (1995) applied a similar logic in her analysis of Haddon’s cinematographic experiment and Alison Griffith (1996) added additional layers of instrumentality, gaze and orientalism when she looked at the problem of Haddon’s films ‘through the lens’ of theories developed by Michel Foucault and Edward Said. Jones (2008) and Griffiths (2002) subsequently wrote more sympathetic treatments of Haddon, but the trope of a former zoologist with a biological understanding of the study of culture remained as an epistemological bottom line.

To summarize, there is a discernible pattern in these knowledge-making strategies, and Joan Leopold (1991: 315–17) provided an interesting perspective on its origin when she reviewed Stocking’s 1987 study *Victorian Anthropology*. She detected a determination to establish evolutionism as *the* dominant organizing logic in Victorian anthropology, and I contend that the examples above establish this as a wider academic trend, which I have characterized as a preoccupation with evolution bracketed by race and empire in the context of a scientific revolution. Consequently, ‘The Study of Anthropology’ was forgotten in the sense that Guy Beiner (2006) used the term to describe the obsolescence of events in preferred histories that are necessarily selec-

tive. Thomas Hylland Eriksen, speaking at a webinar organized by the History of Anthropology Network on 19 November 2021, diagnosed the cumulative effect of strategic forgetting as a form of ‘structural amnesia’, and the results can be seen in Ó Giolláin’s introduction to *Irish Ethnologies* (2017). This presents a synthesis of authoritative and trusted scholarship and, as such, locates the cause of this ‘amnesia’ in key texts from a historicist tradition that has dominated the history of anthropology since the 1990s and, ironically, derives its authority from its unprecedented study of primary sources. Discovering these discrepancies altered the trajectory of my research and I went back to the same sources to see what else had been forgotten.

REMEMBERING

Recovering the ‘forgotten’ events of Haddon’s practice involved a multilayered ‘Irish’ reading of the Haddon Papers and related records, including photographic collections in Dublin, Cambridge and London. The first task was to photograph every document and document every photograph and then connect this archive to institutional records and newspaper reports using online archives like the Biodiversity Heritage Library (BAAS, RIA, RDS and BNFC proceedings and reports), the proceedings of the Royal Anthropological Institute and Royal Irish Academy, the Folklore Society, *Nature* – Haddon was a regular contributor – and the British Newspaper Archive (British Library and Find My Past). Newspapers were especially valuable in filling gaps in institutional records and constructing political contexts for various incidents in the daily lives of ethnologists and anthropologists. Archive.org and Hathi Trust digital libraries provided access to the first editions of many important texts and the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (ODNB) was a useful source of biographical detail that added nuance to the lives of actors in networks connected to Haddon.

Regarding Haddon’s papers, the TROVE portal managed by the National Library of Australia provides online access to the

papers, and it was a pleasure to be able to ‘leaf’ through his sketchbooks on one screen while reading his record of making the same sketches on a second screen, a process enhanced significantly in 2020 by Anita Herle and Jude Philp’s publication of *Recording Kastom*, an annotated and thoroughly illustrated transcription of Haddon’s Torres Strait and New Guinea journals. Haddon and Mead argued that words cannot give the full sense of a dance performed, and Haddon’s films can be viewed online at the National Film and Sound Archive of Australia. The associated sound recordings can be streamed on the British Library website. Michael Eaton combined both in his 2010 film *Masks of Mer*, and the National Museum of Ireland gave me access to dance ‘toggerly’ Haddon collected in 1888, adding a material dimension to this multimedia research and recapitulating Haddon’s use of this material in slideshows in Dublin in 1890.

The second task involved organizing this material around key events, and this required timelines and organizational charts that tracked the flow of ideas, money and influence, a methodology that drew on my experience as an organization and methods analyst in the Department of Justice *fadó fadó* (a long time ago). The information produced required several revisions over a four-year period as new facts disrupted emerging narratives. For instance, the last document I accessed in Cambridge University Library was Haddon’s ‘little black book’. He listed Douglas Hyde among regular contacts in the period under review, thereby triggering a late detour into the field of Anglo-Irish folklore and the discovery of a link between Haddon’s first experience of a Malu ceremony in 1888, his collaboration with Clara Patterson in Belfast in 1893 and his filming of a Malu dance performance in 1898 (see Walsh 2021c).

This illustrates how my research process became a form of spatial historiography, the scope and complexity of the sources generating a multidimensional and mobile epistemology in which new material comes online constantly. For instance, the British Newspaper Archive recently uploaded the *Optical Lantern and Kinematograph Journal*, which published a review of Haddon’s films in 1906. Likewise, discovering a recently uploaded copy of

Cruft's 1915 history of the Haddon family filled significant gaps in my research in relation to (a) linking Haddon's humanitarian activism to the Aborigines Protection Society and (b) tracing the origin of Haddon's interest in art. Finally, I found a letter Haddon wrote to Geddes on 25 December 1887 on TROVE – the original is held in Strathclyde University Archive Department – while checking quotes during the copyedit phase of this publication and it confirmed Haddon's interest in art and the importance of Geddes as a mentor, which points to opportunities for further research in this and other related archives. Finding this material involved some creativity with keywords in an effort to disrupt the algorithms that build internet searches around account histories, and this added a post-human dimension to the process. Further disruption is inevitable as new material comes online, and this monograph constitutes a time-specific epistemological screenshot of sorts, a conditional epistemology that contrasts sharply with the certainty, fixed perspectives and determined 'forgetfulness' of the historicist tradition that has dominated the history of anthropology for three decades.

Regarding these histories, the main problem was reconciling Haddon's involvement in the skull business with the discovery of Kropotkin's influence. This exposed a yawning gap in mainstream histories, and Kenneth Maddock's article 'Through Kropotkin to the Foundation of Radcliffe-Brown's Anthropology' (1994) makes one wonder why more researchers haven't investigated 'Anarchy' Brown more thoroughly. If they had, they might have discovered that 'Anarchy' Brown was secretly wearing Haddon's theoretical undergarments. Moreover, there is plenty of material in the wider literature on utopianism and anarchism that explains why Haddon was so influenced by Kropotkin. To begin with, Norman MacKenzie's 1975 study of the origins of the Fabian Society includes a brief but valuable account of Haddon's father's sisters, Caroline and Margaret. Neil Weir's 2006 ODNB biography of Margaret (Haddon) Hinton's husband James adds further detail in terms of Caroline Haddon's sponsorship of Ellis's medical training in preparation for his groundbreaking study of sexuality. Likewise, Anna Clark adds detail to that relationship

in her 2017 study *Alternative Histories of the Self: A Cultural History of Sexuality and Secrets*. Caroline Haddon also features in outline in Susan Hinely's study 'Charlotte Wilson, the "Woman Question" and the Meaning of Anarchist Socialism in Late Victorian Radicalism' (2012), as well as Nan Sloane's *The Women in the Room: Labour's Forgotten History* (2018). Lawrence Davis and Ruth Kinna's collection of essays *Anarchism and Utopianism* (2009) updated Mackenzie, and Judy Greenway contributed an essay that deals specifically with sexual politics in 'Speaking Desire: Anarchism and Free Love as Utopian Performance in *Fin de Siècle* Britain'. The 'Miss Haddons', as MacKenzie (1975: 51) called them, do not feature, but Greenway provides additional context for their nephew's advanced thinking on gender, sex and sexuality. Similarly, Tom Steele's (2007) work on Élisée Reclus, Patrick Geddes and links between radical French Freemasonry and popular education movements helps explain Haddon's commitment to the university extension movement and his participation, with Geddes and Reclus, in the Science and Art Meeting in Edinburgh in 1895. Federico Ferretti's work 'Anarchist Geographers and Feminism in Late 19th Century France: The Contributions of Élisée and Élie Reclus' (2016) provides a good description of the radical milieu that Haddon associated with when he decided to go into anthropology. Gerry Kearns's work on Kropotkin in 'The Political Pivot of Geography' (2004) provides a framework for constructing a similar pivot in organized anthropology and, with Ferretti, provides a basis for reconnecting ethnology to its roots in geography. Han Vermeulen's (2015b) study of the origin of ethnology in the German Enlightenment extended the timeframe of anti-imperial thought in ethnology. Jack Morrell and Arnold Thackray's brief study of ethnology in the 1830s in *Gentlemen of Science* (1981) is a valuable prequel to Chris Renwick's study *British Sociology's Lost Biological Roots* (2012), essential reading in relation to differences Geddes had with Huxley and Galton. Similarly, Erin McLaughlin-Jenkins's 2001 investigation of an exchange of articles in the press between Huxley and Kropotkin makes it possible to connect a class war in science in the 1880s to the culture war in organized anthropology

in the 1890s. Similarly, Clifford O'Connor's *A People's History of Science: Miners, Midwives and Low Mechanics* (2005) revealed to me Huxley's mobilization of science in support of capitalism, which is especially interesting in the context of Haddon's attempt to move anthropology out of a restricted form of natural history and into sociology.

Haddon was not an anarchist. He was a philosophical reformist, and the need for clarity around terms like 'radical' arose in conversation with David Shankland¹ and fed into a longer conversation with Mark Maguire² about the power of anthropology and the anthropology of power. This led to an engagement with a new historiography of anthropology that has gathered momentum around questions of modernity before and beyond Malinowski. Shankland (2014) and Vermeulen (2015a) were instrumental in reviving the History of Anthropology Newsletter and reformulating it as the History of Anthropology Network (HOAN), which organized a wider review of pre-Malinowskian ethnography at the 2020 conference of the European Association of Social Anthropologists (EASA). The HOAN continued the process of remembering in 2021 with Thomas Hylland Eriksen's webinar on forgotten anthropologies, which set up the publication of Vermeulen and Delgado Rosa's 2022 collection of essays on ethnography before Malinowski. However, a decision to exclude recent scholarship on Haddon and his associates – the foundations of the book were laid down in 2018 – has rendered this akin to a discussion of Hamlet without the Prince. Delgado Rosa and Christine Laurière offset this to some extent when they commissioned a contemporaneous review of Haddon's life and work for the *Bérose International Encyclopaedia of Histories of Anthropology* (Walsh 2022), which drew on research for this volume.

To conclude, historiography is a dynamic and often contrary process and this volume, written by an outsider in terms of academic traditions and networks, continues in that spirit. Accordingly, the question of Haddon's ancestry is framed by a fundamental shift from history as the construction of disciplinary traditions to history as part of a process of engagement

with colonial legacies in the wake of the murder in police custody of George Floyd. Haddon makes most sense in the latter context. He envisaged a new anthropology as a response to the genocidal logic of colonialism, the destruction of Oceanic civilizations and, with it, the loss of ancestral knowledges that bridged the extremes of humankind and contested European ethnocentricity. He drew inspiration from the anti-slavery activism of his grandparents John Haddon and Elizabeth Cort, who fostered a tradition of nonconformism that continued through the radical feminism of his aunts Caroline Haddon and Margaret Hinton and the humanitarian activism of their nephew and his associates in a loose network of anarcho-utopian activists who imagined another anthropology. The memory of that anthropology may have skipped a generation or two, but the unsettled state of the historiography of anthropology today provides a useful vantage point to recall the ancestral knowledges that influenced it.

This story of that other anthropology is told (with the aid of photographs) in three parts of three chapters and subchapters each, three being a magical number in Celtic mythology. The first part deals with Haddon's decision to go into anthropology in 1889 and argues against the common sense that he experienced an anthropological epiphany in the Torres Strait during the 1888 expedition and bided his time in Dublin before returning to Cambridge and leading an anthropological expedition back to the Torres Strait in 1898. This is the essence of the 'taking anthropology out of the armchair' trope that is so central to the folklore of disciplinary anthropology, for which Haddon is partly responsible, it must be said. Dismantling that trope was relatively easy, but it is way beyond the wordcount of this project, and I have chosen instead to deal with it in terms of the following conundrum: Haddon's papers clearly show that he abandoned marine biology upon reaching the Torres Strait in 1888, decided to go into anthropology in 1889 and became the anthropological lead in an anarchism-inspired social reform movement in 1890. So, how did he become a part-time ethnologist in 1900 after a craniologist became the first full-time anthropologist at Cambridge University?

The second part goes back to the Aran Islands in 1892 and the problematic ‘selfie’ of Haddon and Browne measuring Tom Connelly’s skull in a mobile version of Galton’s anthropometric laboratory. This photograph places Haddon’s practice firmly in the realm of scientific racism, but this ‘selfie’ has a long history and its function as a demonstration of advanced practical science in action is inextricably tied up with the wider political response of a Tory government to a campaign by Irish nationalists to exit the Union with Great Britain. Practical science in the fisheries sector brought Haddon to the west of Ireland two years earlier and he discovered a seemingly undisturbed ethnological zone that was the perfect testing ground for a reconstructed anthropology. The question here is why he set up and mobilized an anthropometric laboratory in a partnership with Galton and Daniel J. Cunningham, Professor of Anatomy at TCD and a staunch defender of British rule in Ireland.

The third part takes its cue from a subversive act that points to the most innovative aspect of Haddon’s work as an ethnologist. Haddon included in the report of the 1892 ethnographic expedition to the Aran Islands a photograph that documented the refusal by Michael Faherty and two women – they withheld their names – to submit to measurement. It was a study in native agency and affect that materialized an earlier decision to adopt ‘instantaneous’ photography over ‘tedious’ text as his ethnographic method of choice. It also recorded a ‘little war’ in the daily life of the colony and so materialized Haddon’s anticolonial attitude. He had already adopted the magic lantern – literally and metaphorically – as an instrument of anticolonial activism and incorporated this into a performed ethnography that culminated in the filming of the last dance of the Malu Zogo-Le. One year later, Haddon published a manifesto on photography as the fifth field of anthropology and created a foundation for visual anthropology that was thoroughly buried under the discipline of words Mead described in 1975. The question here is whether this is sufficient reason to claim that Haddon was a modernist – not just a modernizer – who ought to be remembered as a pioneer of

modern anthropology and the man who pointed Synge towards the Aran Islands.

This question goes to the heart of any discussion of ancestry. It is inextricably tied to the question of what anthropology meant in 1890 and how that relates to what anthropology means in 2023. The main finding of this study is that the conflict between radical and reactionary forces in the 1890s is being re-enacted in a stand-off between exponents of 'traditional' and 'academic' anthropologies in which debates about restricted knowledge production are enlivened by a renewed engagement with structural racism and colonial legacies in the wake of the murder of George Floyd. It seems that the history of anthropology has at last caught up with Haddon.

NOTES

1. David Shankland, Director, Royal Anthropological Institute for Great Britain and Ireland, acted as external examiner for my PhD thesis.
2. Mark Maguire, Dean of Social Studies, Maynooth University, supervised my doctoral research.