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1 INTRODUCTION (1)

The aim of this chapter is to present a picture of anthropological work on sub-Saharan Africa as undertaken in the Netherlands during the 1970s. The audience I address myself to is that of colleagues abroad, who do not have Dutch, who are unfamiliar with the organization of academic life in this country, and who are likely to find themselves outside the usual circuit of Dutch academic publications—even if written in English or French. However, while engaged in a task of this nature one cannot help but state one or two home-truths which are mainly intended for the national community of Dutch social scientists working on Africa. One is forced to select, to evaluate, to state preferences and to take sides. In the Netherlands as elsewhere, African Studies are in a state of transition. The strongly international orientation among Africanists in the Netherlands makes it likely that the issues at stake here have also some relevance abroad.

In an attempt to define the various parameters that feature in the title of this chapter, I shall have to state unequivocally what, to my mind, constitutes anthropology; controversial though the topic is, my somewhat lengthy discussion of the discipline and its predicaments, in section 2, clears the ground for a rather succinct presentation of the current Dutch work, in section 4. In between I shall discuss, in section 3, the resources and background of Africanist anthropology in the Netherlands. Finally I shall attempt to identify, in section 5, some general trends as well as blind-spots. The attached bibliography, while selective, should guide the reader to the most significant Dutch work in this field as published in the 1970s; in addition, some background literature has been included.

2 DEFINING THE FIELD

What do we mean by 'Dutch anthropology of sub-Saharan Africa in the 1970s'? Let us try to define the four parameters that this phrase contains. The *time dimension* of this field is well-defined; however, the historical development of the social sciences does not take place in neat 10-year intervals, and I shall feel free to disregard into the late 1960s, and into the 1980s. Meanwhile it must be borne in mind that the writing-up of anthropological research often takes many years. Therefore some of the publications coming out in the 1970s were based on research conducted in the 1960s—and this is likely to show in the handling of the material, the theoretical framework adopted, and the references the authors
make to the historical context in which the research was situated. For instance, the Centre for
the Study of Education in Changing Societies (CESO), Amsterdam/The Hague, undertook
interdisciplinary research on primary education in 1964–67, but the full-length books emanating
from this project only came out in the course of the 1970s (see below).
Likewise, the geographical dimension does not pose great problems. Some significant anthropolog-
al work on North Africa is being done in the Netherlands, but it falls outside our present
scope. Moreover, work on the Sahara itself (cf. Leupen 1978) is indispensable for an under-
standing of continuities in terms of trade, Islamic religion and law, between North and
sub-saharan Africa, and for economic and political developments in the Sahelian zone. Yet
'sub-saharan Africa' is generally considered a meaningful field of study, both abroad and in the
Netherlands. The various Dutch institutions, associations and funding agencies that deal with
the study of Africa explicitly or in practice confine themselves to sub-saharan, 'Black', Africa.
We shall concentrate on mainland Africa, which is no serious limitation since to my knowledge
no major Dutch anthropological research was conducted, during the period covered, on
Madagascar or any of the smaller islands surrounding the African continent.
The term 'Dutch', however, does carry ambiguities which can only be resolved by more or less
arbitrary decisions. Ignoring the more playful connotations of the word ('Dutch' tending to
mean 'phony', 'cheap', 'mean', 'Ersatz', etc.), let me make it clear, in the first place, that
language cannot be a criterium in the present context. (2) In the Netherlands, anthropology is
taught in Dutch. However, most of the textbooks used are in English. And most scholarly
work produced by Dutch Africanists is in English or (to a decreasing extent) French: not only
books, and articles meant for publication in international journals, but also doctoral theses and
an increasing number of doctorandus theses – particularly those selected for publication in
departmental series. (3) Most of the titles in the bibliography attached to this chapter (4) are in
fact in English. Nationality cannot be a criterium either, in a cosmopolitan academic environ-
ment where, due to a combination of factors (including xenophilia, quite attractive salaries, and
the paucity of senior specialists in African anthropology among locals) a considerable percentage
of the researchers and lecturers employed in this field is of foreign origin. Nor is it meaningful to
define Dutch anthropology as a body of literature published by Dutch publishing houses or in
Dutch periodicals. African anthropologists are relatively thin on the ground in the Netherlands,
and much of their academic contacts and reference groups are abroad. As a result, some of the
most significant work by Africanist anthropologists working in the Netherlands has been
published elsewhere, particularly in the United Kingdom and the U.S.A. The main publisher
of Africanist anthropology in the Netherlands is the African Studies Centre, both directly, and
through international publishing houses. But while the Centre has built up an impressive list of
publications (5), including many books, it is fair to admit that a substantial proportion of these
were written by non-Dutchmen attached to institutions abroad, and could not be reckoned as
contributions to Dutch Africanist anthropology.
Therefore, the only meaningful way to define Dutch anthropology seems to be by reference to
the academic institutions and funding agencies in association with which a given piece of
research has been initiated, conducted, and completed. Dutch Africanist anthropology would
then be that body of anthropological work produced by anthropologists largely or entirely in
the course of their attachment to (notably: employment by) Dutch academic institutions,
and/or funded by Dutch agencies.
This may appear to be stating the obvious, but in view of the international orientation and,
consequently, the continuous in-flux and out-flux of international personnel in the field of Dutch Africanist anthropology thus defined, my definition has as a main implication that work done prior to attachment to a Dutch institution, or after the termination of such attachment, falls outside the scope of this review. As a result the work of some of the senior Africanist anthropologists presently active on the Dutch scene (e.g. Kuper, Schoffeleers, and Fabian) can only be considered as from the time of their entering the Dutch academic world, even though they gained their chairs on the basis of the outstanding qualities of their earlier, pre-Dutch work. (6) The same applies to publications such as Harrell-Bond's (1975) Modern Marriage in Sierra Leone (7), Holcman's (1974) Issues in African Law (8), and Bleck's (1975) Marriage, Inheritance and Witchcraft (9). These and similar works represent the imported part of the foundation of Dutch Africanist anthropology, the spoils of an inverted brain-drain – but they could not count as constituent elements in Dutch Africanist anthropology itself. My point is, of course, controversial, and therefore needs to be stated explicitly.

Finally, what is anthropology?

I shall deal with this question at somewhat greater length, because my answer on this point constitutes the justification of my selection of scholarly work as presented in this chapter, and at the same time provides the rationale for my thematic overview in section 4; the research topics introduced, and commented upon, in the course of my definition of the anthropological discipline will feature again, without further elaboration, in that section.

Twenty years ago, it was much easier to define the nature of anthropology as a distinct discipline in a way likely to satisfy the majority of our colleagues. The conventional topics of anthropological enquiry (small-scale production systems, residence, family and marriage, kinship, myth and ritual, traditional status and its distribution, norms and values, the dynamics of small non-experimental groups) (10) have been greatly augmented by others, no less exciting and relevant, but more difficult to locate in time and place, and much less amenable to monopolization by anthropologists. Anthropologists associated with academic institutions and funding agencies in the Netherlands during the 1970s usually received a training that was in the main-stream of classical anthropology, with a strong emphasis on the British structural-functionalist tradition of Radcliffe-Brown, Fortes and Evans-Pritchard. As a dominant paradigm, however, structural functionalism was already on the decline in the Netherlands at the end of the 1960s, and in a search for alternatives the classical paradigm was wedded too, if not chased by, such approaches as: French and Dutch structuralism; American culture theory, ethnoscientific and componential analysis; British transactionalism, network analysis and extended-case analysis; materialist approaches with as their most recent form the French neomarxism of Godderie, Meillassoux, Terray and Rey. As elsewhere, these elements are clearly identifiable in Dutch work published during the 1970s. The process of reformulating the theoretical content and orientation of the discipline is still in full swing, and occasionally gives rise to considerable antagonism – some of which will show through in this chapter.

Nationally as well as internationally, this search for new theory was partly in response to the failure of the classical paradigm to do justice to the social realities of Africa today. Formulated largely on the basis of highly schematized African empirical studies, the classical paradigm had primarily been devised to cope with synchronic sets of social relationships in small-scale, culturally and structurally fairly homogeneous, local rural societies viewed as bounded ethnic groups, or tribes. It had been formulated for a colonial Third World. Here anthropologists were not yet confronted with the force of public and professional opinion which in later years was to
emerge among the people they were studying. Thus, often in line with public opinion in their
own home countries (where the stereotype of the primitive isolate was widespread), these
researchers could largely ignore the higher-level linkages (of an economic, social, political,
administrative, cultural and religious nature) by which small, local sets of relationships were
tied to, and to a very high extent were determined by, structural arrangements at the regional,
national, international and inter-continental level - arrangements, moreover, which could only
be meaningfully studied when their historical dimensions were taken into account. Meanwhile,
however, the penetration of the capitalist mode of production, as mediated by the colonial and
post-colonial state, had called into existence large-scale commercial farming, mining and
manufacturing industry; towns as centres of industry and administration; migration between
designated rural labour reserves, and the rural and urban centres of capitalist production; new
patterns of class and elite formation; political processes featuring the emergence of political
division, revolutionary movements, the growth of the military as a dominant focus of power in
society, and the judicial and ideological problem of nation-building, legitimation, and legisla-
tion; and finally, new cultural, artistic and religious expressions befitting the radically altered
conditions of modern African life. In many parts of Africa, the types of society for which
anthropology had primarily been designed in the first half of this century, had been supplanted
by new forms of urban, industrial, capitalist societies whose functioning the classical paradigm could
not begin to explain. And in those rural areas where a mere optical illusion suggested the
continued existence of so-called traditional societies, the same paradigm was unable to thrown
light on both the national and international incorporation processes that made for this persist-
ence - and on the subtle but fundamental changes incorporation had brought about in the
internal, local functioning of these societies.
In the Netherlands as elsewhere, anthropologists were not slow in taking up the theoretical and
analytical challenges which the new Africa presented. However, in the process they found
themselves engaging in forms of data collection and theorizing which had never before been
part of the anthropological undertaking: large-scale surveys, bringing out patterns of fertility,
migration, urbanization, income distribution; the tracing of ego-centred networks of social
relationships, between people who did not form primary, face-to-face social groups; analysis of
modern state formation, class formation, and class conflict; studying the workings of such
formal organizations as a state bureaucracy, industry, schools, parties, hospitals, churches,
rural development projects, as mediators between national and international policy on the one
hand, and social relationships at the grass-roots level on the other; trying to come to grips with
emergent patterns of urban life in which culture and identity, through ethnicity, took on very
different forms from what they had been in rural communities as studied with the classical
paradigm.
Anthropologists increasingly found themselves entering fields of enquiry where not the classical
anthropological tradition, but the heritage of other disciplines provided the main frame of
reference: sociology, political science, history, geography, demography, literary criticism,
Islamic studies, missiology. One was forced to start thinking about the ‘limits of naivety in
social anthropology,’ to use Gluckman’s phrase (1964). The boundaries of the anthropological
discipline became blurred and subject to negotiation. Those who by training and/or formal
institutional affiliation would continue to call themselves anthropologists, would increasingly
publish for a partly non-anthropological audience, and in their work they would associate with
close colleagues belonging to different disciplines.
Meanwhile the social science of Africa faced pressures from at least two sides outside the anthropological discipline. African intellectuals and politicians would challenge the colonial and paternalistic connotations of classical anthropology, and while fostering often unrealistically high hopes with regard to the other social sciences including history, they would often bar anthropology from African curricula and research programmes. And within the metropolitan countries, the increasing preoccupation with technical assistance and planned social and economic change in the Third World (inspired by a combination of humanitarian motives and the desire to expand capitalism and metropolitan influence in the periphery of the modern world system) led bureaucrats and politicians to clamour for a social science that would be orientated towards ‘development’.

The modern Africanist sometimes appears as a jack-of-all-trades, alternating between papers on kinship, residence and ritual, to arguments on pre-colonial history, state penetration, the articulation of modes of production, thwarted rural development, and the organisational constraints upon health care delivery systems. Is there really a science of anthropology that could make one remotely expert on all these topics? Or is the modern Africanist anthropologist primarily a superior dilettante, who picks up the pebbles in the river-bed of modern Africa, and brilliantly juggles with them, leaving to others the tedious task of extracting such gold (or more likely, iron) as they may contain?

Under the circumstances it has become extremely difficult and controversial to define modern Africanist anthropology. Is there merely one emergent social-science-cum-history of Africa (‘African Studies’?), of which anthropologists, more or less arbitrarily and largely as a result of existing unit boundaries in academic institutions, have obtained an ill-defined share? Or is there, within the emergent whole of African Studies, still something that clearly stands out as anthropology? Features that used to characterize the anthropological undertaking in the past (like prolonged participatory field-work, qualitative data, open-ended questions, the emphasis on face-to-face relationships) can hardly serve as criteria anymore, now that modern so-called anthropologists are as likely to use archival and secondary sources, impersonal survey techniques and computer analysis, as any historian, sociologist, or political scientist.

Yet I believe that it is meaningful to define Africanist anthropology as the pursuit (by means of a variety of techniques of data-collection and analysis that are no longer specific to the discipline) of a problematic that derives either directly, or indirectly, from classical anthropology. Direct derivation would then mean the continuation of such debates as have been formulated by established anthropology in the 1940s and 1950s, e.g. on the nature of pre-colonial states in Africa, the implications of the ‘matrilineal puzzle’, the relation between ecology and social organization, or between the interpretation of misfortune and the structure of the local community.

Indirect derivation would apply to any problematic which, far from ignoring the orientation of classical anthropology, re-evaluates this orientation, taking critical distance and trying to formulate alternatives that have a better fit with the data on contemporary and past Africa, than have the explanations of classical anthropology (11). A good example of what I have in mind is the rethinking, throughout the 1960s and 1970s, of the concept of ‘tribe’ as used in classical anthropology. (12) In a related fashion, many of the studies of incorporation processes (viewed from the political, economic, ethnic, cultural or judicial angle) can be considered an indirect derivation of the classical concept of the local rural community: an assessment of the extent to which such a community defines itself vis-à-vis the wider world, and of the conditions
under which its relatively autonomous existence persists, or is encroached upon. Naturally, there is a vast border area of modern studies which do not address themselves directly or indirectly to the problematic of classical anthropology, but which might have done so. Here I think particularly of studies concentrating on the structure and impact of modern formal organizations in Africa (industry, schools, hospitals etc.). These studies are often instigated by developmental concerns, and funded on that basis; but on the other hand they have a theoretical and analytical potential, offering us a picture of alternative forms of social relationships that have emerged on African soil in addition to, if not instead of, the 'traditional' local community as studied by classical anthropology.

Finally, however, there is within African Studies today a large number of topics which could not possibly be considered direct or indirect derivations from a classical anthropological problematic, and which for that reason I would not call anthropological. This, of course, does not imply a judgment on the validity and relevance of such studies! Here I think of studies focusing not on social relationships but exclusively on relations of a biological, economic or political nature: distribution of central places, patterns of fertility and morbidity, the flow of resources, capital, labour within and between units of economic life, the relations between states and between worldwide power blocks. Often such studies provide the necessary basis for more profound and less global interpretations in terms of social relationships; they may be only one step removed from modern anthropology – but in the studies I have in mind the authors just happen not to take that step. Thus, quantitative descriptions of the flow of individuals from one area to another form the necessary prelude for an anthropology of migration – just as material descriptions of types and deficiences in urban dwellings form the necessary preludia for an anthropology of urban squats. Yet, for these studies to become truly anthropological, they should lead on to an examination of the patterns of social relationships in both urban and rural areas in which real and potential migrants, e.g. urbanites, are involved, and the development of these relationships over time. Similarly, data on fertility, morbidity and mortality would not be anthropological in themselves, but might lead on to anthropology if they are interpreted in a sophisticated way that throws light upon the social relationships between the sexes and between the generations, the life-cycle of domestic groups, the use or non-use of health care delivery institutions, the labour supply for agricultural production or industry, the articulation between capitalist and non-capitalist modes of production within a social formation.

What I have defined here as modern anthropology will often make use of participatory field-work as one of its techniques of data-collection, or at least base itself secondarily on data obtained through such field-work. Participatory field-work yields unique insight in local, small-scale patterns of social relationships. While classical anthropology would tend to emphasize the relevance of such insights for an understanding of the internal logic of the local community, this modern anthropology would make use of such insights mainly in so far as they throw light upon the penetration of wider, higher-level structures within the lives of the people involved in the limited social field which we manage to open up through field-work. And this social field is no longer necessarily a rural local community: it could equally be an urban compound, a localized unit within a formal organization (industrial plant, church, party branch), or a personal network. It does not necessarily consist of poor, illiterate or powerless people. Nor is participatory field-work always the only, best or cheapest way to gain insight in a given social field.
DUTCH ANTHROPOLOGY OF SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA IN THE 1970S

Having thus defined 'Dutch Africanists anthropology in the 1970s', and having sketched the shifts that have taken place within the discipline in general, let us now look at its national resources and background.

3 RESOURCES AND BACKGROUND

Within the Netherlands, Africanist anthropology is a subject of research and teaching at nearly all universities, as part of general programmes in anthropology and Third-World studies. Having been a centre of 'Oriental Studies' for centuries, the University of Leiden was chosen as the location for the first, extra-ordinary chair in African ethnography, immediately after World War II. Its first incumbent was Hofstra (13), who in 1933 had completed a doctorate (a library study of 'primitive individuality' in Africa) under supervision of Steinmetz (14), one of the founding fathers of sociology in the Netherlands. Earlier, Hofstra had also done some fieldwork in Sierra Leone under Malinowski, and studied with Vierkandt and Westermann in Berlin.

However, Africanist anthropology in the Netherlands remained largely an armchair undertaking until about 1950, when such researchers as Köbben, Prins, Scherer and Trouwborst went to the field in Africa for the first time. (15) The author of a winning Curl Prize Essay on cross-cultural comparison (Köbben 1952). Köbben combined his African field experience with a strong comparative interest (cf. Köbben 1955b), and, since his appointment in the chair of social and cultural anthropology at the City University of Amsterdam, built that institution into an important focus of Dutch Africanist anthropology. Several of today's leaders in the field studied there under Köbben in the 1950s and 1960s. But although Köbben's teaching and writing continued to carry a considerable Africanist emphasis right into the 1970s (e.g. Köbben 1971), his field-work interest soon shifted to Surinam, the former Dutch colony. Via the study of Indonesian and Caribbean/Surinamese minority problems within the Netherlands Köbben has now reverted to the study of his own contemporary society — thus following, in Srinivas's words, the path of the trice-born anthropologist, like Margaret Mead and Victor Turner before him.

By the beginning of the 1970s also a few other general anthropology chairs in the Netherlands were de facto occupied by Africanists: Prins in Groningen, Trouwborst in Nijmegen, Gerbrants (16) in Leiden, and Thoden van Velzen (17) newly appointed in the chair at Utrecht. The Africanist Mohr (18) retired in 1979 from the other Nijmegen chair of anthropology. In addition, Holleman (19) occupied the chair of legal anthropology at Leiden (1969-80), after having been in the Leiden Africa chair since 1963 (see below). The ranks of Africanists outside Leiden were further boosted in 1975, when Schoffeleers (who in 1968 had obtained an Oxford PhD under Evans-Pritchard) left the University of Malawi in order to take up the position of Reader in Non-Western Religion at the Free University, Amsterdam (a post converted into a full professorship in 1979); and in 1980, when after a long 'interregnum' (the word suits the exalted status professors still have in the Netherlands) Fabian left the U.S.A. in order to succeed to Köbben's chair at the University of Amsterdam. All these chairs are attached to anthropology departments, containing, among others, Africanists, and offering first and second degree courses, and doctorates, in the field of Africanist anthropology.

There is a nationally recognized division of labour between the various universities and chairs in anthropology. Thus African Studies as a speciality have been assigned to the University of
Leiden. However, until far into the 1970s research and teaching have followed a rather individualistic course, without much coordination and integration – not even at the departmental level. As a result the various research projects are attached to the names of individual researchers, rather than to departments; and as such I shall treat them in section 4. Meanwhile, during the last few years there has been considerable pressure from the Ministry of Education and Sciences (through WOTRO, see below) to arrive at more coordinated and systematic research programming at least at the departmental level. While a comprehensive programme for Dutch anthropology in general does already exist, a specific master plan for the anthropology of sub-Saharan Africa is likely to result from this pressure in the near future.

Against the background of the somewhat scattered but constant Africanist anthropology output of other Dutch universities, Leiden has, at least during the period covered in this chapter, hardly succeeded in playing a leading role within the Netherlands. (20) This was largely a result of the discontinuity (cf. Anonymous 1977) in the occupation of the Leiden Africanist chairs, the lack of staff and secretarial support, and the organizational and communication problems associated with the appointment of foreigners unfamiliar with Dutch academic life.

'Musical chairs' would aptly describe the vicissitudes of Africanist anthropology at the University of Leiden. In 1960 there was added, to Hostra's chair, an extra-ordinary chair in the sociology and culture of Africa. The first incumbent was Busia (21). This chair was converted into an ordinary chair when Busia was succeeded by Holleman in 1963. Hofstra's chair went out of existence when he retired in 1968. After Holleman left the Africanist chair in 1969 for the chair of legal anthropology, the former was occupied (1972-75) by Beattie from Oxford (22); after a brief period when Van Binsbergen (23) acted in the chair, it has been occupied, since 1977, by Kuper, a Cambridge PhD previously at University College, London. During the entire decade, the chair produced only one doctorate (Van Leynseele (1979), whose independently undertaken research was adopted by Leiden while Beattie was still in the chair). Beattie published little while associated with Leiden, although informally he did have some impact on work going on elsewhere in Leiden, particularly at the African Studies Centre and the theological faculty. Catering for only a handful of post-graduate students under Beattie and Van Binsbergen, the teaching is now picking up momentum. Having seen a number of students through their second degrees, and staged field-work training for them in Botswana as part of the doctorandus programme, Kuper is now guiding a few Africanist anthropologists through their doctoral research; some of them are already beginning to make a contribution to the profession.

With Africanist anthropology at Dutch universities being scattered or, in the case of the Leiden chair, for most of the decade performing below expectations, the African Studies Centre at Leiden is clearly the main focus of the discipline in the Netherlands. Created in 1958, the Centre is a Foundation which, although housed on the premises of the University of Leiden, is independent from that institution. It is funded directly by the Ministries of Education and Sciences, Foreign Affairs and Agriculture, partly on the basis of these ministries' own budgets, but for the greater part on the basis of governmental funds voted for international technical assistance. Leiden professors have been prominent: among those serving on the Executive Board of the Centre. During most of the 1960s, Holleman combined the chair in Africanist anthropology at Leiden with the Directorship of the Centre. When he left, it was decided that the Centre would no longer have a scientific director. Managing Director of the Centre has been
Grootenhuis, since 1967; his research experience was in Surinam and Irian Jaya. Grootenhuis has been the driving force behind much of the research and especially the publications output of the African Studies Centre during the 1970s. With Van Lier (a specialist on agricultural sociology, and on Surinam), Köbben and Voorhoeve (professor of African linguistics at Leiden university) succeeding each other as chairmen of the Executive Board, the Centre in the course of the decade went through various phases of decentralisation, until in 1980 the research staff was reshuffled so as to form two major departments: 'Socio-economic Studies', headed by the psychologist Hoorweg (24), and 'Political Science and History', headed by Van Binsbergen – with in addition a smaller section on African law, headed by Van Rouweroy van Nieuwaal. (25) Devoted to full-time research in African Studies in general, in which however anthropology as defined above plays an important role, the Centre commands considerably resources: an academic research staff (including librarians and documentalists) of about twenty, an administrative and library staff to match, by far the best Africanist library and documentation service in the Netherlands, and sufficient research funds to enable all researchers to regularly conduct research inside Africa. The Centre is the main Dutch publisher of Africana. Until 1979 it had its own periodical: first Kroniek van Afrika (1961-75), later African Perspectives (1976-9). That within a decade two successive conceptions of the Centre's main journal had to be abandoned has a number of structural reasons. The high costs of production were in no way compensated by subscriptions; also in terms of available copy and information offered the competition from other, international journals was too strong; and finally, the editorial tasks weighed too heavily on the shoulders of too limited a number of researchers, and hampered their other publication commitments. The Centre's Documentatieblad (1968- ) is a monthly review of abstracts (in English or French) from international Africanist journals. Since 1977 the Centre has also published, under the editorship of Gerold-Scheepers (26), an annual Newsletter on African Studies in the Netherlands, which gives information on current research, recent publications and other activities. For many years the Centre has organized an annual international conference, geared to current research projects at the Centre; edited selections of the papers have found their way into the Centre's publication series. In addition to these major conferences, the Centre regularly organizes smaller conventions of Africanists in the Netherlands, in addition to an inter-university Africanist monthly seminar which Van Binsbergen has organized and chaired since 1975. While the African Studies Centre at Leiden is the only research institute in the Netherlands that concentrates entirely on research in sub-saharan African, some important Africanist work has been done at research and teaching institutes that deal with the Third World in general: the Royal Tropical Institute (KIT) in Amsterdam, the Institute for Social Studies (ISS) in the Hague, The Development Research Institute (IOV) in Tilburg, the Inter-University Institute for Missiology and Ecumenical Studies (IMIO) in Leiden, and, as already mentioned, CESO in the Hague.

It is only recently that Dutch Africanists have organized themselves in a professional body, of a more specific scope than the general Netherlands Sociological and Anthropological Society (NSAV). The Netherlands Association of African Studies (Werkgemeenschap Afrika) was founded in 1980, with Doornbos (27) as its first chairman, since succeeded by Geschiere (28). One of the first activities of the Association was to establish an advisory committee for research applications concerning Africa. Its priorities for the near future include, on the basis of the inventarisation of research as presented in the Newsletter, the development of an integrated research programme for African Studies in the Netherlands; and hopefully the creation of a
viable Dutch Africanist journal. As a first step towards the realization of these goals the Association formally participates in the publication of the Newsletter. Part of the universities' research (notably: much research not undertaken in the pursuit of a doctorate) is paid out of their own funds as allocated by the Ministry of Education and Sciences. Similarly, the African Studies Centre and the other research institutes mentioned have their own independent budgets. Most doctoral research undertaken at the universities and the research institutes, is funded by the Netherlands Foundation for the Advancement of Tropical Research (WOTRO). In the case of doctoral research, applications to WOTRO are made by the candidate's supervisor, and the recipient normally obtains an academic salary plus research expenses paid, under the assumption that some university or research institute offers him or her logistic support, and academic guidance, for the duration of the research. It is these WOTRO applications which are now processed through the Netherlands Association of African Studies. While funding research on the entire Third World, throughout the 1970s WOTRO has allocated an average 20% of their funds to Africanist projects, most of which anthropological in the sense defined above. Table 1 presents figures for some selected years:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>year</th>
<th>total of allocations (Dfl.)</th>
<th>of which on Africa (Dfl.)</th>
<th>% on Africa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>710,000</td>
<td>101,600</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>941,400</td>
<td>273,700</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>1,386,600</td>
<td>277,800</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is within this logistic and organizational context that Dutch Africanist anthropology has developed in the 1970s, along lines which I shall now indicate.

4 A THEMATIC OVERVIEW OF DUTCH ANTHROPOLOGY OF SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA IN THE 1970S

Describing a national body of anthropological literature poses, in a way, similar problems as the description of any given society: most items could be classified in more than one way; and the patterns of interrelations that one observer would make out, cut across each other and would, moreover, look very differently to other observers. Within Dutch Africanist anthropology of the 1970s I discern the following main areas of interest: social demography and fertility behaviour; socio-economic changes in the rural areas; formal bureaucratic organizations; African states; law; and the contextual study of African religion. This order is not entirely arbitrary: it ranges from the concrete material and biological basic requirements of social life, through evolving forms of social and economic organization, to the abstract, ideological aspects of society as embodied in law and religion. In addition a number of studies will be discussed which fall outside these topics, and which tend to pursue a more classical problematic.
Social demography and fertility behaviour

In addition to demographic surveys (Blok 1978), evaluations of such surveys (De Jonge & Sterkenburg 1971, 1973; Vianen 1980), and analyses of the relation between population growth and economic development (Sterkenburg & De Jonge 1974), such as belong to the discipline of demography proper, work on the demographic background of social relationships has been done particularly by De Jonge and associates (Van Hekken & De Jonge 1970; De Jonge 1973). In this work the view is presented that fertility is not an independent input variable in the social process, but on the contrary reflects complex social relationships. In Bleek's work on birth control and sexual relations in a Ghanaian rural town similar views are developed, on the basis however of a much more profound insight in the specific details of the social process involved (Blek 1976a).

Socio-economic changes in rural areas

A logical step forward from the holistic, a-historical classical paradigm was the study of overall changes such as modern times had brought to selected rural areas of Africa. Internationally, some of the best work in Africanist anthropology since the 1950s has been in this vein. Within Dutch Africanist anthropology, such general studies have been attempted by Feddema (1972) for the South African Tswana, Kooyman (1978) for a Tswana group within Botswana, Giesche (1978) for the Makka of Cameroon, Jorritsma (1979) for Niger, and De Wolf (1977) for the Kenyan Bukusu. All these studies deal with economic change (varieties of the penetration of the capitalist mode of production), with differing emphasis however on the concomitant political and religious aspects. Studies concentrating on the specific economic aspects of the penetration of the capitalist mode of production in African rural areas, and its more immediate effects on social relationships within the rural communities, include, in addition to forthcoming work by Van den Bremer, those by Konert (1974, 1976) on Tanzania; Venema (1978) on the Wolof of Senegal; De Jonge (1978, 1979), Van der Klei (1978, 1979), and Vypkens-Smit (1976) for the Casamance region of Senegal; Doornbos (1975b; Doornbos & Vlotchje 1971) for Ankole, Uganda; Broekhuysse (1974, 1977) for the Mossi and Fulani of Upper Volta; Hinderink & Tempelman (1978) for Ivory Coast; Mafe (1973) for Uganda; Jager (1971b), Van Spening (1977) and Van Binsbergen (1977) for Zambia; and Verstruysse (1972, 1980) for Ghanaian fishermen. Studies on land tenure as cited below under 'African law' also relate to the rural problematic. In many parts of Africa, rural-urban migration has been a major aspect of the penetration of capitalism. A large-scale research project on the determinants of such migration (meant to test neo-marxist hypotheses advanced in this connexion by Amin, Rey and Meillassoux) was conducted in the Casamance region of Senegal by an African Studies Centre research team consisting of De Jonge, Van der Klei, Storm and Meilink (De Jonge et al., 1978). Van der Wiel (1977) deals with migrant labour from Lesotho. General theoretical issues in migration studies, along with case studies on West and Southern Africa, were presented in a collection edited by Van Binsbergen & Meilink (1978). Finally, the overall local effects (including migration) of the establishment of large-scale industry in a Zambian rural area were studied by Dietz, Van Haastrecht & Scheffer (1977).
Formal, bureaucratic organizations

Much research has concentrated on the formal, bureaucratic organizations which have come to represent a major aspect of social organization in modern Africa. Among other aspects, such research has looked into the impact these organizations are having at the grass-roots level (village, urban compound, family life), and has studied the way in which they reflect national policy and both national and international economic pressures. The main sub-topics we could distinguish under this heading, are those of the major bureaucratic organizations as found today in Africa: school, hospital, church, industry and the trade union movement, and finally political parties; the state and its bureaucratic apparatus will be discussed under a separate heading.

School: While the administrative and policy aspects of educational administration in Africa were the subject of a symposium edited by Ponsioen (1972), the more immediately anthropological aspects were treated in a series of CESO studies in the Tanzanian Mwanza district (Renes 1970; Dubbeldam 1970; Varkevisser 1973; Kaayk 1976).

The related topic of youth organization in a context of nation-building and school-leaver unemployment was studied in Zambia by Van Rijnsoever (1979). Studies of African school curricula from a point of view of cultural imperialism and relevance for development are currently undertaken by De Nie for Ghana (cf. 1971) and Draisma for Zambia (cf. 1978). A recent overview of the field is Kaayk (1980).

Hospital: The confrontation between the bureaucratically-organized metropolitan medical system, and local African medical systems, is the topic of major studies by Janssen (1973) and Buschkens & Slikkerveer (1980), as well as a collection edited by Van der Geest & Van der Veen (1979) which is largely concerned with the African situation. The same problem was studied for leprosy patients in Kenya by Varkevisser, Risseeuw & Bijleveld (1977). While these studies focused on the therapeutic micro-situation, the more general, systematic constraints on the Tanzanian rural health care delivery system were studied by Van Etten (1976).


In addition to Buijtenhuijs’s studies of revolutionary movements (see below), studies of African political parties and the process of their rural mobilization include those by Geschiere on rural Cameroon (1978: ch. 9–12), and, with regard to the Tanzanian TANU, Van Hecken & Thoden van Velzen (1972; cf. Thoden van Velzen 1972, 1972, 1973, 1975), Konter (1978) and Huizer (1971).

African states

Within the context of Dutch Africanist anthropology, the study of African states can be divided into three interlocking sub-topics: early states, incorporation processes, and revolutionary movements.
The comparative and theoretical work of Claessen, Skalnik and associates (Claessen 1970; Claessen & Skalnik 1978, 1981; Seaton & Claessen 1979; Hagesteijn 1980 (29)) concentrates on the description and classification of the forms of pre-colonial (so-called 'early') African states, the conditions under which they arose, and under which they changed prior to being incorporated into colonial and post-colonial states. Skalnik, after general studies of the Voltaic early states (published in Claessen & Skalnik 1978; Seaton & Claessen 1979), has since 1978 concentrated on a long-term study of one of these, Nanun in Northern Ghana. Baesjou and Van Leynseele are currently undertaking research into early states in the coastal area of Ghana and Ivory Coast. A case study of a non-colonial state, twentieth-century Ethiopia viewed as a patrimonial bureaucracy in the Weberian sense, is Asmerom (1978).

A second sub-topic is formed by the processes of national incorporation and their consequences for the sort of encapsulated, neo-traditional remnants of ancient polities such as exist today within African nation-states. The major work along this line has been done, for the Netherlands, by Doornbos, who in a series of studies not only reassessed the nature of the pre-colonial Nkore polity in Uganda and the incorporation processes to which it has been subjected, but also contributed to the emergent general theory of African incorporation processes in general (Doornbos 1975a, 1977, 1978; Doornbos et al. 1976; Cliffe et al. 1977). Other studies along this line include Geschiere (1978), as well as those of rural political mobilization mentioned above. The third sub-topic in the political field revolves on the processes by which colonial and post-colonial states in Africa, failing to legitimate themselves in the eyes of significant portions of the population (as marked by emerging ethnic, religious, regional and class identities), and unable to control these effectively, give rise to revolutionary movements. This has been the constant line in the work of Buitenhuijs, on the Kenyan Mau Mau (1971a, 1973), the Chadian Frolinat movement (1978), Guine Bissau (Buitenhuijs & De Jong 1979), and African revolutionary movements in general (1973). Other studies along this line include Doornbos (1970) on Uganda; Post (1972) on West Africa: Gerold-Scheepers on Zimbabwe (1976); and Van Binsbergen (1979a: ch. 1. 8) on the Zambian Lumpa rising.

The study of African law

Being primarily a legal anthropologist, it was inevitable that Holleman’s prominent position in Dutch Africanist anthropology since the early 1960s stimulated African law studies in this country. So far these have mainly concentrated on legal aspects of family and marriage (Van Rouweroyen van Nieuwla 1976; Roberts 1977; Harrell-Bond & Rijndorp 1975; Rijndorp 1975), the disparity between law and social reality (Harrell-Bond & Van Rouweroyen van Nieuwla 1975; Holleman 1977), and the study of land tenure in West Africa (Van Rouweroyen van Nieuwla 1977; Van Rouweroyen van Nieuwla & Améga 1979). Further research on this latter topic is currently undertaken by Hesseling, whose earlier work was on African constitutional law (in press) and the judicial implications of the language situation in Africa (1980). A common theme in all this work has been the confrontation between local judicial systems and national systems of legalisation and adjudication (Van Rouweroyen van Nieuwla 1975), within a context of changing economic, social and political relationships. The chair of the sociology of law in Groningen is occupied by Griffiths, whose considerable African experience shows e.g. in his review (1977) of Van Rouweroyen van Nieuwla (1976). (30)
The contextual study of African religion

The classical paradigm did suggest how aspects of religion (e.g. the interpretation of evil in terms of witchcraft, sorcery, or ancestral wrath) could be interpreted by reference to the small-scale social process in which the religious phenomena are embedded. Dutch Africanist anthropology has yielded a few studies in this vein during the period covered (e.g. Van Nieuwenhuijzen 1974; Bleek 1976b). However, the main growth with regard to the study of religion has been through attempts to arrive at broad historical and regional approaches, which would allow us to classify and understand religious phenomena, and the changes therein, in relation to the changing economic, social and political context at the macro-level. These studies represent a considerable departure from the classical paradigm and reflect general changes within the discipline. (31) Examples are Schoelleleers's edited volume on territorial cults in Central Africa (1979), and Van Binsbergen's work on religious change in Zambia (1979a); cf. Van Binsbergen & Schoelleleurs, in press. In these works, like in Putsvoet's study of Akan religion (Ghana) (1979), Van Beek's (1979) on Kapsiki and Higi religion in Cameroon and Nigeria, and Geschiere's (1980) on witchcraft beliefs in Cameroon, emphasis is on the dynamics of African religions as springing from internal sources rather than from the confrontation with Christianity. This confrontation is a more central issue in Droogers's studies on the Africanization of Christianity (1977, 1980b), specifically among the Zaïrean Wagenia: Ilogu's work on Christianity and Igbo culture (1974; based on his Leiden DD); and Kuper's essay on the blurred boundaries between Christian and non-Christian elements in modern Botswana (1979). To these works should be added those listed above on Christian churches studied as formal organizations. The emphasis on poly-ethnic, regional elements in most of these works was foreshadowed in Dande's (1970a) controversial study of the Zimbabwean Mwari cult. The need to clarify the relations between religious innovation and political change in the colonial context inspired the collection edited by Van Binsbergen & Buitenhuijs (1976).

General ethnographic studies

What I have identified so far as major areas of interest fits in, obviously, with my preference for an anthropology which critically and indirectly, rather than directly and faithfully, derives from the classical anthropological paradigm, trying to come to terms with the reality of modern Africa, with intellectual and political pressures from within Africa, and with developmental concerns. However, outside this orientation, and much closer to the classical paradigm, a great deal of work has been done in Dutch Africanist anthropology, judged by its own internal criteria, much of this work is of considerable, sometimes even of outstanding, qualities. This work is often of a descriptive nature and tries to fill in areas in the map which classical African ethnography had left more or less untouched. Under this heading falls Van Leynseele's description of ecology, economy, and socio-juridical organization of the Zaïrean Libinza (1979); van Beek's (1978) description of the Kapsiki and Higi; Droogers's (1980a) description of symbolic aspects of boy's initiation among the Wagenia; Meijer's (1979) study of West-Pokot, Kenya; and Knops's (1980) work on the West African Senufo. In so far as these studies reveal a positive antiquarian concern (the wish to record phenomena likely to disappear in the near future), these studies link up with such anthropological excursions into oral-historical data collection as conducted, e.g., by Jaeger (1971a) and Bantje (1971) in Zambia; Varkevisser (1971)
in Tanzania; and Geschiere (1978) in Cameroon. The emphasis on cognitive-anthropological approaches in the works of Van Beek and Droogers, on the other hand, links up not only with Kuper’s work (to which I shall presently turn), but also with Beattie’s (1976) on Ugandan symbolism; Visser’s (1975, 1977) on Ivorian ethnobotany and ethno-agriculture; Van den Breeker’s (1977) on Ivorian concepts of slavery; Droogers & Bokdami’s (1975) on Wagenia ethnobotany; and Van Beek’s on ethno-religion (1975).

A preference for straightforward ethnography, uncontaminated by what may turn out to be ephemeral theorizing and the socio-political concerns and pressures of the moment, is reflected in some of Kuper’s recent writings, e.g. his English summary of Fourie’s early-twentieth-century ethnography of the Southern Transvaal Ndebele (Kuper 1978a; cf. Fourie 1921). (32) ‘Pure’ ethnography of this nature also provides the raw data for Kuper’s main ongoing research: an attempt to unearth the social-organizational and symbolic deep-structure of which the various ethnographic forms as described for ethnic groups in the Southern African region (kinship terminology, residential patterns, marriage, rank etc.) could be considered to be the surface manifestations, and to formulate the transformational rules which connect these surface phenomena to the common deep-structure (Kuper 1975, 1977a, 1978b, 1980). As an exercise in pure science, the project shows considerable creativity and courage, and in fact takes up a concern for cross-cultural comparison which has been one of the main constants in Dutch anthropology (cf. Nieboer 1910; Köbben 1952, 1955b, 1971; Thoden van Velzen & Van Wetering 1960; Kloos 1963; Claessen 1970; De Leeuw 1971). However, as the main research project associated with the only chair in Africanist anthropology in the Netherlands, and moreover concentrating on a part of Africa that in terms of conflict and oppression is one the most tragic of the entire continent, Kuper’s project may remind some of us of a hobby-horse rocking gently and by its own impetus, in the attic of the academic ivory tower.

5. GENERAL TRENDS, AND BLIND-SPOTS

One aspect of the critical reflection on the classical paradigm, and one uniting researchers which otherwise would have very little in common, is an increasing emphasis on broad regional and historical patterns, of which the distinct ethnic groups as studied at any one moment in time are only more or less arbitrarily chosen specimens. This regional/historical trend underlies not only recent attempts to arrive at a contextual analysis of African religious change, but also Kuper’s work on the social-organizational deep structure of Southern African ‘traditional’ societies, as well as his and his associates’ archaeological explorations (Kuper 1978; Kuper & Van Leynseele 1978; Uhlenbeck 1979). It is inherent in Kuper’s, Van Beek’s and Platvoet’s search for great versus little traditions in African religion, as well as in theoretical explorations which seek to transcend the limitations of the classical paradigm by application of the marxist approach of the articulation of modes of production (Buijtenhuis & Geschiere 1978; Schoffeleers 1978; Van Binsbergen 1979a; Vercruyssse 1980; Van Binsbergen & Geschiere 1981; and most studies in Van Binsbergen & Meilink 1978), or other brands of marxism such as propounded by Waterman (Waterman 1979; Gukind & Waterman 1977) and Skalnik (Claessen & Skalnik 1978, 1981). For all these theoretical developments, however divergent from each other (and however defective or tentative when considered on their individual merits), attempt to formulate (usually from a point of view that is, implicitly or explicitly, historical) general processes that transcend the narrow confines of the once sacrosanct ethnic group or tribe and that display regularities to be found in many parts of Africa.
Similarly, a more comprehensive regional approach has supplanted smaller socio-cultural units in the course of a reassessment of the significance of tribal, ethnic and racial distinctions in the works of Buitjens (e.g. Grandin-Blanc & Buitjens 1977), Doornbos (1970, 1976, 1978: Doornbos et al. 1976) Kuper (1976), Van der Laan (1975a, 1975b), February (1976), and Van Binsbergen (in press).

Characteristically, these developments tend to manifest themselves in the context of the examination of a specific body of ethnographic and historical data. Discussions of the history and theoretical orientations of the discipline do not abound in Dutch Africanist anthropology during the period covered here (however, cf. Trouwborst 1979), and especially Trouwborst (1971), which lucidly deals with the breakdown of the classical anthropological paradigm in the face of the analytical problems presented by 'complex societies'). In the other general discussions of the discipline there is often an emphasis not on methodological but on ethical and political considerations which has struck some foreigners as being typically Dutch. (31) Examples include the exchange between Beatitie and Buitjens (in the merits of the anthropological record in Africa (Beatitie 1973, 1974; Buitjens' 1974, cf. 1971b, 1972), or in Van Terefluten's (1978) contentious assessment of Glueckman and the Manchester School. Similar overtones can be heard in the exchange between Bleek and Van Binsbergen on the instrumental versus the experiential or existential dimensions of modern anthropological field-work (Bleek 1979; Van Binsbergen 1979b). However, the decade produced one full-length treatment of anthropological field-work that manages to avoid such onesidensness (Bleek 1976).

With all this work going on in the Netherlands during the 1970s, in a country whose historical involvement in Africa was rather limited as with such metropolitan countries as Britain, France, Belgium, Portugal, why try and identify blind-spots in Dutch Africanists anthropology? However, in the Netherlands as elsewhere the development of the discipline is less and less determined by the specific nature of historical links between North Atlantic countries and the African continent during the pre-colonial and colonial era (34). It is with an eye on the future of the discipline in the Netherlands that I think a discussion of weaknesses and omissions in the work of the 1970s can be extremely useful.

Although some enlightenment has inevitably taken place recently, still very few Dutch studies manage to deal with African women as more than peripheral to the main-stream of the social process. What little work exists in this field is of a fairly exploratory nature (cf. Havers 1976; Aig-Ojehomon-Ketting 1975; Lagerwerf 1975; Presvelou & Spijkers-Zwart 1980: Doorn & Van Stiphout 1978; Van der Geest 1975). The exchange between Van der Geest (1979a) and Schrijvers (1979b) addresses itself to the more fundamental issues of feminist anthropology, but does not specifically concentrate on Africa. Research currently undertaken in Upper Volta, as part of the 'Women and Development' project of Leiden University, is likely to partly fill in this gap in the near future.

Moreover, due to the rather rigid separation, in the Netherlands, between 'museum anthropology', dealing with material culture, and 'university anthropology', dealing with social relationships, it is somewhat difficult for me to assess the extent to which the changing material culture of Africa - with all its implications for changing productive forces and modes of production - is in fact a blind-spot in current Dutch studies; but despite some recent publications (Boelmann & Van Holthoorn 1973; Dobbelmann 1976; Leyten & Fieret 1980), this topic does not seem to be receiving the attention it deserves. An exception must be made for the Afrika-Museum Berg en Dal, whose collection has gained international fame. Equally scarce
are studies of the non-material artistic and creative expressions of 'traditional' and 'modern' Africa, although here perhaps it is right that the few significant studies have come mainly from non-anthropologists (Schippers-De Leeuw 1973, 1977a, 1977b; February 1977 (3); Haafkens 1979; Bayer & Emanuel 1972), in addition to occasional contributions to ethnomusicology (Moore 1977, 1981; Bantje 1978; Van der Geest 1979b).

A further blind-spot seems to be the study of Islam as a social-organizational and judicial factor of the greatest importance in vast areas of sub-Saharan Africa, against the relative abundance of studies on Christian churches and the transformation of indigenous religious systems; the few exceptions include Haafkens (1979) and Prins (1965). Research priorities currently being formulated at the African Studies Centre, Leiden, are likely to confront this problem in the near future.

African elites and modern ruling classes also form something of a blind-spot. With the exception of Harrell-Bond's work on Sierra Leone (1975), and Holleman & Biesheuvel's (1973) on white mine-workers on the Zambian Copperbelt – both works do not really belong to Dutch Africanist anthropology as defined above --, no full-size studies exist on this topic, although it is more succinctly dealt with in a number of works (including Doornbos 1976, 1978; Buijtenhuijs 1973, 1978; Buijtenhuijs & Geschiere 1978; Geschiere 1975, 1978; Konter 1977; and De Wolf 1978).

That the study of social networks has not developed into a major topic in Dutch anthropology, contrary to the high expectations that surrounded the network concept in the late 1960s, need not surprise us, given the international developments in this particular field; from a cure-all for the deficiencies of the classical structural-functionalist paradigm, network analysis has rightly developed into a more modest tool for the study of social and political relationships, especially useful in situations of incorporation and urbanization. And it is in the latter form that it is has found some limited use in Dutch Africanist anthropology (Van Hekken & Thoden van Velzen 1972; Thoden van Velzen 1972; Trouwborst 1973).

Muller's (1975) study of a Kenyan housing estate brings out one final blind-spot in current Dutch anthropology: urbanism in modern Africa. When confronted with the puzzling reality of urban life in Africa (since long has taken on a shape and a dynamism beyond the limitations of the urbanization concept), international anthropology has needed decades to proceed beyond the temptation of superficial quantification and survey methods. Thus African urbanites have been treated mainly as atomistic carriers of individual characteristics: sex, age, income, occupational position, type of dwelling, extent of participation in voluntary associations, extent of the use of medical facilities, etc. Surveys of this type have also been undertaken by Dutch researchers (e.g. an interdisciplinary project of Leiden University on Dakar cryptically called RUI-12 and directed by Bergh, yielding publications such as Maan 1973, Faber 1973, Rasenberg 1973, Bijl et al. 1974-75; and further: Hinderink & Sterkenburg 1975; Mansvelt Beck & Sterkenburg 1976, on Cape Coast, Ghana; Hoek-Smit 1976, on urban Kenya; and Lagerberg & Mansvelt Beck 1975, on Douala, Cameroon). However, since they provide little insight in crucial urban relationships, and in the emergence of social patterns of perception and norms typical of urbanism, these studies are at best potentially anthropological. Muller's doctoral thesis stands out among Dutch studies as one which poses properly anthropological questions within the African urban environment, and tries to answer these questions. Although other Dutch Africanist anthropologists have shown an awareness of similar dimensions of the urban situation in scattered passages in their work (e.g. Van der Poort 1973; Van Dijk 1980; Hinderink
1970; Van Binsbergen 1979a: ch. 7), this is indicative of the enormous amount of work that remains to be done. (36) Such urban studies as have been carried out by Dutch researchers suggest that the topic of the urban ‘informal sector’ is likely to form a growth-pole, both theoretically and as regards developmental concerns.

6 CONCLUSION

If I mark these general trends, and blind-spots. I do not mean that here, and nowhere else, should be the research priorities for Dutch Africanist anthropology in the near future. What is first needed is a critical assessment of the resources (in terms of organization, logistics and man-power), strength and weakness of current Africanist work in the Netherlands. This chapter makes only a beginning with this task. Kuper has a point when he suggests (1977b: iii) that we may be spreading our resources too thinly. Will we be able to draw up a master plan for Dutch anthropology of Africa – a programme which comes to terms with the pressures from within Africa and from development specialists in the metropolitan countries, while formulating sophisticated alternatives to the classical paradigm in anthropology? And, in the process, shall we be able to safeguard not only our research funds and our jobs, but also our academic freedom, creativity, and political and ethical responsibility? For this immensely difficult operation to be successful, a powerful Netherlands Association of African Studies, and a new, viable journal as a national vehicle for exchange and criticism, seem required as the necessary foundations upon which the promise of Dutch Africanist anthropology, so dearly manifested in the course of the 1970s, could mature and bear fruit.

NOTES

1 Due to editorial difficulties, the request to write this chapter only reached me three months before the text was due at the printer’s. The gigantic task of compiling, selecting, reading and structuring the mass of anthropological and related publications covered by my argument could not have been completed but for the assistance of many people, only some of whom I can single out for specific acknowledgment here. My greatest debt is to Thérèse Gerold-Scheepers, who compiled much of the bibliographical material, and made extensive comments on an earlier draft of this paper. Further I wish to express gratitude to Gerrit Grootehuis, Managing Director of the African Studies Centre, Leiden, for great moral and practical support; and to the library staff of the same institution. This chapter has moreover benefited from comments made by Peter Kloos, Hans Claessen, Sjaak van der Geest, Peter Geschiere, Peter Skalinik, Wouter van Beek, A. A. Trouwborst, and participants in a meeting of the Anthropology Work-Group, Netherlands African Studies Association, where an earlier draft was discussed in December, 1980. While acknowledging these essential contributions, I should stress that the responsibility for the text of this chapter and for the bibliographical selection as presented here is entirely mine – to the extent to which one can at all be responsible for the outcome of an impossible commission.

2 This also means that this review does not comprise work done by Belgian Africanist anthropologists writing in Dutch. Contacts between Belgian and Dutch researchers in this field are limited, and need to be expanded in the near future. With regard to the German Federal
Republic, and virtually all other countries on the European mainland except France, a similar situation obtains.

3 For a discussion of the structure of academic degrees in the Netherlands, see Kloos's chapter on doctoral theses in the present volume. In the Netherlands, doctoral theses are considered to be fully-fledged publications. At the author's expense they are published in a sufficient number of copies to guarantee wide circulation; each Dutch doctoral thesis should be easily available from any Dutch university library. Doctorandus theses that have been issued as departmental publications are likewise counted as published. Other doctorandus theses, as well as kandidaats theses, count as unpublished materials and have been ignored in this chapter. I have also refrained from making reference to any other unpublished materials (seminar and conference papers, internal reports, drafts of books etc.), unless these are due for publication within a year.

4 Given the introductory nature of the present book, as well as its physical limitations, this bibliography had to be highly selective. The selection process is explained, in part, in section 1 of the text, in note 3, and in the heading of the bibliography itself. The materials collected in preparation for the present chapter will however form the basis for a much more extensive bibliography of Dutch anthropology of sub-saharan Africa, to be published by the African Studies Centre, P.O. Box 9507, 2300 RA Leiden, the Netherlands.

5 Most of the African Studies Centre books used to be published with Mouton (the Hague/Paris). From 1980 onwards a new series is being published by Kegan Paul International (London/Boston). In addition, the African Studies Centre itself produced a number of publications, in print or offset. Among these a series was published jointly with the African Studies Centre, Cambridge, United Kingdom. Cf. Afrika-Studiecentrum, n.d., and subsequent announcements of recent publications in the Newsletter on African Studies in the Netherlands.


7 Based on her PhD work with K. Little in Edinburgh, United Kingdom, prior to her joining the African Studies Centre, Leiden.

8 A re-publication of miscellaneous work up to 1962, with only a few additional pages written while the author was attached, as from 1963, to Leiden University and the African Studies Centre, Leiden.

9 A University of Ghana MA thesis integrally re-published by the Africin Studies Centre. Leiden.

10 Topics in physical anthropology do not feature in this list, and have also been ignored in this chapter. A major centre of Africanist physical anthropology in the Netherlands is the Instituut voor Antropobiologie, University of Utrecht (Achter de Dom 24, 3512 JP Utrecht, the Netherlands), where further information may be obtained.
11 In the Netherlands the distinction between these two varieties of anthropology is very roughly equivalent to that between what is locally called cultural anthropology (in direct derivation from a classical problematic), and non-western sociology (the indirect-derivative variant, geared to problems of social change and technical assistance); cf. Kloos 1975: 17f. However, I would agree with Köbben (1977: ch. 3) that this distinction as applied in the organization of Dutch academic life is impractical, and without denying the differences in relevance and scope of these two variants, I would prefer to call them both anthropology.


16 After his doctoral research on African art (1966), Gerbrands has concentrated on art and society in Irian Jaya, and on visual anthropology in general.

17 Thoden van Velzen’s doctoral research under Köbben was on Surinam. But immediately after taking his PhD he carried out (1966-68) research in Rungwe District, Tanzania, as a member of an African Studies Centre research team; and some of his most significant publications are based on this African experience.


20 A recent Leiden departmental publication (half in Dutch, half in English) was called Leiden in Africa (Kuper 1977b). Only the e in Africa identifies the title as English and not Dutch – in the latter language it would have contained an interesting pun, meaning not only ‘Leiden research on Africa’, but also ‘Taking the lead in Africa’.

21 Cf. Busia 1950, 1951, 1967; Busia was Ghana’s Prime Minister in the years 1969-71.


23 Van Binsbergen’s research on North African popular Islam and on urban and rural Zambia by that time was still largely unpublished.
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26 Of Gerold-Scheepers's valuable review articles as published in Kroniek van Afrika and African Perspectives, the bibliography only mentions the ones on Zimbabwean resistance (1976) and on workers' consciousness (1978); cf. her contributions in Sterkenburg & De Jonge 1974; Buitjenhuijs & Baesjou 1974; Van Binsbergen & Buitjenhuijs 1976; Van Binsbergen & Meilink 1978.


29 Cf. Claessen's contribution to the present volume.

30 In addition to his writings in legal anthropology, Van Rouweroy van Nieuwaal's research has yielded a number of excellent ethnographic films on the judicial process and rural life in general in Togo; these include: Mambim (1973), Moslims in Mango (1974), Shereu (1975), A la Recherche de la Justice (1980), and Bekoidinatu (1980). These films are distributed by the Foundation for Film and Science, Hengeveldstraat 29, P.O. Box 9550, 3506 GN Utrecht, the Netherlands; full-length documentation on each of these films has been published by the African Studies Centre, Leiden.

31 Cf. Schoffeleers's contribution to the present volume.

32 Fourie's work (1921) shows, incidentally, that field-work in Dutch Africanist anthropology did not quite start with Hofstra or those mentioned in note 15. It is not unlikely that other cases like Fourie could be unearthed. However, their impact on mainstream Dutch anthropology would have been negligible.

33 Somewhat surprisingly, however, given the relative abundance of work on Southern Africa in Dutch anthropology during the period covered, there has been little of an attempt to confront the ethical problems surrounding social research and publication under conditions of racial segregation and state oppression; a notable exception is Bovenkerk et al. 1976. This remark does not apply to authors like February and Du Toit who, themselves of South African origin, identify as enemies of the apartheid state, resolving the ethical issue by a clear political stance.

34 Dutch archival sources on the West African coast offer a good example of this state of affairs. Despite their richness, hardly any work has ever been done on them prior to the 1970s (cf. Baesjou 1979).

35 Although primarily discussions of a body of creative writing, both Schipper-De Leeuw's
(1971) and February's (1977) studies have considerable relevance for the sociology of race relations in modern Africa.

36 Cf. the contribution by Nas and Prins to the present volume.
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