

“A sojourn of Harmony and Dissonance”: A cast of Hybrid of Confluence and Discord between History and Anthropology in Contemporary Scholarship

Confidence Chia Ngam

Lecturer/Researcher, The Department of History and Archeology, Service Head of Records and Admissions, The University of Bamenda, Cameroon

***Corresponding Author:**

Confidence Chia Ngam

Email: ngamconfidence@yahoo.com

Abstract: Social science contemporary studies posits with vehemence that the employment of interdisciplinary approach is an indispensable method of attempting to have a full grasp of what man and his environment in any time scope is all about. Two scientific disciplines where this intercourse has been consistently growing warm and active by dint of its mutual benefits are history and anthropology. In its all-out contemporary spirit of seeking to understand mans' past (triumphs and failures) History leans on anthropology to provide her with knowledge about societal norms, mores, institutions, structures and cultural tenets. Anthropology on its part requires the knowledge of history to understand the rudiments of human cultures, received traditions and time influences. As integral components of the social sciences family, they are birds of a feather and in respect to inter-relatedness of the issues they handle (about man in all his aspects), they are bound to trot together. This notwithstanding, Historians and anthropologists have scientific junctions where they converge which are just as many as those disciplines that stubbornly keep them astride. This paper diagnoses not only the areas and reasons where/why they meet but attempts to map out their changing positions in choosing issues to be investigated, conducting research, analyzing the results and bringing forth their findings. It uses abounding evidences in the Bamenda Grasslands to opine that the cooperation between these two disciplines with their all-embracing character do not only obey the tenets of the interdisciplinary concerns but have helped to open new frontiers of awareness in the entire historical guild.

Keywords: History, Anthropology, Contemporary, Diagnosis, Converging, Diverging.

INTRODUCTION

In the past decades the extension of the research scope and frontiers of anthropology to investigate all issues concerning man in his recent or distant past alongside that of history to adopt a new approach of seeking to understand the most recent past from the ashes ethnographic and archeological data have combined to bring forth an interesting scenario in the expanding frontiers of social Science scholarship. This has opened wide gates for further investigation of previously established facts and a growing need for social science key disciplines; History and Anthropology to be seen as birds of a feather.ⁱ

However, there is a growing debate that the warm scientific intercourse between these two disciplines are indications that they are unintentional requesting for a forced marriage or at best, a situation where one will be scraped off in favour of the other. Viewing advancements made in technology and the rapidly expanding nature of research, it is rather very possible that more disciplines might in the nearer future be borne out of these disciplines than a worst case situation where the two shall grow into one.ⁱⁱ In any

case, it is worth while noting that Anthropology and History are just complementing bed fellows in the evolving game of social sciences and that; each in its own rights differ in tone, essence and content in satisfying scientific curiosity. This notwithstanding, there are virtually involved in the same kind of mission which is that of brining man in his wholesome entity into a veritable apprehensions thereby, giving him the feat to look and plan for the future with a fair degree of assurance. Seen on the premise of these venture, the two disciplines are in the best of circumstances “birds of a feather” that are bound to pace together in respect of the issues under investigation.ⁱⁱⁱ Substantially, there still exist a world of difference between them reasons why there are and shall in the foreseeable future remain as separate disciplines. From broad ranged of evidences gathered from primary and secondary sources, these paper attempts to bring to the fore the scientific distanced covered by the complementarity of these disciplines in the domain of choosing the matter to be investigated, method of investigation, analyses and establishment of results. It traps and presents the converging and diverging horizons concluding that their warm intercourse in scientific scholarship makes them

appear more like one but intrinsically different in essence and principles.

Contextualizing the Issues

But for the growth and employment of the interdisciplinary approach in social science research, a lot of issues, events and matter dealing with man in his remote primitive or far advanced form could have been and will remain enveloped in absurdities. The 21st century emphasis on cross discipline approach is novelty not developed just for its sake but on its implication on mans' attempt to have a full grasps of his society, how it started, how it grew, the patterns of thoughts and people that animated its growth and how all of these triumphed and failed in a web of time and space.^{iv} Without this kind of approach any single discipline contention about man will be frail, lame and definitely exposed to systematic doubt. It is within this framework that History and Anthropology as key social science disciplines are seen to be birds of a feather by dint of their shared approach and responsibility of studying man in all his aspects.

Converging Horizons of History and Anthropology (Birds of a feather)

By definition modern Anthropology is a social science which is concerned with a profound study of man; how he lived, how he managed himself and his environment as well as how he thought and appreciated other people who lived in his niche at the same or different times. Within the bosom of Anthropology we come to have a full or near complete grasp of man's pattern of working, marrying, living, worshiping trends of organization and how order can be maintain in a single or multi-dimensioned time span. Either in its all-embracing mission to understand human culture and build logical trends of knowledge that can in a whole explain man's world view and philosophical conviction or its noble mission of understanding man's anatomy and his evolution from the early stone age to the present and further, in its challenging engagement of presenting how man has developed and is able to respond to change and developmental progress, anthropology make profound recourse to history in all its form. Anthropology is therefore that noble branch of the social sciences which gives us broad and specific knowledge about people life patterns, their philosophy of life (theological and metaphysical apprehensions) and how this has impacted in his production pattern. It goes further to render a noble service to man by giving him the latitude to understand how in space and time, people of their breed but in different circumstances and exigencies battled against natural and manmade interjections to create, cultures, norms and values of their own. Marett's contention about Anthropology articulately places the discipline in the same scientific equation with history. Without mincing words, he argues that;

Anthropology is the whole history of man as fired and pervaded by the idea of evolution. Man in its evolution that is the subject in its full reach. Anthropology studies man as he occurs in all parts of the world. It studies him body and soul together-as a bodily organism subject to conditions operating in time and space which bodily organism is in intimate relations with a psychic life also subject those same conditions. Having an eye to such conditions from first to last, it seeks to plot out the general series of changes bodily and mental together undergone by man in the course of history.^v

Such emphatic contentions yields doubts whether it is anthropology that is getting and ascribed to take the place of history or it History that has been instructed to go Anthropological. Understood from any angle, such a contention only sums up to the idea that both are like hands in gloves. This can also be further understood when anthropology both as a subject and discipline is properly placed in its context of time and logic of interpretation of sources and establishment of results.

Anthropology and the Question of Source

Interestingly, in its early foundations as a separate discipline Anthropology was granted a job ascribed to people whose mission is to seek and established outmoded fashion and style. It was held to be involved in studying primitive cultures like those that flourished and are still flourishing in Africa, India, China and other backward societies of the known world. Sociologists like Emile Dukheim and a host of others fought with impunity to erroneously conclude that the job (meaning research and relevance) of anthropology stops at the boundary of a town or when an issue of a civilized form is mentioned.^{vi} By pushing it to be concerned with the remotest pattern of mans' life, this discipline found itself incidentally involved in a mission which provided a worthy ingredient to History known as ethnology.

The discovery and dramatic progress made in the field of ethnology with its constant appeal of more revealing archeological evidences made it closer and useful to history than any other science. To this should be added the fact that physical anthropology grew not just to become the study of the naked anatomy of man but consciously provided broader streams of knowledge through and under which bones and cultures of man in the form of "Homo sapien Sapien" and "Homo Erectus" could be carefully understood. This knowledge pushed the frontiers of hitherto unknown truths about humankind beyond the confines of what the Europeans

scholars in their numbers, blindly called Historical age.^{vii}

However, in its growth and extending frontiers anthropology either in its gown as Physical, cultural or development creed, just like history, has embraced the knowledge of Geography and Biology to identify and make use of plants, of archeological finds to produce broad and specific zones of cultural progress and belief systems as well as astrology to have a vague idea of mans' conception of the stratosphere. She has made a wider use of sociology, psychology and philosophy to identify theories and working hypothesis through and under which their research in the field can be made and finding too established. History is almost practically concerned with this very kind of job. Ethnographic components especially in the Bamenda Grassfields were a reserve of prominent anthropologists. This happened at a time where and when the Cameroon historical guild had not found faith in the fact that the traditional institutions and migratory trends of the different groups of people that settled in the Grassfields could be investigated from the standpoint of the Historian. It is therefore not an overstatement to say that almost all historians of the Grassfields depended on the material earlier provided by anthropologists and archeologist like Raymond Asombang as start off points.

It is not only in the field of archeology, ethnology or the concentration on mans in all its aspects that history and anthropology converges. As far as source is concern, these disciplines especially with matters that relate to African systems make a romantic appeal to oral sources as evidences. Eye witnesses account run through the entire length and breadth of historical and anthropological investigation. It provides fresh and refreshing insights acting like a fulcrum to the poorly known or conceived knowledge and further by, bringing completely new ideas that orients social scientists in no little way. Viewing the tonnage of criticism levied on oral sources either in form of myths, songs, proverbs, rhymes and relics that have been identified to bear volumes of truth about man, the combined scientific weight of History and anthropology has pushed oral sources or verbal accounts to the center of all scientific study as a source. These disciplines did not use boldness of imagination and fertility of facts to bring it in as a source. They rather developed multiple checks and control techniques through and under which the bias and prejudices that beset negative criticism of oral or eyewitness account as a source could be laid to rest once and for all.

From the above upheld evidences one can move away with a deep conviction that in the domain of source identification and usage, history and anthropology are caught up in the same morass or research web. This is further sustained by the fact that,

the issues on menu for investigation are either almost the same or separated from each other by a very thin membrane reasons why they are fitting to be called birds of a feather. It is this joint approach that issues of gender trends and mutations, power topography and diplomacy, conflict, war and peace, religious credos, ethnic hegemony, cultural trends, development trends and nutritional patterns of the people that lived and are presently living in the Bamenda Grassfields are variedly investigated and salient facts established. As earlier indicated, history and anthropology though involved in the same mission, making recourse to the same kind of disciplines and using the same sources still differ intrinsically in their approach not just of method of collecting data analyzing it and establishing results but largely, in their overlapping perceptions about the issues concerning man. An understanding worth the name of this scientific drama between these two disciplines can only be made if the special contours of History are brought to the fore.

History and the Compendious Notion of Source

History and modern History for this matter, is a discipline that seeks to know and present where man lived, how he lived, the battles he fought lost or worn, the speeches he made, why he made them the way he did as well as how all of this was relevant either to people of that generation or to our present thoughts and approach to things. History is therefore a discipline which encompasses anything that moves in the direction of providing clues to human thought and reaction in the past. This past has no limit in terms of time span but it becomes useful and researchable only as long as they are traces in terms of archeological finds, ethnographic data or even some mute fact like stone pebbles, debris, carvings, buildings, tress, tombs, court judgments and eyewitnesses that can be consulted logically analyzed and finding established.^{viii} Unlike Geography that places a premium on land forms and sub crustal currents alongside its accompanied plate tectonics, History and Anthropology only get concerned about this areas when they bear direct relevance to man. How this intercourse has helped to pushed the frontiers of History beyond a single life time span and generation, has already been discussed above but it suffice here to note that the disagreement of historical causation analyses and contentions make the notion of source an indispensable necessity. When facts are said to be all time relevant, gratitude is paid to the author for making a judicious use of the facts that were available to him at the time. Facts may remain the same or even shift and take different forms in history but the whole task is abandoned into the hands of professional historian to use his logic embedded in historical mindedness to allow them to talk out and speak in such a way that such account and sources given to another expert historian will find such contention valid when the exigencies of that period are taken into play.

With the exception of rigorous source criticism and the lifelong disagreement that exist between historians, History and Anthropology could have been seen to be involved almost in the same kind of job. Their sojourn in the evolving world of science have a common origin and destination but different ways of arrival. One emphasises on the cultural and developmental aspect of man prizing values, mores and traditional customs while the other is more focused on these aspects but places more emphasis on time and space arguing that; as a result of human unpredictability and changes in respond pattern even within people of the same cultural belief system; causation and reaction pattern in history varies from one time span and space to the other. In their attempt to study man and the contours of every aspect that relates to him, these two disciplines move in the same direction in the sources they consult, in their research approach and to some extent, on the way their data collected from the field is being analyzed and finding established. But the issue of source identification, criticism stand to emphasize that the vectors (vessels) through and in which historical and anthropological knowledge are transported and submitted are the same but the transporters are not only different in physique but also in spirit and ambition.

Source Identification and Criticism

One of the key areas where History share strong bonds with anthropology is the fact that both employ and make a judicious usage almost the same kind of sources to establish their facts. They believe that material and immaterial evidence for every of their assertion is mostly found in the field either in peoples' minds, actions or feelings, in old buildings ,on carvings found on the rocks or trees, in the inscriptions either on the rocks ,graves, on peoples cupboards in forms of dairies, programmes, letters or postings. To this should be added the rigorous appeal made to the study of archeological finds in studying mans' recent past. These are the rudiments from which all anthropological and historical assertions are made. In this light, when a relevant fact is said to be established in the field of social sciences, care is made to assure that the evidences come from all or most of these sources.

The fact that history and anthropology uses the same sources but sometimes arrived at far distant but most often not contradictory conclusion is already stale enough to be emphasized here. As indicated earlier, they made a higher use of oral sources but to different logical ends. A historian first of all take into account the fact that anybody to be chosen to provide oral information about a given event or unknown facts must be in every aspect related to the issue en vogue. This might be as an eyewitness or a second generation oral reporter or must have been touched by the issue on research in a distant or near past. History makes sure

that oral testimonies and reports are collected from people who at least have a detailed knowledge on what they are requested to provide answers. By so doing, he takes into context variables like (a) the respondent ability to deliver reliable evidences which can be deduced from his broad grasp of specific awareness (b) the respondent qualification to provide quality information about the matter or event under investigation. Most of the time this quality is deduced not only from the witness relation to the matter but equally to his position either in the society on course or on the structure and event that is being studied AND (C) the condition that might warrant him to provide answers without qualms. Seen from this end, it therefore goes that the choice of respondents for interviews (oral sources) in History is not an easy task.

Another problem still linked to source identification with regards to the ensuing discussion is that unlike anthropology that relies first on quantitative data with majority answers as first hand evidences, history is authoritative in tone in terms of choice and relies just slightly on quantitative data. In the main ,history in its wholesome length and breadth is not democratic. It does not rely on the majority of evidences to assert a fact as historical but on carefully selected qualitative sources using the criteria given above. This is understood from the realm of the contention that a researcher cultured in the art of historical research while sufficiently informed about the generalities that may surround a given research area and event, tries as much as possible to go the field without presumptions. He goes out with no pre judgment but open ended and flexible research guides definitely sure of his destination but doubtful of the goods (meaning research results) he will arrived with. History as a distinct discipline pays a high scholarly premium on the unique and the specific. He believes that human action can only be similar in a given condition but that its implication in time and space can never be the same what so ever. It further goes that an incident that has once made history goes away for good and can never be repeated so historians seeks to know how and why it happened and from internal logic ascertained to history alone, build up ideas that shows its relevance to the present. These are the qualities that make history not to depend so much on a working hypothesis or theoretical considerations.

Professional historians in the past believed that such dependence could give them wider exposure to mere generalization which besides being a tradition of anthropology and other sciences does harm to historical facts.

This was why History moved away from generalities and from the knowledge of generally accepted truths to the paradigm of unique assertions. This was further sustained by the fact that, historians do

believe that using the same facts any historians is required to write the history of his own age anchoring the technological progress and the philosophy and expectations that goes with it.

In posing questions on the field t^xthe historian performs a job almost closer to that of a detective .It was for this reason that John Cannon in his celebrated article titled “the Historian at Work argues emphatically that “the writing of history is quite easy but to become a celebrated historian is perhaps the rarest of intellectual distinctions.^xHe was of course only saying that history like other disciplines is like an industries where professional and amateur hub. The complexities surrounding historical research, the interpretation of data not leaving out the issue and time frame for the issue en vogue to be investigated had given the discipline acclaimed criticism from far and near. Besides the fact that it is still seen even within the context of the expanding strand of time to be intentionally tailored to chisel old wound and keep awake old conflicts, it had earlier received blames from social scientist and placed in a

.... private world inhabited exclusively by penetrating but unfathomable insights and ineffable understanding. History was attacked from the intellectual heights as being vague, cliché ridden and devoid of basic standards and from the popular lowlands as being pedantic and over concerned with the detailed pursuit of the insignificant. Even to those innocent of any interest in the maintenance of intellectual standards and unfamiliar with the pedantries, the very name of history often smell of ranked boredom.^{xi}

This distrust to historical scholastic and social utility had greater connections to that of the early sixteenth century which for the most part saw the work of a historian to be a sort of deliberate attempt to search for the unnecessary and scattered truths from the realms of disjointed and meaningless conclusions. Greater blame of this magnitude lay in the bosom of the words of sir Philip Sidney who contented among other things that;

The Historian... loaden with old mouse-eaten records, authorizing himselfe [sic]for the most part upon other histories whose greatest authorities are built upon the notable foundation of hearsay[meaning oral account]having much ado to accord differing writers and to prick truth out of partiality: better acquainted with 1000years ago than with the present age and yet better knowing how this world goeth than how his owne[sic] with runneth, curious for antiquities and inquisitive

of novelties, a wonder to young folks and a tyrant in table talk.^{xii}

If such contention were allowed to swing with the flow of scholarship, history could have been classified as the most turgid and outmoded discipline having its dignified seat in the museum of antiquity. This was however a single dimensional way of viewing discipline or course. In any case such a parochial judgment failed to take into account the growing concerns of history in place and time and ultimately that every discipline has its own techniques whose relevance are both frail and sterile only as far as it is put to the scholarship public. In detailing the entire job of an historian, John Cannon provides a fitting account that fires answers to most of the blames levied on history by emphasizing that;

What historians do need is a combination of talents that is a little rare. They must be capable of a task of often regarded as minute and repetitive drudgery-working out accounts, searching for genealogical evidence, adding up votes, recording place-names, computing crimes, comparing baptism and burial without allowing it to blunt their intellect. They must retain amidst these inescapable chores, the capacity not to see the wood for the tress and to stand back from the evidences they have so painstakingly amassed and ask interesting, important and perhaps irrelevant questions.^{xiii}

As a distinguished discipline, History has grown through a stiff battle with the vices like prejudice, bias, lame judgment and fact damage. It has gone through the grill of discredit, continuous blame for being too concerned with minute unique details that most often create more problems than providing solutions for any burning human problem.

Like any other human endeavour, history and contemporary history for that matter has grown to epic standards as a result of these criticisms. Its growth in time and space has taken this course unto new height enabling it to develop a fluid quality of swinging freely and fittingly in the world of pure humanities and social sciences. It is this oxalating ability that its courtship and even marriage with anthropology has continued be kept alive inspite of the intrinsic differences. What makes history radically different from anthropology is that; the likelihood of even trained historian to investigate a single matter under the same condition in time and space is rare. This is because of the subjective element that often runs through historical analyses. Historians do not talk about truth with the absolute dimensions as obtained in natural sciences like Mathematics, Chemistry, Physics or Biology. Truth in History simply refers to the fact that the historian in question used all

the techniques available to him at a given point in time and brought up explanation that were valid or that could be valid and similar to conclusions of another historian given the same conditions. Anthropologist methods a more arranged, widely accepted and do not shift from time to time or from one person to the other as does history. This is because is strength which historians have labored painfully to insist that it is an innovation in futility. Anthropologist through participant observations, the adoption of methods of collection of data through focused group discussion, sampling and analyses, have succeeded to build general systems of thought and theories which disagreement have been argued away. This is not to say that anthropologists believe that human beings and their reactions to given situation at a particular place and time is absolutely uniform like factory made and branded goods. They are sufficiently aware of these slight differences but try as much as possible to categorize human beings according to broader groups with regards to culture, tradition, forms of worship or other intrinsic characteristics that are better explained by psychologists.^{xiv} The adamancy of history and the historians to insist on specific and go through a kind of “needle work” task of threading those specific to convey a relevant message make her a distant relative to social sciences reasons why it is sometimes treated as pure humanity discipline like Literature.

Historians most often begin their research from the general to the specific making sure that his questionnaire is elastic or flexible enough to embrace questions arising from the humour of the respondent. However, the rigour employed by history in analyzing these sources, causing them to communicate the past in the present is different in length and breadth.

Still with regards to this kind of source Anthropology and history meet at a junction of in-depth interviews. In analyzing the data collected through this kind of data collection method anthropologists employ transcription and field observation methods which enables them to arrive at some general truths that can help to explain either cultural patterns, developmental trends and other physical aspects that have marked or are still marking man in his anthropological niche. History on its part tries to check out the validity of his oral accounts by making a rigorous recourse to primary sources like private and public archives that take the shape of letters, communiqués, reports, Minutes, speeches, declarations memoranda and court proceedings. A further search is made through a thorough review of a catalog of unpublished material that may exist in form of letters, manuscript, thesis dissertations, Long Essays and even mute but historical relevant material sources like pictures, carving, stones, footpaths, debris and other archeological finds. Source complementarity and research originality in history is

seen in this kind of approach. This approach makes history completely diametrically different in kind from what Spangler called “a Scissor and Paste approach” or Karl Marks’ later contentions of “historical general causation”.^{xv}

Seen in this realm history will be broadly considered as an eloquent dialogue between a mute or vocal past with the present in the mind of the present. Though it is widely accepted that it is history in its function of social utility and the healing of scientific curiosity and not the historian that the human society desires, it is also possible that a given society will require the services of a disciplined, cultured or expert historian than history since anything written down about the past that lay emphasis on dates and chronology is considered at the amateur level to be history. Professionalism and amateurism as used in scientific discourse is an indication that in the field of social sciences, the acquisition, interpretation and dissemination of knowledge is much more like an industries which combined skills and evolving technology. This is exactly what the contemporary frontiers of history and Anthropology is all about.

History and Anthropology in Contemporary Scholarship

The divisions and differences that kept these two disciplines apart during the last few decades have kept those who profited from this division in real confusion. This confusion is arising not only from the fact that the dividing these lines that kept them apart have been rendered faint and useless but also that; the contemporary aggressiveness curiosity of these disciplines have obliged them to be seen as one. Contemporary history and anthropology in their extending straitjackets have delved or stepped into yards not hitherto imagined. In these new jackets they have broken bounds of tradition in issues chosen for investigation, in the manner of making their analyses and explanation and even the way facts are established making it cumbersome to say with certainty whether a piece of research is purely historic or anthropogenic. In sum, history and anthropology has not got new definitions they have simply shifted their emphasis and by that virtue have refused to respect time bared traditions that kept apart. This emphasis may differ in content ,essence and form but all amount to the fact that in all the subject have taken the quest for answers to contemporary problems that concerns man as a nucleus of their existence.

It is these new impetuses that new concepts like applied anthropology, new historicism and history of the present has gained currency in popular scholarship. Conscious of its fourth dimensional pillar of time history has shifted from the field of politics, man in his distant past, war and administration to be

concerned with issues that were formerly kept at the comfort of geography research to see how historical knowledge can help or bring more light about the environment(environmental history).it goes further to investigate mans' relations either in distant or researchable past with plants and animals and how the interaction between the two can be combined to solve pressing problems surrounding human health. Indeed, the notion of objectivity and subjectivity of historical causation interpretation of data and establishment of result which formed the basis of the Jig-saw puzzle between history and other social sciences is been shifted aside by the fact that history has grown wild in the use of theories and broad based generalization to get to specific facts. This new approach does not only constitute a net progress in the domain of research but has made it in such a way that issues which were hitherto tabooed for historical investigation have been brought into the zone of investigation with impunity. New historicism and contemporary history requires that the rigour of historical investigation be maintained but that history be taught and should conduct research mostly in areas that can provide ready answer to pressing societal problems like wars, conflicts power trends, gender topography disease patterns as well as the progress already made or expected in the domain of worship and medication. This assignment is either not in essence and content different from that carried out by an applied anthropologist or simply the same .

Applied anthropology in its ofphysical, developmental and cultural tenets has taken upon itself the noble mission of suggesting solutions to the pressing human problems .It is used here on the premise that the apostles of the disciplines have taken keen interest on human problems have decided to apply its evolving knowledge on issues which were hitherto seen as fields crucially encased and thought to be the concerns of other sciences like Biology, History, chemistry a lot more. A shortlist of issues that have recently percolated into the ambit of applied anthropology will include injustice, stress, disaster, crime, medical care, conflict management, food production, eating habits as well as the support of common initiative groups towards self-surviving projects. In these brackets, contemporary scholarship anthropologists are hired like hot cake to perform these functions.

To understand broader trends of human conflicts, genocides, diseases, nutrition, leadership, power trends and institutional growth in the Grassfields contemporary History has taken a mixed approach method which pays a high premium to knowledge obtained from a broad spectrum of sciences. Indeed, celebrated studies in the Bamenda Grassfields like those of P.N.Nkwi, J.P.Warnier, M. Aletum,Cohen,Chem,Fanso,Ndi and scores of others are

products of this kind of mixed marriage in approach. Through this, the Bamenda Grassfields that was in the backyard of research has not only get a scientific attention common with the extending frontiers of these disciplines in contemporary scholarship but pertinent areas like war fare, developmental tenets, indigenous response to alien concepts and dynamics among the Nso,Kom, Balis, Bafut, Bum,Mankon, Wibum, Fulani,Wedikim and other groups of people that settled here have gained fresh and refreshing insights.

CONCLUSION

The complementarity benefits and the scientific bonding alive in the partnership between Anthropology and History either in their traditional forms or in their contemporary straitjackets can never be exhaustive in a single study. This study does not attempt to make that claim.It has simply used a few of the many available instances in the field of scholarship to show the meeting and separating junctions between these two disciplines arguing that the cars and techniques of collection, transportation and submission of data at the consumption point may be quite different but their mission is essentially the same (Birds of a Feather).By using sorted cases in the Bamenda Grassfields, this paper posits that in their contemporary confinements, these two disciplines have gone on the research offensive to encompass research areas and issues which were held to be out their scholarly reach. To our mind, such a venture is a muscular demonstration of strength because it has not only given fresh and refreshing insights about people, institutions, resources and the response pattern in the Bamenda Grassfields but also placed well trained experts of these fields in a broad plane of job opportunities. Those who wrapped up themselves in the brackets of single subject or discipline contention, painfully presenting the nudity of the other are by virtue of these new development called upon to roll their sleeves and join this interesting enterprise so that the past and the present can be threaded together into an understandable, unifying, happy and a significant whole by anthropology and history as birds of a feather.

Foot Notes

- ⁱ The list of this social sciences disciplines that share blends and shadings that are separated by a sort of a razor thin membrane can hardly be exhaustive in one study.History and Anthropology is chosen as just capital cases in point. Jean Vansina who has researched extensively on the forms and patterns of social sciences along Evan Pritchard bear testament to these kind of scientific courtship and contract marriages.

2. ⁱⁱ A keen regards at the literature existing on the present day Bamenda Grassfields seem to suggest that there is need to form a discipline which is neither purely anthropology or History in kind, form and content. A few of these will include the works of Chilver and Kaberry, West African Kingdoms in the 19th Century, P N Nkwi and JP Warnier, Elements of a History of the Western Grassfield Michael T. Aleutum, "Traditional Institutions of the Tikar"
3. ⁱⁱⁱ A good account of this intercourse between these disciplines has been elaborately presented by Victor Bong Amaaze (2002) in *Historiography and Historical Method, Bamenda: Patron Publishing House*, pp.122-28.
4. ^{iv} In the field of social science, this approach is the most valid passport required for any scientific assertion to stand the test of time. A more succinct account of the potency of cross disciplinary approach investigating matter and establishing results is presented by Sidney E. Beatrice Webb (1975) *Method of Social Study*, London: Cambridge University Press. See especially the third chapter titled "How to study Social Facts" pp.54-75.
5. ^v This is lucidly presented by Michael D Levin (1988) "Notes of the Potential Contribution of Social Anthropology to the study of History" in Monday B Abasiatai (eds) *Expanding Frontiers of African History. The Interdisciplinary Methodology*, Calabar: University of Calabar Press. Also see John Lewis (1981) *Anthropology Made Simple*, London Heinemann
6. ^{vi} V. B. *Historiography and Historical Method* (2002) p.122. This was of course a denigrating way of looking at a scientific discipline. Such worthy blamed grew on the ashes of the fact that Anthropology grew out of sociology and like any other freedom gotten by force, sociologists out of bias could only push them to the peripheral zones of research and in this case they classed the course to be concern essentially with ancient customs and practices. These ideas can also be deduced on a thorough reading of Sidney E Beatrice Webb (1975) *Methods of Social Study*. It was the works of the celebrated German born American Anthropologist named Franz Boas who fought and established a full fledged four dimensional essence and functions of Anthropology. Together with his students like Alfred Kroeber, Ruth Benedict and Margaret Mead; Anthropology grew out the Columbia University and departments of of this disciplines were formed in other university.
7. ^{vii} This represented for the most part a very naive, lame or parochial way of describing History. To them, the Historical age denotes the age when man started to document something write or wrong about his part. History according to this realm of thinking only begin when documents exist about the known or conjectured past. Anything concerning the past that does not stem from such evidences was to be considered pure and simple was bad history or no History at all. Gibbons, Voltaire, Nebuhr, Nemair, Braudel, Colling Wood and Toynbee are among the apostles of this slanted ideas.
8. ^{viii} In the mind of this paper no body seem to have done better in handling historical sources showing the logic of critical analyses and establishment of fact better than Arthur Mark (1981) in his Monumental edition titled *The Nature of History*, pp .99-110.
9. ^x John Cannon (ed) (1980) *The Historian at Work*, London: George Allen and Unwin, p.1.
10. ^{xi} Arthur Marwick, p. 13.
11. ^{xii} Original of this citation is found in Arthur Marwick *Nature of History*, p.13. He was supposedly citing Bede (1955) in his monumental account of the Church titled *A History of the English Church and its People*, edited by Leo Sherley-Price, pp.72-3.
12. ^{xiii} John Cannon, p.1.
13. ^{xiv} Through the knowledge of psychology and Sociology man has an idea on how and why some people are likely to react more aggressively or to remain passive when provoked. The behavior of the Jews throughout history can be explained and understood if their treatment during the early part of the 20th century either by the Jews or Arabs is taken into context. The behavior of the Germans in international politics throughout the 20th and 21st century is largely understood if the German concept of "Herensvolk" is placed in its square context. To add to this psychologists have been able to group human along the lines of blood groups and stimuli quotients arguing that there are different reactions and respond variability between people whom they classed into introverts and extroverts. Political scientist, anthropologists, sociologists have bought this concepts whole sale to postulate their theories while history has remained turgid. A very succinct design dealing with the usefulness of generalization in historical

studies has been done by John W. Creswell (2014) *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approaches*, London: University of Nebraska, Sage Publication Inc. See particularly, pp.51-5 and pp.77.80.

14. ^{xv}These two authors' conception of History were in the best of Words "traditional". Spangler saw the main job of a historian to be reduced to the level of cutting pieces of information from around the broad stream of knowledge and struggling like an unskilled craftsman to give it a general meaning. Writing in the first part of the 19th century Karl marks profited from the mounting search for a veritable method and field of history and made a contribution that made little sense to historians of his time and far worse to those of the contemporary era. Based in his over reliance on economic motives that formed the Nucleus of his 1848 Communist Manifesto, he asserted that economic causes once discovered can explain the whole trend of history once and for all. Though his assertion made little sense to history, it provided a working hypothesis to Charles Darwin's theory of survival of the fittest and Reverend father Malthus' concept of population growth and food production.