

Men in Groups: Anthropology and Aggression, 1965–84

by Erika Lorraine Milam*

ABSTRACT

By the late 1950s, Harry Frank Guggenheim was concerned with understanding why some charismatic leaders fought for freedom, while others sought power and domination. He believed that best-selling books on ethological approaches to animal and human behavior, especially those by playwright and screenwriter Robert Ardrey, promised a key to this dilemma, and he created a foundation that would fund research addressing problems of violence, aggression, and dominance. Under the directorship of Rutgers University professors Robin Fox and Lionel Tiger, the Harry Frank Guggenheim Foundation fostered scientific investigations into the biological basis of human nature. This essay analyzes their discussions of aggression as fundamental to the behavior of men in groups in order to elucidate the private and professional dimensions of masculine networks of US philanthropic and academic authority in the late 1960s and 1970s.

Multimillionaire Harry Frank Guggenheim read Robert Ardrey's *Territorial Imperative* in November 1967 and found it "of fascinating interest."¹ Guggenheim had long been concerned with improving "man's relation to man" but had trouble deciding how best to proceed. In 1959, together with a small cadre of close friends, he began a conversation with University of Michigan professor of psychology Paul Fitts. A few years later, Fitts assembled a group of scientists to tackle the problem at a 1964 symposium entitled "Strategies of Dominance and Social Power," which was held at Henry Ford's former home, Fair Lane, by then part of the university's Dearborn campus. For both Guggenheim and Fitts, one of the most promising lines of inquiry lay in analyzing

* Department of History, 136 Dickinson Hall, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08544-1017; emilam@princeton.edu.

I owe a huge debt to Robert A. Nye, my stalwart coeditor, for his advice and friendship and for introducing me to fabulous restaurants in cities across the country. The feedback from participants at the *Masculinities in Science/Sciences of Masculinity* workshop vastly improved an early draft, as did later readings by Michael Gordin, Sarah Milov, Karen Rader, Alex Rutherford, participants in Princeton's History of Science Program Seminar, and two anonymous reviewers. Charles Greifenstein at the American Philosophical Society and Karen Colvard at the Harry Frank Guggenheim Foundation granted me access and guidance through their collections. Thank you to the APS Library for permission to quote from their archived collections. I am additionally grateful to Robin Fox and Lionel Tiger for sharing their memories of these events and for their clemency should our interpretations differ.

¹ Robert Ardrey, *The Territorial Imperative: A Personal Inquiry into the Animal Origins of Property and Nations* (New York, 1966); Harry Frank Guggenheim (HFG) to Henry Allen Moe, 10 November 1967, Folder: Guggenheim, Harry Frank #5, Mss.B.M722, Henry Allen Moe Papers, American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia, Pa. (hereafter cited as "Moe Papers").

©2015 by The History of Science Society. All rights reserved. 0369-7827/11/2015-0004\$10.00

the origins, development, and mechanisms of dominance in order to discover ways of controlling its expression. Fitts hoped Guggenheim would fund a research center at Michigan, but Guggenheim remained skeptical of the institutional stagnation he felt would inevitably characterize any university-based center.² In the end, it didn't matter. Fitts died less than a year after the symposium at Fair Lane, mere months after Guggenheim formalized arrangements for his philanthropic foundation "to promote the development of knowledge concerning, and the application of such knowledge to the improvement of, man's relation to man for scientific and charitable purposes."³

The Harry Frank Guggenheim Foundation (HFGF) came to play a significant role in fostering research on the biological basis of human nature in the service of understanding the domination of some men by others. Guggenheim believed that in order for his new venture to succeed, it was "imperative" to "enlist the interest not only of top flight men in the field, but the right men" and to find "a first class person to head up the project."⁴ In the final years of his life, Guggenheim struck up an unlikely friendship with Ardrey, a playwright and screenwriter who in the early 1960s turned his attention to nonfiction with the wildly successful *African Genesis*, describing the evolutionary origins of humanity.⁵ Together with Konrad Lorenz and Desmond Morris, Ardrey was often characterized in the popular press as advancing a vision of man as nothing but an animal. In the United States, Lorenz may have been best known for his popular science writings—*King Solomon's Ring* and *On Aggression*—but his authority as an expert on animal behavior was girded by his position as director of the Max Planck Institute for Behavioral Physiology in Seewiesen, Germany.⁶ After Morris earned his DPhil at Oxford under Nikolaas Tinbergen, Lorenz's close scientific collaborator and friend, he moved to London to head the Granada TV and Film Unit at the Zoological Society of London (producing the popular television show *Zootime*) before accepting an appointment as curator of mammals at the Zoological Society, where he penned *The Naked Ape*, an international best seller.⁷ Unlike Lorenz and Morris, Ardrey had little training in the sciences, but he maintained a devoted readership nevertheless.⁸ Ardrey personally recommended social anthropologists Robin Fox and Lionel Tiger as candidates for directing the fellowship program at the HFGF. After Guggenheim's death and some ensuing debate among members of the board, the foundation hired them as co-research directors of the fellowship program in 1972.

As midcareer scientists fascinated by questions of aggression and human behavior, Fox and Tiger constituted a logical choice. They had published the first in a series

² HFG to "All Hands—Man's Relation to Man Project," 16 December 1968, Folder: Guggenheim, Harry Frank, Foundation #2, Moe Papers.

³ "30 March 1965, State of New York, Department of State, James E. Allen, Jr. Commissioner of Education of the State of New York," Folder: Guggenheim, Harry Frank, Foundation #1, Moe Papers.

⁴ HFG to Moe, 8 January 1964, Folder: Guggenheim, Harry Frank #2, Moe Papers.

⁵ Robert Ardrey, *African Genesis: A Personal Investigation into the Animal Origins and Nature of Man* (New York, 1961).

⁶ Konrad Lorenz, *On Aggression*, trans. Marjorie Kerr Wilson (New York, 1966). On Lorenz's public persona, see Tania Munz, "'My Goose Child Martina': The Multiple Uses of Geese in the Writings of Konrad Lorenz," *Hist. Stud. Nat. Sci.* 41 (2011): 405–46.

⁷ Desmond Morris, *The Naked Ape: A Zoologist's Study of the Human Animal* (New York, 1967). On the intellectual ecologies of this community, see Richard W. Burkhardt Jr., *Patterns of Behavior: Konrad Lorenz, Niko Tinbergen, and the Founding of Ethology* (Chicago, 2005).

⁸ Nadine Weidman, "Popularizing the Ancestry of Man: Robert Ardrey and the Killer Instinct," *Isis* 102 (2011): 269–99; Erika Lorraine Milam, "Making Males Aggressive and Females Coy: Gender across the Animal-Human Boundary," *Signs* 37 (2012): 935–59.

of collaborative efforts in 1966—"The Zoological Perspective in Social Science."⁹ Social scientists ought to pay more attention to recent advances in the biological sciences, they argued, especially those emerging from the study of animal behavior. They posited that, by understanding humans as cultural animals ("with an as yet insufficiently explored repertoire of genetically programmed behavioural predispositions"), social scientists should take seriously recent insights from ethology, paleo-anthropology, and genetics. These factors constrained the variability of human social action that typically occupied the research efforts of sociologists and anthropologists.¹⁰ They hoped the object of study in the social sciences would remain the same but become more nuanced as a result of such evolutionary reasoning. Of particular concern to Tiger was the question of homosocial association—how and why groups of men function the way they do.¹¹ Fox, for his part, had been rethinking notions of kinship in human societies. He emphasized the mother-child bond as the primary basis for understanding kinship patterns in human and nonhuman primates.¹² When we look at the collective body of their work, a sexual division of labor comes into stark relief—men hunted and women reproduced.

Throughout the 1960s and early 1970s the effects of the women's movement became visible as women entered graduate school and professional scientific careers in greater numbers.¹³ Workplaces and organizations with male homosocial networks were increasingly called into question, not only by left-leaning feminists but also by right-leaning conservatives who had, since the 1950s, been concerned with the influence of "homosexuals" in the public sphere.¹⁴ Tiger and Fox thus sought to defend the normality of homosocial association between adult men against the perceived threat of feminists and Freudians, basing their research on ostensibly universal behaviors of primates and humans. Their arguments functioned to both exclude women and safeguard a masculine preserve for the "right" men.¹⁵

⁹ Lionel Tiger and Robin Fox, "The Zoological Perspective in Social Science," *Man*, n.s., 1 (1966): 75–81. In their copublications, Tiger's name always came first. I thus refer to them as "Tiger and Fox" when discussing joint publications, and alphabetically as "Fox and Tiger" at all other times.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 76–7, 80. Critics read their arguments as biologically determinist, yet Tiger and Fox believed culture and experience acted to modify behavior, too, and would not have self-identified as "determinists." At issue were differing convictions regarding the degree of constraint. See, e.g., Ullica Segerstråle, *Defenders of the Truth: The Battle for Science in the Sociobiology Debate and Beyond* (New York, 2001), 27–8.

¹¹ Lionel Tiger, *Men in Groups* (New York, 1969). On the cultures of homosociality in the sciences, see also Alexandra Rutherford, "Maintaining Masculinity in Mid-Twentieth-Century American Psychology: Edwin Boring, Scientific Eminence, and the 'Woman Problem,'" and Nathan Ensmenger, "'Beards, Sandals, and Other Signs of Rugged Individualism': Masculine Culture within the Computing Profession," both in this volume.

¹² Robin Fox, *Kinship and Marriage: An Anthropological Perspective* (Baltimore, 1967).

¹³ Margaret W. Rossiter, "The Path to Liberation: Consciousness Raised, Legislation Enacted," in *Women Scientists in America: Before Affirmative Action, 1940–1972* (Baltimore, 1995), 361–82; and on the more recent decades, Rossiter, *Women Scientists in America: Forging a New World since 1972* (Baltimore, 2012).

¹⁴ Rosabeth Kanter, *Men and Women of the Corporation* (New York, 1977). On midcentury politics over homosexuality, see David K. Johnson, *The Lavender Scare: The Cold War Persecution of Gays and Lesbians in the Federal Government* (Chicago, 2004); Margot Canaday, *The Straight State: Sexuality and Citizenship in Twentieth-Century America* (Princeton, N.J., 2009). On the science of homosexuality, see also Nathan Ha, "Detecting and Teaching Desire: Phallometry, Freund, and Behavioral Sexology," in this volume.

¹⁵ Robert A. Nye, "Kinship, Male Bonds, and Masculinity in Comparative Perspective," *Amer. Hist. Rev.* 105 (2000): 1656–66; Nye, "Medicine and Science as Masculine 'Fields of Honor,'" *Osiris* 12 (1997): 60–79.

During their tenure as research directors at the HFGF (1972–84), Fox and Tiger weathered considerable changes in Americans' scientific search for human nature. Cultural and biological approaches to understanding "the human" increasingly diverged, dashing their hopes for a unified, more biologically based anthropology.¹⁶ A great many cultural anthropologists, for example, refused to believe that the pair's zoological framework provided any explanatory power in interpreting human actions and behaviors. Yet at the same time, the HFGF provided monetary and therefore institutional protection from these critics. Perhaps most importantly for understanding the fate of evolutionary theories of human sociality, the foundation provided a haven for research that buttressed gendered norms in the evolutionary past of humans and promoted the idea that male and female evolutionary strategies worked necessarily at odds with one another.

This essay analyzes how discussions about dominance and aggression exemplified masculine social dynamics of the 1960s and 1970s. As a mechanism for making visible the tight-knit alliances and friendships binding some men together and excluding others, I refer to the men comprising the HFGF's board of directors as they referred to each other. Standard writing convention now suggests that authors should use the full name of their subjects at the first mention and solely the last name in all subsequent references. Among its other functions, this convention avoids perpetuating outdated tendencies to refer to female scientists, politicians, and other professionals by their first names, thereby connoting a false sense of familiarity or diminution of status.¹⁷ The strength of the practice speaks to the continuing power of forms of address in mediating professional and personal relationships.¹⁸ In the first half of the article, then, I use familiar names to reflect the private social circles constructed and maintained, in part through such informal forms of address, by the men about whom I write. This is simply a matter of using actors' categories. More public conversations about Fox and Tiger's research and work at the HFGF occupy the second half of the article, and I accordingly switch to the more traditional naming convention that characterized those discussions.¹⁹

The early history of HFGF's investment in "Man's Relation to Man" provides an intimate glimpse into how these groups of men hoped to use an evolutionary perspective to transform research on human nature and how they enacted their scientific

¹⁶ On the diversity of anthropological approaches in the twentieth century, many of which incorporated alternative evolutionary perspectives, see Henrika Kuklick, ed., *A New Anthropology* (Oxford, 2008), and Susan Lindee and Ricardo Ventura Santos, eds., "The Biological Anthropology of Living Human Populations: World Histories, National Styles, and International Networks: Wenner-Gren Symposium Supplement 5," *Current Anthropology*, vol. 53, suppl. 5 (2012).

¹⁷ R. Brown and M. Ford, "Address in American English," *J. Abnormal Soc. Psychol.* 62 (1961): 375–85; D. Slobin, S. Miller, and L. Porter, "Forms of Address and Social Relations in a Business Organization," *J. Personality Soc. Psychol.* 8 (1968): 289–93.

¹⁸ Gloria Cowan and Jill Kasen, "Form of Reference: Sex Differences in Letters of Recommendation," *J. Personality Soc. Psychol.* 46 (1984): 636–45; Hilary Takiff, Diana Sanchez, and Tracie Stewart, "What's in a Name? The Status Implications of Students' Terms of Address for Male and Female Professors," *Psychol. Women Quart.* 25 (2001): 134–44. On the long-standing importance of forms of address in the sciences, see also Mario Biagioli, *Galileo, Courtier: The Practice of Science in the Culture of Absolutism* (Chicago, 1994).

¹⁹ In my interviews with both Fox (8 November 2011) and Tiger (10 November 2011), they often referred to each other by first name but used last names when discussing each other's research. At the time of writing this essay, neither had archived their correspondence. However, Tiger's papers have now been deposited at Special Collections and University Archives, Rutgers University Archives (R-MC 117).

commitments socially by establishing their own standing in the worlds of private philanthropy and academia.²⁰ It also illustrates the importance of informal masculine networks of money and authority, embodied in the leadership of the HFGF, in defining the kinds of questions scientists asked and how they answered them. Understanding these dynamics requires a careful exploration of the bonds of friendship that tied together Ardrey, Guggenheim, Fox, and Tiger.

THE PHILANTHROPIC SAVANNA

In 1848, Harry Guggenheim's grandparents moved to Philadelphia, where they started a successful mining company. Harry's father, Daniel Guggenheim, eventually took over the burgeoning family business, and Daniel and his nine siblings became fixtures in East Coast philanthropic networks, creating the Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum and Foundation in New York City, the John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation, and the Daniel and Florence Guggenheim Aviation Safety Center at Cornell University. Harry served in both world wars as a member of the Naval Aviation Forces, where he met James "Jimmy" Doolittle and Charles "Slim" Lindbergh. He was appointed US ambassador to Cuba from 1929 to 1933 and cofounded *Newsday* with Alicia Patterson (his third wife) in 1940.²¹ Jimmy and Slim were family friends and were awarded Daniel Guggenheim Medals in 1942 and 1953, respectively, honoring their "notable achievements in the advancement of aeronautics." Jimmy retired from active military service in 1959 but remained interested in aviation safety throughout his life (a concern shared by both Harry and Slim). Slim had been an associate of the Guggenheim family at least as early as the 1920s, when he toured the country promoting aviation under the sponsorship of Daniel Guggenheim. In short, Harry was a man who moved through elite New York circles, surrounded by socially and economically powerful men whose mettle, he believed, had been tested by combat and hardened by business. He intended to spend his money on practical solutions to one of the persistent dilemmas confronting all humanity.

Harry was also strong-willed, perhaps obstinate. He admitted as much when writing to his "old and valued friend" Henry Allen Moe.²² Henry was then president of the American Philosophical Society, would soon become interim chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities (until the first official chairman appointed by President Lyndon Johnson could begin his duties), and believed firmly in the importance of universities in creating an intellectually healthy nation.²³ Harry apologetically wrote to Henry, "I'm afraid I am perhaps a difficult donor, and perhaps unable to accept the role of a philanthropist who calls in experts to dispense his funds. I have been the head of three Foundations, two of which I still head, not as a philanthropist but as

²⁰ On the mutual mapping of professional and knowledge agendas in the study of human nature, see Donna Haraway, *Primate Visions: Gender, Race, and Nature in the World of Modern Science* (New York, 1989).

²¹ Under Patterson and Guggenheim, *Newsday* was a successful conservative suburban daily newspaper (Monday–Saturday) in a tabloid format; Lee Smith, "The Battle for Sunday," *New York Magazine*, 25 October 1971, 34–9.

²² HFG to Moe, 19 April 1965, Folder: Guggenheim, Harry Frank #2, Moe Papers; Guggenheim referred to Moe as his "old and valued friend" in a letter to Paul Fitts, 21 January 1964, Folder: Guggenheim, Harry Frank #3, Moe Papers.

²³ E.g., Henry Allen Moe, "The Shortage of Scientific Personnel," *Science* 105 (1947): 195–8, and Moe, "The Power of Freedom," *Amer. Assoc. Univ. Professors* 37 (1951): 462–75.

the directing spirit, with some expertise, dispensing funds of others.” He wondered whether, due to this experience, he found it “hard to turn over these funds to professionals and say, ‘I want to improve man’s relation to man; here are X dollars; now get to work.’” Expressing a sentiment he came to repeat often in his correspondence with friends, Harry added, “In the six years that I have been attempting to make some progress on this project I have found that the only suggestions . . . in what I consider a practicable manner were not suggested by professionals, but were the intuitive suggestions of laymen.”²⁴ Practicality, or common sense, was a quality Harry deemed especially lacking in social scientists.

Harry and his associates expected the HFGF would award about six fellowships a year of between \$5,000 and \$9,000 each (in 2015 terms, between \$37,000 and \$68,000). Awardees were to be granted a great deal of leeway with their research projects under the assumption that as vetted men of quality they would produce top-notch results. Henry (chairman), Fitts, and G. Edward “Ed” Pendray formed the initial fellowship committee, but they hoped additionally to find a part-time director for the fellowship program.²⁵ Ed was another long-term associate of the Guggenheim family, having helped develop the Guggenheim Jet Propulsion Laboratory at the California Institute of Technology, among other such ventures. In the wake of Fitts’s death, the nascent foundation floundered, waiting for someone to assume responsibility for the entire project or (at least) the fellowship program—part-time initially, but full-time later if they and the project were to “take-fire.”²⁶

In the spring of 1966, Harry wrote to his confidant Slim Lindbergh that throughout history men had abused their political power. “In pursuit of that primary urge to dominate their fellow man,” he suggested, “they have decimated him and caused incalculable destruction to the accumulated works of beauty and utility that man has created.” Harry further noted that in the 1960s the world still contained several of these men, who needed to be controlled lest they “continue to cause holocausts of destruction.”²⁷ Slim believed that the quickest, most effective, and reasonable strategy for improving man’s relationship to man would be to ameliorate the conditions of human life—especially through the conservation of natural resources.²⁸ To this Harry replied that the fundamental issue he wished to address was located not in the environment but in the “qualities in man.” He asked Slim, “How can we determine the cause of this destructive rather than constructive competitive quality in man? How can we educate him so that we may divert these energies to competition that is good rather than evil?”²⁹ In the face of Harry’s queries, Slim remained firm: “It seems to me there is good domination, and bad domination (possibly ‘leadership’ would be a better term to work with), and all kinds of forms in between. Again, ‘good’ and ‘bad’ vary with frameworks of reference.” He staunchly continued, “I think that men who

²⁴ HFG to Moe, 19 April 1965, Folder: Guggenheim, Harry Frank #2, Moe Papers.

²⁵ Pendray also wrote popular books (including several science fiction novels under the pseudonym Gawain Edwards) and received a John Simon Guggenheim Fellowship in 1964.

²⁶ G. Edward Pendray, “Summary of Progress, Man’s Relation to Man Project,” 15 April 1961 to 1 August 1965, Folder: Guggenheim, Harry Frank Foundation: Lindbergh, Charles A., Moe Papers.

²⁷ HFG to General Charles A. Lindbergh, 10 May 1966, Folder: Guggenheim, Harry Frank, Foundation: Lindbergh, Charles A., Moe Papers.

²⁸ Lindbergh to HFG, 26 April 1966, Folder: Guggenheim, Harry Frank, Foundation: Lindbergh, Charles A., Moe Papers.

²⁹ HFG to Lindbergh, 10 May 1966, Folder: Guggenheim, Harry Frank, Foundation: Lindbergh, Charles A., Moe Papers.

gain great ability to dominate and exert power intertwine with their environment, in addition to being affected by hereditary characteristics. I don't believe you can separate them from institutions of their times any more than you can separate heredity and environment."³⁰ Harry again responded without addressing Slim's point. Their dialogue, he wrote, helped him "think through the answer to a most difficult question: 'Is there a basic quality in man that can be isolated which is the cause of strife with his fellow man?'"³¹

The following year, when Harry picked up *Territorial Imperative*, he was looking for a new perspective as well as a new man to spearhead research on "man's relation to man" with the full financial backing of his foundation. He wrote Henry, brimming with enthusiasm for the *Territorial Imperative*.³² Henry suggested that Harry was bound to find Desmond Morris's recently released *The Naked Ape* equally worthwhile. (In fact, Harry later reported, he found it "extraordinary."³³) The previous year, Henry had also recommended Lorenz's *On Aggression*, which Harry had consumed with equal vigor. Harry even published an editorial in *Newsday*—entitled "The Mark of Cain"—in which he called his readers' attention to the need to understand "the nature of the beast within man" and lavished praise on both Ardrey and Lorenz for their efforts to uncover man's instinctive aggression.³⁴ Lorenz's conception of "aggression" as key to human nature, and fundamental to our virtuous qualities (leadership and kindness) as well as our violent tendencies (dictatorship and murder), fit neatly within Harry's vision of human social relations. Harry thought these books so useful to his incipient foundation that he sent copies to his board.³⁵ A remarkable exchange of letters then ensued between Harry, Henry, Jimmy, Slim, and Ed, discussing the merits of a biological perspective on aggression, including the male drive to defend territory and compete with other males for social status.³⁶ Harry habitually excerpted and distributed letters among members of the group.³⁷ A letter to him thus often functioned as a letter to all.

Ardrey, impressed by the "Mark of Cain" editorial in *Newsday*, wrote to introduce himself to Mr. Guggenheim, and they began a lively correspondence. Rather than pessimistically predicting man's inevitable doom, however, Ardrey closed on a positive note: "I believe that when one regards oneself as a risen ape, the future becomes illimitable. When one regards oneself as a fallen angel, one has no future at all. What

³⁰ Lindbergh to HFG, 29 May 1966, Folder: Guggenheim, Harry Frank, Foundation #27, Moe Papers.

³¹ HFG to Lindbergh, 1 June 1966, Folder: Guggenheim, Harry Frank, Foundation #27, Moe Papers.

³² HFG to Moe, 10 November 1967, Folder: Guggenheim, Harry Frank #5, Moe Papers.

³³ HFG to Moe, 19 December 1967, Folder: Guggenheim, Harry Frank #5, Moe Papers.

³⁴ [Harry F. Guggenheim], "The Mark of Cain," *Newsday*, 25 September 1967, 33.

³⁵ HFG to Doolittle, 6 July 1966, Folder: Guggenheim, Harry Frank #6; HFG to Moe, 10 November 1967, Folder: Guggenheim, Harry Frank #5; HFG to Moe, 19 December 1967, Folder: Guggenheim, Harry Frank #5, Moe Papers. Based on this correspondence, it appears likely that Guggenheim had not yet finished *Territorial Imperative* at the time he penned his editorial.

³⁶ Recent scholarship draws our attention to the social and material natures of letter writing, the complex etiquette dictating the relationships between public and private correspondence, and the hierarchies of credibility that define membership in epistolary communities. See, e.g., James How, *Epistolary Spaces: English Letter-Writing from the Foundation of the Post Office to Richardson's "Clarissa"* (Aldershot, 1988); Anthony Grafton, "The Humanist as Reader," in *A History of Reading in the West*, ed. Guglielmo Cavallo and Roger Chartier (Amherst, Mass., 1999), 179–212; Lorraine Daston, "Sciences of the Archive," *Osiris* 27 (2012): 156–87.

³⁷ Most of the letters I discuss are thus preserved in a single archive—Henry Allen Moe's papers at the American Philosophical Society. Guggenheim carefully distinguished between private news and professional discussions, and his secretary reproduced only those sections of letters that directly addressed the question of "man's relation to man."

man needs in our time, above all else is an elation. I think that's what my ethologist friends are finding."³⁸ Here, it seemed, was the expert guidance for which Harry had been looking. He replied to Mr. Ardrey, informing him of his foundation and asking him to contribute an article to *Newsday* as part of a series on "The Condition of the American Spirit."³⁹ Ardrey responded immediately, taking the opportunity to cultivate a potential patron, and cleverly made his intellectual project about Guggenheim's: "With admirable intuition you as long ago as 1963 grasped the problem of dominance as central to the human predicament, and I have outlined the program of my work to demonstrate that I too regard it as central."⁴⁰ Yet by dating Guggenheim's interest to 1963, Ardrey also established his own priority, as *African Genesis* had been published two years earlier. Ardrey followed his compliment with a request—would Guggenheim be so kind as to send him a copy of the bibliography on dominance that Fitts had prepared after the conference?

In *African Genesis*, Ardrey had expounded paleoanthropologist Raymond Dart's idea that man was born evolutionarily when he picked up a bone or piece of rock and realized its power as a weapon. Through the group hunt, he posited, came greater quantities of meat in our diet, an enlarged brain, and cooperative hunting. Man had not fathered the weapon; "the weapon, instead, had fathered man."⁴¹ Five years later, he stood by this argument. While preparing to write the *Territorial Imperative*, Ardrey returned to Africa, where he also came to believe that males fight for status and females mate with whichever male happens to be occupying the best territory, using antelope as his example. "The female wants her affection," Ardrey noted, "but she wants it at a good address. Whether or not our human sensibilities are offended or intrigued, it is a harsh truth that the doe is attracted and excited by the qualities of the property, not the qualities of the proprietor."⁴² Although he refrained from invoking explicit parallels to human courtship, the implications hung heavily in the air. Absent was any mention of male-female affection or family structure as the basis of social order.

Even though reality rarely lived up to the iconic tropes of the 1950s, Ardrey's reframing of social structure in terms of male-male interactions represented a substantial break with traditional norms of familial masculinity. Such rhetoric, with its core American values depicted in the nuclear families of June and Ward Cleaver (*Leave It to Beaver*) or Ozzie and Harriet Nelson (*The Adventures of Ozzie and Harriet*), had emphasized the importance of reproduction to the country's democratic future.⁴³

Ardrey found inspiration for part of his vision of social behavior in the work of ecologist Vero Copner Wynne-Edwards.⁴⁴ Wynne-Edwards argued that birds and other

³⁸ Ardrey to HFG, 18 October 1967, Folder: Guggenheim, Harry Frank #5, Moe Papers.

³⁹ HFG to Ardrey, 30 and 31 October 1967, Folder: Guggenheim, Harry Frank #5, Moe Papers.

⁴⁰ Ardrey to HFG, 4 November 1967, Folder: Guggenheim, Harry Frank #5, Moe Papers.

⁴¹ Ardrey, *African Genesis* (cit. n. 5), 29.

⁴² Ardrey, *Territorial Imperative* (cit. n. 1), 45–8.

⁴³ Elaine Tyler May, *Homeward Bound: American Families in the Cold War Era* (New York, 1988); Stephanie Coontz, *The Way We Never Were: American Families and the Nostalgia Trap* (New York, 1992); Joanne Meyerowitz, ed., *Not June Cleaver: Women and Gender in Postwar America, 1945–1960* (Philadelphia, 1994); Wendy Kline, *Building a Better Race: Gender, Sexuality, and Eugenics from the Turn of the Century to the Baby Boom* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 2001); James Gilbert, *Men in the Middle: Searching for Masculinity in the 1950s* (Chicago, 2005); Alexandra Stern, *Eugenic Nation: Faults and Frontiers of Better Breeding in Modern America* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 2005).

⁴⁴ Wynne-Edwards's suggestion that animal species acted to limit their own population growth for the good of the species would eventually land him in intellectual hot water; Mark Borello, *Evolutionary Restraints: The Contentious History of Group Selection* (Chicago, 2010).

animals rarely caused each other lasting physical harm during their contests for superiority. “Instead,” he suggested, “they merely threaten with aggressive postures, vigorous singing or displays of plumage. The forms of intimidation of rivals by birds range all the way from the naked display of weapons to the triumph of splendor revealed in the peacock’s train.”⁴⁵ Humans, on the other hand, had lost the knack for ritualized combat and too often succumbed to real killing. Yet based on his firm belief that much social behavior was indeed ritualized, even in humans, Wynne-Edwards defined societies as “brotherhood[s] tempered by rivalry,” expressed through ritualized combat so as to preserve the longevity of the population.⁴⁶ Ardrey made use of Wynne-Edwards’s twinned concepts of brotherhood and rivalry in his explanation of *noyaus*, societies whose members cohered thanks only to shared suspicion of a common enemy.

Ardrey also followed the lead of ethologists when he dismissed the idea that male courtship was female directed in favor of arguing that males competed with each other over territories through ritualized behavior.⁴⁷ He submitted to his readers that the true objects of a male’s thoughts during the mating season were other males—his performance mattered “in the eyes of his fellows”—and thereby discounted Charles Darwin’s theory that male courtship display functioned to attract the attention of females. Ardrey fretted that he was leaving himself open to accusations of universalizing a homosocial and potentially homosexual tendency, a position he quickly disavowed.⁴⁸ He need not have worried. The idea that males were preoccupied with gaining the respect of other males became one of the oft-cited conclusions of his work.

Harry found these ideas enthralling. Still, before responding, he decided he should vet Ardrey with his trusted friends and so telephoned Henry. As Harry later recounted, he was delighted to discover that Ardrey was “an old [John Simon] Guggenheim Fellow and so an old friend” of Henry’s.⁴⁹ Henry later passed along a copy of an article about Ardrey’s experience in the theater industry to help acquaint Harry with Ardrey’s primary career in the arts.⁵⁰ In his reply to Ardrey, Harry promised to dig out a copy of Fitts’s bibliography but remarked, “the bibliography is going to be a disappointment to you as it was to me. It consists mainly of references to power in industry.” He also forwarded copies of his complete correspondence with Ardrey to Henry and Slim—

⁴⁵ V. C. Wynne-Edwards, “Population Control in Animals,” *Sci. Amer.*, August 1964, 68–74, on 71. Ethologists had long believed that male animals engaged in “ritualized” fights rather than killing each other; see, e.g., A. David Blest, “The Concept of ‘Ritualisation,’” in *Current Problems in Animal Behaviour*, ed. W. H. Thorpe and O. L. Zangwill (Cambridge, 1961), 102–24; Julian S. Huxley, “A Discussion on Ritualization of Behaviour in Animals and Man,” *Phil. Trans. Royal Soc. London Ser. B* 251 (1966): 249–71.

⁴⁶ Wynne-Edwards, “Population Control in Animals” (cit. n. 45), 71.

⁴⁷ Ardrey, *Territorial Imperative* (cit. n. 1), 55.

⁴⁸ At the time, occasional hostile accusations circulated that manly characters, such as Batman and Robin, the men of *Bonanza*, and even James Bond (due to his utilitarian engagements with women), reflected a growing homosexual tendency in American culture: Carol L. Tilley, “Seducing the Innocent: Frederic Wertham and the Falsifications That Helped Condemn Comics,” *Inform. & Cult.* 47 (2012): 383–413; Wendall Hall, “The Fag-Jag on the Boob-Tube,” *Fact* 4 (1967): 16–23.

⁴⁹ HFG to Ardrey, 7 November 1967, Folder: Guggenheim, Harry Frank #5, Moe Papers. Ardrey received a fellowship from the John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation in 1937 for “Creative Arts—Drama & Performance Art.”

⁵⁰ Moe to HFG, 8 January 1968, Folder: Guggenheim, Harry Frank #5, Moe Papers; Robert Ardrey, “Reflections on the Theatre,” *Amer. Sch.*, 4 December 1967, 111–20.

writing that he anticipated “this contact with Mr. Ardrey opens up a new vista in our Man’s Relation to Man Project” and asking for their thoughts and reactions.⁵¹

Ed Pendray wrote back first and most critically. If Ardrey were correct, which Ed doubted, his arguments seemed to call into question the utility of proceeding with the man’s relation to man project. “If human behavior is basically instinct, what can ever be done (short of a long period of evolution) to modify or improve it?” Ed continued, “I still believe profoundly in the modifiability of human behavior, based on knowledge, understanding, social pressures and education. How else can we account for all the varieties of cultures already to be found in the world?”⁵² Harry defended Ardrey, insisting that his studies “confirm my thesis that dominance is a basic instinct of man. Man’s actions are governed by the sum of his inheritance and environmental characteristics.” By changing the crucial environment for powerful men, then, he hoped “we can influence man by directing his instinct to dominate for the progress of rather than for the depravity of mankind. In the former case we had Christ, in the latter a Hitler.”⁵³ Harry’s response is remarkable for any number of reasons, not least that he appears to have internalized Slim’s earlier arguments along these lines. This assertion, of the malleability of man in the face of his inherited instincts, would prove to be a sticking point among several of the inner group (as it was for many social scientists).⁵⁴

While waiting for his other friends to respond, Mr. Guggenheim and Mr. Ardrey, now Harry and Bob, grew closer. The next time he wrote, Bob addressed Ed’s criticisms (which Harry had forwarded to him along with his own response). Bob reported enthusiastically, “You couldn’t have given a better answer. . . . What we now know about dominance is that in the males of all species it’s an instinct. The drive is there, born in, and cannot be obliterated as it cannot be ignored. But the goals are adjustable.”⁵⁵ Bob argued that, therefore, by “denying” the innate drive to dominance in all men, “we lose control over the goals.” Headway on the problem of man’s relation to man could be made only by accepting man’s base nature. Ever the careful correspondent, however, Bob had no wish to ostracize Ed (perhaps recognizing by now that his letter would surely find its way into Ed’s hands), so he added that he “retain[ed] a considerable sympathy for Mr. Pendray’s question,” even if it “rests on the false concept of instinct that we’ve been taught and is forced on us by every Ashley Montagu in the hope that we’ll deny it exists.”⁵⁶ Bob said that given the novelty of his ideas, he understood the resistance to his books. He then discounted the work of continental ethologists (including Lorenz and Tinbergen, on whose research he had based much of *The Territorial Imperative*), cryptically noting that “their attitudes towards

⁵¹ HFG to Moe, 10 November 1967, Folder: Guggenheim, Harry Frank #5, Moe Papers; see also Charles R. Lindbergh to HFG, 24 April 1968, Folder: Guggenheim, Harry Frank, Foundation #13, Moe Papers.

⁵² G. Edward Pendray to HFG, 10 January 1968, Folder: Guggenheim, Harry Frank #5, Moe Papers.

⁵³ HFG to Pendray, 8 January 1968, Folder: Guggenheim, Harry Frank #5, Moe Papers. Lindbergh’s comments should be understood in the context of his deep sympathy with the American eugenics movement. See, e.g., Andrés Horacio Reggiani, “Charles Lindbergh and the Institute of Man,” in *God’s Eugenicist: Alexis Carrel and the Sociobiology of Decline* (New York, 2007), 85–102.

⁵⁴ E.g., M. F. Ashley Montagu, ed., *Culture: Man’s Adaptive Dimension* (Oxford, 1968).

⁵⁵ Ardrey to HFG, 17 January 1968, Folder: Guggenheim, Harry Frank, Foundation: Ardrey, Robert, Moe Papers.

⁵⁶ As a cultural anthropologist, Montagu publicly dismissed Ardrey’s arguments but until the later 1960s remained sympathetic to the man. See M. F. Ashley Montagu, ed., *Man and Aggression* (New York, 1968); Montagu, *The Nature of Human Aggression* (New York, 1976).

instinct were formed at the cellular level . . . a level at which nothing so far has proved demonstrable.” Again, Bob hewed closely to Harry’s stated position: “what you wrote is utterly correct. A genetically determined behavior pattern is a cup of determined shape. What rain falls into that cup God and man must decide. But something will fall, and something will be retained. So one d[e]termines the difference between a Christ and a Hitler.” Bob was now a trusted friend, and Harry circulated his letter at once, not for approval but for information.

Harry also arranged a “stag dinner (business clothes)” at his five-story New York City town house.⁵⁷ For posterity and the HFGF records, Ed kept minutes of the occasion.⁵⁸ Henry attended, as did other New York notables, including Roger Straus (Harry’s cousin and later cofounder of publishing house Farrar, Straus and Giroux), Peter Lawson-Johnston (heir to the Guggenheim Brothers business), and Dr. Malachi Fitzmaurice-Martin (a Catholic priest and recent recipient of a grant from the Harry Frank Guggenheim Foundation)—Slim and Jimmy regretfully declined. Bob took the opportunity to reinforce his allegiance to Harry and to advance his own cause by arguing that his volumes, together with those of Lorenz and Morris, were the only “worth-while books” about human aggression and dominance. When asked who might be appropriate to direct the man’s relation to man project, he requested more time to think but also suggested “the most important possibility to be Dr. Robin Fox, Chairman of the Department of Anthropology at Rutgers University.”⁵⁹ All told, the dinner seemed to go quite well.

The next friend to respond to Harry’s query about Bob’s ideas was Slim Lindbergh. Although he began his letter by stating that he largely concurred with Harry’s positive assessment, his final opinion turned out to be more complicated. “I could not be in more agreement with Ardrey’s statement that ‘To me, the nightmare is the denial of instinct, the denigration of competition—’ (I think the essential value of competition is deplorably lacking in the marvelous philosophy of Jesus, at least as it has been handed to us).”⁶⁰ Yet he shared Ed’s doubts about applying this philosophy to the foundation. “When we relate dominance to competition, it seems to me we are relating a fragment to a whole, and I cannot believe this is the best way to approach improving man’s relation to man.” As he had become both older and more experienced, Slim continued, he also became “more aware of the limitations of man’s sciences.” The difficulties facing the task ahead of them were tremendous and long-standing. “How do we clarify the issues of war in Viet Nam, of riots in our cities, of our cold-war with Russia?” In sum, he closed, “man’s relationship to man expands into the miracle, and here the tools of science are inadequate.” The sheer magnitude of these problems belied any easy answer, even Bob’s.

When Jimmy Doolittle chimed in, he pragmatically noted the different time scales required to address the problem of man’s relation to man with various methods.⁶¹ The

⁵⁷ Memo to Dr. Moe, 13 March 1968, Folder: Guggenheim, Harry Frank, Foundation #15, Moe Papers.

⁵⁸ Edward Pendray, “Summary of Meeting: The Man’s Relation to Man Project,” 19 March 1968, Folder: Guggenheim, Harry Frank, Foundation, 1968 #41, Moe Papers.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.* No one considered Bob a contender: he lived happily in Rome, possessed no administrative experience, and lacked a PhD.

⁶⁰ General Charles R. Lindbergh to HFG, 24 April 1968 [copied/sent to Moe: May 13, 1968], Folder: Guggenheim, Harry Frank, Foundation #13, Moe Papers.

⁶¹ Doolittle to HFG, 24 October 1968, Folder: Guggenheim, Harry Frank, Foundation #14, Moe Papers.

most permanent solution operated on the longest time frame. “There is little question but that improving mankind through evolution will take a very long time indeed; measured in many millennia, or perhaps even millions of years,” he wrote. “The ability to successfully change the genes—cut the meanness out and put kindness in—may come in tens or hundreds of years.” In the interim, “social pressures cannot change man’s instincts but may well serve to suppress the baser of them. With proper planning and implementation this effect might well occur in the relatively short time left to you and me.” Like Ed, Jimmy advocated strategies that would allow a rapid change in human actions, and that meant concentrating the foundation’s resources on immediately controllable elements of the human social environment.

Henry Moe took an even more direct approach by presenting his own candidate for directorship—Glenn A. Olds. At first glance, Olds was an odd choice. As a faculty member at Yale, he had taught philosophy, ethics, logic, and religion and, as an ordained Methodist minister, had directed Cornell’s United Religious Work. Yet he possessed all the qualities of manly leadership Henry valued. Olds had served as president of Springfield College in Massachusetts and had been a professional boxer during his college years. In 1968, he was executive dean of the State University of New York and was widely appreciated in academic circles as a forward-thinking and energetic man. Olds was nothing if not an administrator and humanist, cast from a similar mold as Henry himself. Henry urged Harry to consider him a serious candidate, despite Bob’s standing recommendations.⁶²

Although members of Harry’s inner circle seemed inclined to trust the fate of humanity to evolution in the long run, and genetics in the slightly less distant future, research into the social and cultural causes of violence struck them as entirely more practicable in the short term. Against this background of skepticism, Bob continued corresponding with Harry and Henry, and two names recur in his letters as suggestions for the post of research director.⁶³ “This pair with the improbable names,” as Bob dubbed Fox and Tiger, intended to “establish an anthropological redoubt against orthodoxy.” From Harry’s perspective on the general inutility of most social scientists, that made them only more attractive as candidates.

When Harry replied, however, it was from the hospital, one of many visits to battle the cancer that was already eating away at his body.⁶⁴ By the time he passed away two years later, in January 1971, no decisions had been made as to the fate of his foundation. Yet Harry Frank Guggenheim’s legacy lived on because of the board’s desire to honor his intentions, even if they disagreed with them. Survival in the philanthropic savanna required an intuitive sense of the dominance hierarchies governing the social interactions of these men. Bob, although a relative newcomer to the group, quickly figured out an appropriate rubric for maintaining a friendship with a powerful man like Harry—a well-balanced combination of maverick bravado and studied deference.⁶⁵

⁶² Moe to HFG, 12 November 1968, Folder: Guggenheim, Harry Frank, Foundation: Ardrey, Robert, Moe Papers.

⁶³ Ardrey to Moe, 24 April 1968, Folder: Guggenheim, Harry Frank, Foundation: Ardrey, Robert, Moe Papers.

⁶⁴ HFG to Ardrey, 17 January 1969, Folder: Guggenheim, Harry Frank, Foundation #2, Moe Papers.

⁶⁵ The character of Ardrey’s letters varied widely by correspondent. With men he identified as kindred spirits, like Clarence Ray Carpenter and Kenneth Oakley, Ardrey tended to write in more personal terms. In his letters to Farley Mowat, I would describe his phrasing as positively earthy. See Series I, Professional Correspondence, MC 190, Robert Ardrey Papers, 1955–1980, Special Collections and University Archives, Rutgers University Libraries, New Brunswick, N.J.

THE ACADEMIC JUNGLE

Fox and Tiger met in London in 1965. According to Fox, they started talking after one of Desmond Morris's seminars at the London Zoo—in front of the gibbon cages they discussed human and animal instincts and the importance of male bonding and competition in controlling human social relations. (Tiger insists there were no gibbons.) Fox “was taken immediately by this funny, smart, talkative, small but confident son of the Montreal ghetto,” and they bonded “fiercely.”⁶⁶ When Fox founded the Department of Anthropology at Rutgers, he hired Tiger, and there they made quite a pair.⁶⁷ Fox was lanky, charming, British, and chose to settle in the farmlands of rural New Jersey, in a house outside of Princeton. Tiger was shorter and steelier, preferring the urban sophistication of New York City. They commuted to Rutgers from different directions, literally and figuratively.

Fox and Tiger acquired their fascination with evolution from different sources. Fox's attention was caught by John Bowlby's Darwinian take on psychoanalytic theory and Michael Chance's research on the social behavior of monkeys.⁶⁸ Tiger had been reading Morris, ethologist John Crook, and primatologist John Napier, all of whom circulated through London.⁶⁹ When importing this evolutionary perspective into the social sciences, Tiger and Fox made two subsidiary scholarly arguments that are worth particular note in the context of their incipient directorship of the HFGF. First, both made academic names for themselves in the late 1960s and early 1970s by suggesting that human societies should be studied as a function of two distinct kinds of social relationships shared by all primates—the friendships uniting males and the parental love between females and their offspring. These bonds seemed to require, at least for Tiger, a sexual division of labor that worked against the claims of feminists.⁷⁰ In biological terms, male-male bonding had been crucial in driving the intellectual evolution of humanity, while female-child bonding had perpetuated the species. Fox additionally reasoned that, as a result, female-male bonding was incidental to the overall social stability of the population.⁷¹ Both located the origins of the imbalance between male and female contributions to human evolution in the development of early human hunting practices.⁷² Because of hunting in groups, men exhibited higher levels of testosterone and competitive behavior, making them ideally suited to life in

⁶⁶ Robin Fox, *Participant Observer: Memoir of a Transatlantic Life* (New Brunswick, N.J., 2004), 329–30; see also Alex Walter, “An Interview with Robin Fox,” *Curr. Anthropol.* 34 (1993): 441–52. Fox's autobiography is narrated in the third person.

⁶⁷ Fox submitted his thesis in anthropology to the University of London and was awarded a PhD in 1965. Before moving to New Jersey in 1967, he lectured at the London School of Economics (LSE). Tiger earned his PhD in 1962 at LSE for a thesis in sociology and taught at the University of British Columbia for several years before joining Fox's new department of anthropology in 1969.

⁶⁸ Robert G. W. Kirk, “Between the Clinic and the Laboratory: Ethology and Pharmacology in the Work of Michael Robin Alexander Chance, c. 1946–1964,” *Med. Hist.* 53 (2009): 513–36; Marga Vicedo, “The Social Nature of the Mother's Tie to Her Child: John Bowlby's Theory of Attachment in Post-War America,” *Brit. J. Hist. Sci.* 44 (2011): 401–26.

⁶⁹ E.g., John Napier and N. A. Barnicot, eds., *The Primates*, Symposia of the Zoological Society of London, no. 10 (London, 1963); and O. G. Edholm, ed., *The Biology of Survival*, Symposia of the Zoological Society of London, no. 13 (London, 1964).

⁷⁰ Lionel Tiger, “Male Dominance? Yes, Alas. A Sexist Plot? No.” *New York Times*, 25 October 1970, SM18.

⁷¹ Robin Fox, “The Evolution of Sexual Behavior,” *New York Times*, 24 March 1968, SM32.

⁷² Contemporaneous academically oriented collections advanced a similar fascination with the idea; Richard B. Lee and Irvén DeVore, eds., *Man the Hunter* (Chicago, 1968).

the corporate jungle.⁷³ Tiger argued that feminists, by ignoring these scientific facts, rendered their vision of social equality frustratingly difficult to achieve.⁷⁴ Second, Tiger and Fox worked self-consciously to replace a Freudian psychological conception of homosociality—which they associated with a juvenile phase of development or with homosexual tendencies—with a biological understanding of homosocial association as fully adult and normal for all men. Ardrey (who had similarly attacked Freudian psychology as so much nonsense in *Territorial Imperative*) enthusiastically agreed.⁷⁵ In his review of *Men in Groups*, he argued, “Men want, need, and must have the opportunity of exclusive association. And the all-male group, bonded by long familiarity, furnishes society with its spine.”⁷⁶

The sympathy and mutual regard worked both ways. In an interview, Tiger attributed his initial interest in biology and paleoanthropology to picking up *African Genesis*. “Sometimes a book makes a difference,” he said. “I thought to myself, this, this is something.”⁷⁷ They, too, struck up a correspondence, finally meeting in London when Ardrey invited him to dinner at the Savoy. Conversation naturally turned to animal behavior. Fox first encountered Ardrey through a chance recommendation from his cousin, who called *African Genesis* “quite dramatic” and “all about” Fox’s “latest enthusiasms for Zoology and early man.”⁷⁸ When he read it, he was impressed by the “remarkable” book’s basic argument, that (in his words) “society was older than man; we did not invent it, we inherited it. This animal heritage could only be understood by putting together the knowledge of animal society (territory, mating, dominance etc) with the knowledge of primate and human evolution.”⁷⁹ Fox finally met Ardrey while in Bristol for a televised joint interview and found him “instantly likeable in his non-nonsense, tell-it-like-it-is fashion. . . . He had an easy manner and a witty delivery, with a wicked line in sarcasm.”⁸⁰ Fox noted, “he was immediately Bob.”

Fox wrote his first book, *Kinship and Marriage*, for use in university courses, and it received little popular attention.⁸¹ His next book was an introduction to anthropology designed to appeal to the elusive “general public” and consisted in large part of republished essays adapted, translated when necessary, and compiled for the book.⁸² The last of these was “The Cultural Animal.”⁸³ In it, Fox maintained that culture and nature were inextricably intertwined—just as early humans produced culture, it in turn produced us. But culture, in his vision, could never be expanded to the infinite possibilities of habits and traditions that we might intellectually conceive. All humans possessed “the *capacity* for culture,” he continued, but were simultaneously bound by

⁷³ Tiger, “Male Dominance?” (cit. n. 70).

⁷⁴ Lionel Tiger and Joseph Shepher, *Women in the Kibbutz* (New York, 1975).

⁷⁵ Tiger, Fox, and Ardrey attacked a caricature of psychological theory in the 1960s; for a more nuanced vision of the field, see Jonathan Metzl, *Prozac on the Couch: Prescribing Gender in the Era of Wonder Drugs* (Durham, N.C., 2003).

⁷⁶ Robert Ardrey, “A Tiger about to Stir up a Mare’s Nest,” review of *Men in Groups*, by Lionel Tiger, *Life* 66 (20 June 1969): 11.

⁷⁷ Lionel Tiger, interview by Erika Lorraine Milam, 10 November 2011, New York City.

⁷⁸ Fox, *Participant Observer* (cit. n. 66), 321.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, 324.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 349.

⁸¹ Rodney Needham, “[Review of] *Kinship and Marriage*,” *Man* 3 (1968): 324–5; Eugene A. Hamel, “[Review of] *Kinship and Marriage*,” *Amer. Anthropol.* 70 (1968): 972–3.

⁸² Robin Fox, *Encounter with Anthropology* (New York, 1973).

⁸³ Fox’s “The Cultural Animal” was previously published in the journal *Social Science Information* (9 [1970]: 7–25).

“the *forms* of culture, the universal grammar of language and behavior.”⁸⁴ Here Fox invoked Noam Chomsky’s differentiation between highly variable “surface grammar” and the “deep structures” underlying all human languages as analogous to the relationship between biologically irrelevant cultural variation (shelters built from, e.g., wood, stone, or snow) and the existence of (for example) “laws about property, rules about incest and marriage, customs of taboo and avoidance, [and] methods of settling disputes with a minimum of bloodshed” found in all human cultures.⁸⁵ In his own work on human kinship patterns, Fox asserted that all social systems performed two basic functions—they defined kinship (Fox termed this “descent”) and demarcated eligible mates (“alliance”). In doing so, they established traditions ensuring that members of the same kinship group would not mate, thereby preventing inbreeding without the need for a psychologically imposed “incest taboo.”⁸⁶

Fox’s larger point was that evolution acted to modify human behavior, just as it had altered our anatomy.⁸⁷ A couple of years earlier, Fox wrote an article for the *New York Times* that began with the same sentiment but quickly expanded to a consideration of the evolution of differences in male and female sexual behavior.⁸⁸ Some of his lessons echoed those of Ardrey: males competed with each other for control of reproductively available females, and females fought for status within the social hierarchy to ensure the survival and health of their offspring. To succeed evolutionarily, he theorized, males had to be smart, able to defer gratification (sexual or otherwise), socially graceful and cooperative (with larger, more important males), and acceptable to females. Most important, a male “must also be tough and aggressive in order to assert his rights” within the hierarchy. Control over his emotions turned into the capacity to use tools, wield weapons, and ultimately shape his environment. Other qualities might contribute to a female’s status, some of which they shared with dominant males, Fox added, “with the exception, perhaps, of bitchiness and bossiness.”⁸⁹ He further observed that although harems might appear to be out of vogue in Western culture, making it difficult to gauge male status according to the number of women they oversaw, a “big man” in the office may have several women at his beck and call: “one wife, two full-time secretaries, 20 typists, and a girl who comes in to do his manicuring.” Here was evidence of women as status symbols and some reassurance that “monogamous nuclear families” were merely cultural fictions, perpetuated by (among others) the *Saturday Evening Post*.

Fox attributed the most carefully elaborated example of a deep cultural structure to Tiger’s research: “Whatever the overt cultural differences in male-group behavior . . . in society after society one thing stands out: men form themselves into associations from which they exclude women.”⁹⁰ Tiger, for his part, hoped his *Men in Groups*, published in 1969, would reach a wide audience. He succeeded, receiving two reviews and

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, 21.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, 15; Noam Chomsky, *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax* (Cambridge, Mass., 1965); Chomsky, *Syntactic Structures* (1957; repr., The Hague, 1965).

⁸⁶ Robin Fox, “Primate Kinship and Human Kinship,” in *Biosocial Anthropology* (New York, 1975), 9–35; Fox, “Alliance and Constraint: Sexual Selection in the Evolution of Human Kinship Systems,” in *Sexual Selection and Descent of Man*, ed. Bernard Campbell (Chicago, 1972), 282–331.

⁸⁷ Fox claimed inspiration from both Konrad Lorenz and Charles Darwin, especially *The Expression of Emotions in Man and Animals* (London, 1872).

⁸⁸ Robin Fox, “The Evolution of Human Sexual Behavior,” *New York Times*, 24 March 1968.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, 79.

⁹⁰ Fox, “Cultural Animal” (cit. n. 83), 12.

two interviews in the *New York Times* alone. The interviews described him as a “puckish, 33-year-old Canadian” and as “tailored in London, shod in France and automotively equipped by Alfa-Romeo.”⁹¹ As a representative of a new breed of hip scientific men, Tiger sought to make two points. First, like Fox, he wanted to explore the possibility of uniting biological and anthropological analyses of human behavior. Second, as his case study of such an approach in action, he asked, “Why do human males form all-male groups? What do they do in their groups? And, what are the groups for?”⁹² He proposed, in answer, that all-male groups were ubiquitous in human societies and required some kind of initiation ceremony to demarcate members from nonmembers. These ceremonies, in turn, reflected a form of “unisexual” selection “for work, defense, and hunting purposes” that paralleled sexual selection for reproductive purposes. In this unisexual selection, male bonding and aggression were intimately linked.

“Aggression,” Tiger wrote, “is both the product and cause of strong affective ties between men.”⁹³ He further proffered that unisexual organizations, like all-male prep schools and universities, promoted conceptions of masculinity that arose out of these institutions. The net effect kept males from high-ranking families dominant and subordinated males from families without access to such resources; it also naturally excluded females from the upper echelons of political and social power.⁹⁴ If he were right, Tiger reasoned, then “modifying the dynamics and repercussions of the male bond may be a crucial feature of altered attitudes to power, to the value of destroying other communities’ people and property, and to the concept that manliness is strength rather than flexibility and authority rather than attentiveness to others.”⁹⁵ Given his working-class background, Tiger was likely attuned to the mechanisms by which class could be perpetuated through codes of masculinity defined by youthful experience with exclusive all-male institutions.⁹⁶ Yet he also despaired of changing the resulting social dynamics that characterized contemporary life. He argued that increasing the proportion of women in male-dominated fields would not help—men would continue to see younger women as sexual objects, older women as competitors, and neither as colleagues—while men would instinctively continue to seek alliances with other men. Tiger’s reluctance to admit that the system could be changed left him open to charges of biological determinism.

Reviews of *Men in Groups* were mixed. Elaine Morgan, an early feminist critic of man-the-hunter theories of human evolution, argued that Tiger’s theory of male bonding dominated discussions of human social interactions and thus obscured attention to equally important female-female relations.⁹⁷ Another reviewer called his theory “necessarily tentative and tenuous, based as it is on analogy, speculation and

⁹¹ Quotes from, respectively, Joan Cook, “Explaining Why Men Love to Be One of the Boys,” *New York Times*, 21 June 1969, 14; and Marylin Bender, “No Time for Dandies?” *New York Times*, 14 September 1969, SM2A2.

⁹² Tiger, *Men in Groups* (cit. n. 11), xiii.

⁹³ *Ibid.*, 196.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, 202–3.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, 214.

⁹⁶ For a historical perspective, see Nye, “Medicine and Science” (cit. n. 15); Carroll Smith-Rosenberg, “Writing History: Language, Class, and Gender,” in *Feminist Studies, Critical Studies*, ed. Teresa de Lauretis (Madison, Wis., 1986), 31–54. For more on all-male institutions and privilege, see Amy Milne Smith’s *London Clubland: A Cultural History of Gender and Class in Late-Victorian Britain* (London, 2011).

⁹⁷ Elaine Morgan, *Descent of Woman* (New York, 1972), 190–3; Erika Lorraine Milam, “Dunking the Tarzanists: Elaine Morgan and the Aquatic Ape Theory,” in *Outsider Scientists*, ed. Oren Harman and Michael R. Dietrich (Chicago, 2013), 223–47.

a staggering variety of scholarly sources.”⁹⁸ Tiger fared slightly better at the hands of physical anthropologist Sherwood Washburn (University of California, Berkeley), who nevertheless emphasized the book’s “deep problem . . . the nature of the evidence; how can such an interesting point of view become more than a very tentative hypothesis?”⁹⁹ Ardrey, unsurprisingly, penned the most positive review, and underscored Tiger’s scholarly tone. In his usual metaphor-laden style, he wrote, “footnotes fly by like June bugs in a summer cottage. But let the reader be tolerant. . . . In the academic jungle a footnote can be a man’s best friend. Let the reader likewise endure a ‘paradigm’ or two as scholarly décor. He may read with assurance that no cloistered jargon will muffle the explosion let loose in these pages.” In Ardrey’s reading of *Men in Groups*, two factions would find their cultural assumptions smashed by Tiger’s findings: the Freudians, who held that all male friendship resulted from latent homosexual attraction, and the feminists who sought to challenge the “age-old male bond.”¹⁰⁰ All-male groups were not the result of cultural prejudice or psychological deviance, Ardrey concluded, but of our human biological heritage.

Given Tiger and Fox’s earlier work, in *The Imperial Animal* they drew evidence from biology, history, and genetics to describe the evolution of human “biogrammar,” the political nature of human social interactions, the mother-child bond, and male competition.¹⁰¹ They devoted the second half of the book to more traditional social scientific topics, illustrating how evolution could have influenced the origins of economic systems, educational practices, and efforts to maintain the health of the social body. In writing *The Imperial Animal*, Tiger and Fox fulfilled what they saw as their scholarly duty of diagnosis, leaving its lessons in the hands of the social scientists and politicians who they hoped would embrace and learn from their biological past.¹⁰² For many readers, the book appeared to build directly on the ethological framework provided by Lorenz, Ardrey, and Morris (see fig. 1). Fox later recalled that the volume attracted reviews by “hostile feminists, turf-defending social scientists, snotty humanists and friendly laymen—and women for that matter.”¹⁰³ Elizabeth Fisher, for example, questioned the “clear case” for dominance hierarchies in chimpanzees but quipped, “That they exist among academics I have no doubt—one feels that no woman can advance in those circles without making certain ritual submission gestures.”¹⁰⁴ Fox also highlighted the infighting among anthropologists, describing their attacks as territorial defense. This allusion was nowhere clearer than in a conversation in which Fox remembers Ardrey cheerfully claiming his antagonists were “being consistent with their own Darwinism: they struggle for existence, for the reproductive success of their own ideas.”¹⁰⁵

As they built their own professional identities, Fox and Tiger sought to include Ardrey in their networks. At a conference, Fox recalls defending Ardrey against at-

⁹⁸ Christopher Lehmann-Haupt, “The Disturbing Rediscovery of the Obvious,” *New York Times*, 18 June 1969, 45.

⁹⁹ Sherwood Washburn, “Does Biology Account for the Men’s Club?” *New York Times*, 27 July 1969, BR10.

¹⁰⁰ Ardrey, “A Tiger” (cit. n. 76), 12.

¹⁰¹ Lionel Tiger and Robin Fox, *The Imperial Animal* (1971; repr., New York, 1989). The later reprint includes a foreword by Konrad Lorenz and a new introduction by the authors.

¹⁰² *Ibid.*, 236.

¹⁰³ Fox, *Participant Observer* (cit. n. 66), 437.

¹⁰⁴ Elizabeth Fisher, “Nature and the Animal Determinists,” *Nation*, 17 January 1972, 89–90.

¹⁰⁵ Fox, *Participant Observer* (cit. n. 66), 395.



Figure 1. Konrad Lorenz leading Lionel Tiger, Robin Fox, Robert Ardrey, and Desmond Morris down the garden path of human ethology. The original caption read, “The man/animal bandwagon, undoubtedly on its way to the bank.” From Judith Shapiro, “I Went to the Animal Fair . . . the Tiger and Fox Were There,” *Nat. Hist.* 80 (1971): 90–8.

tacks by scientists who lambasted his (and Lorenz’s) characterization of aggression as “instinct.”¹⁰⁶ According to Tiger, “somebody made some nasty comment about Robert Ardrey, holding him responsible for the Vietnam War and for everything. Fox said, this is just ridiculous, let’s just give him an honorary degree and let him be a member of the group and people will stop bothering him—which to my knowledge was the first time anyone had ever said that in public.”¹⁰⁷ Tiger suggested that many of Ardrey’s professional difficulties stemmed from his lack of academic accreditation. Yet at least according to Fox, Ardrey was happy with life outside the academy. Fox later recalled an illuminating conversation along these lines. After discussing the faults of work by a fellow neo-Darwinian, he remembers Ardrey questioning whether the point was worth a big fight. “Remember . . . you are on the same side in the great struggle: the struggle to get the evolved, biological aspects of behavior recognized and incorporated into a scientific view of human behavior.” Try at all times, he encouraged Fox, “to boost and encourage and promote” people on your side.¹⁰⁸

In fact, both Fox and Tiger saw their work at the HFGF through precisely this lens—it gave them the opportunity to encourage research on the human animal at a time when funds for such work were in short supply. In his memoir, Fox wrote that they “thought of themselves as like the original Royal Society before it became a formal

¹⁰⁶ Segerstråle, *Defenders of the Truth* (cit. n. 10), 90–4.

¹⁰⁷ Tiger, interview by Milam (cit. n. 77).

¹⁰⁸ Fox, *Participant Observer* (cit. n. 66), 395.

institution: an ‘Invisible College.’ They didn’t have an Institute, like [Clifford] Geertz in Princeton, to which people could come. Rather they went out to the people—drew them into the web, put them in touch with each other, gave them support.”¹⁰⁹ He additionally submitted that “they were both wary of guruhood; disciples meant trouble and bother,” so they self-consciously chose not to create a new journal, hold exclusive meetings, or build “factions, scandal, gossip, just like all the others.”¹¹⁰ Instead, they hoped to spread an evolutionary perspective of human nature in new academic conversations, to “seed the virgin environments.” Rather than create a new discipline, Fox and Tiger tried “to return their own discipline,” anthropology, to what they saw as its “true mandate.” Once anthropology reclaimed its evolutionary roots, they firmly believed, other behavioral sciences would naturally follow suit. “That was the plan.”¹¹¹

When Mason W. Gross retired from his position as president of Rutgers University and became president of the HFGF in 1971, he was familiar with Fox and Tiger’s work and actively supported their candidacy as research directors. Gross asked them to submit a research plan to the board of directors.¹¹² When he read it, Henry Moe opposed the idea. He wrote to Gross arguing that Fox and Tiger were “men in a hurry,” and as a result they piled “hypothesis upon hypothesis, until, in the end a hypothetical conclusion is stated as fact. This is not science.” Moe conceded that he was not an expert in the field, so he sought out reviews of *The Imperial Animal* and disappointingly “found none wholly favorable.” He even invoked the memory of the HFGF’s illustrious founder, suggesting that during Guggenheim’s life, similar proposals had come before him, but he had always rejected the idea of a university-based research center (even though Fox and Tiger had something else in mind).¹¹³ He found himself forced to conclude that the trustees should keep looking. Gross, however, ignored his concerns and on 28 March 1972 recommended to the board of directors that the “Fox-Tiger proposal be approved as a three-year project with a budget of up to \$175,000 for the first year.”¹¹⁴ The board agreed, and Fox and Tiger accepted its offer.¹¹⁵ Shortly thereafter, Tiger reported to Gross two lengthy discussions with Ardrey. “Mr. Ardrey” estimated the Fox-Tiger plan for the HFGF was “both an appropriate and constructive rendition of Mr. Guggenheim’s own ideas on the subject.”¹¹⁶ Even after his death, Guggenheim remained a touchstone for members of the organization.

¹⁰⁹ Ibid., 558. Cultural anthropologist Clifford Geertz accepted an appointment at the Institute of Advanced Study in 1970, and Fox and Tiger came to see him as somewhat of a professional nemesis. See especially Tiger’s obituary of Geertz, “Fuzz. Fuzz. . . . It Was Covered in Fuzz,” *Wall Street Journal*, 7 November 2006.

¹¹⁰ Fox, *Participant Observer* (cit. n. 66), 558.

¹¹¹ As recounted by Fox in *Participant Observer* (cit. n. 66), 559.

¹¹² Robin Fox and Lionel Tiger, “Proposed Program for the Harry F. Guggenheim Foundation,” January 1972, in “History of the Harry Frank Guggenheim Foundation” (New York), chap. 4. This photocopied, spiral-bound pamphlet is distributed internally at the foundation (initial date of compilation unknown).

¹¹³ Henry Allen Moe, Memorandum for Dr. Mason Gross, 2 March 1972, Folder: Guggenheim, Harry Frank, Foundation: Tiger-Fox Project #25 and Folder: Tiger and Fox #35, Moe Papers; emphasis in the original.

¹¹⁴ Folder: Guggenheim, Harry Frank, Foundation #5, Moe Papers.

¹¹⁵ “Initial terms of agreement, from April 1 1972 to July 1 1973,” Folder: Guggenheim, Harry Frank, Foundation: Ardrey, Robert, Moe Papers. According to this contract, Tiger and Fox were each to be paid \$1,000/month, plus half of their salary at Rutgers, and any missing benefits because of their half-time work.

¹¹⁶ Tiger to Mason Gross, 17 April 1972, Folder: Guggenheim, Harry Frank, Foundation: Gross, Mason W., Moe Papers.

Under the guidance of Fox and Tiger's "Invisible College," the HFGF funded research designed to unpack the origins of human aggression and explore the behavioral evolution of humanity more broadly. People applied for, and received, small grants (of approximately \$10,000) to support research in a wide variety of fields—psychiatry, zoology, biological and cultural anthropology, psychology, endocrinology, and not least ethology—demonstrating the interdisciplinary nature of human evolutionary studies in the early 1970s.¹¹⁷ Yet for Moe, it seemed the primary beneficiaries of the foundation's largesse were Fox and Tiger themselves. He wrote to Ardrey, asking him to nominate other leaders in the field who would provide a broader perspective. Ardrey capitulated, listing Nikolaas Tinbergen, Konrad Lorenz, Ernst Mayr, Sherwood Washburn, and René Dubos as important theorists or statesmen of biology—Tinbergen and Lorenz, for example, had shared a Nobel Prize in physiology or medicine earlier that year with physiologist Karl von Frisch.¹¹⁸ All of these men, however, held academic positions of tremendous power already. Moe also contacted cotrustee Roger Straus, expressing what he hoped was a mutual hesitation at placing "practically all our eggs in the Tiger-Fox basket." Topmost on his mind were the expenses Fox and Tiger were incurring.¹¹⁹ Moe noted, too, that he had never received a response to his letter to Gross, "either in writing or orally." He felt snubbed. Indeed, at the end of their three-year contract, when Gross proposed giving Fox and Tiger a raise, Straus and Moe attempted to persuade the rest of the trustees to "take a cold hard look at the overall Tiger/Fox relationship philosophically as well as financially."¹²⁰ Instead, Fox and Tiger were granted a raise of \$3,000 a year.¹²¹

In 1978, after six years at the helm, the HFGF asked Fox and Tiger to evaluate their work so far as directors. In their responses, Fox and Tiger reclassified most of the grants from previous years, reflecting their evolving interests. In this new scheme, almost half of the grants fell into the categories of ethology (human and animal) and sociobiology, while the bulk of the remaining grantees devoted their research to brains, hormones, and behavior. Paleoanthropology and cross-cultural studies, which had generated two of the most significant forms of data for re-creating a universal human nature in the 1960s, largely disappeared as research categories of interest. The overwhelmingly male grantees included young movers and shakers in biological anthropology and sociobiology, as well as scientists whom Fox and Tiger had read avidly in their early forays into ethology.¹²² Although the grantees hailed from a wide array of disciplines, they also knew each other from past symposia, conferences, and edited collections. It was a small but steadily growing community of men and women.

¹¹⁷ Fox and Tiger stipulated that the grant money (slightly more than \$44,000 in 2015 dollars) could be used to pay neither a portion of the primary researcher's salary nor university overhead.

¹¹⁸ Ardrey to Moe, 30 November 1973, Folder: Guggenheim, Harry Frank, Foundation: Ardrey, Robert, Moe Papers.

¹¹⁹ Moe to Roger W. Straus, 2 March 1974, Folder: Guggenheim, Harry Frank, Foundation #43, Moe Papers.

¹²⁰ Roger W. Straus Jr. to Mr. Peter Lawson-Johnston and Dr. Mason Gross, 4 August 1975, Folder: Guggenheim, Harry Frank, Foundation: Tiger and Fox #23; Moe to Lawson-Johnston and Gross, 8 August 1975, Folder: Guggenheim, Harry Frank, Foundation: Tiger and Fox #23, Moe Papers.

¹²¹ To the Directors of the Harry Frank Guggenheim Foundation, 27 August 1975, Folder: Guggenheim, Harry Frank, Foundation: Tiger and Fox #23, Moe Papers.

¹²² See Folder: Guggenheim, Harry Frank, Foundation #18; Minutes of Meeting of Fellowship Committee, Held on 6 April 1973, Guggenheim, Harry Frank, Foundation #7; Minutes of Special Meeting of Board of Directors, Held on 17 May 1973, Folder: Guggenheim, Harry Frank, Foundation #9, Moe Papers.

Crucial to this community-building effort was HFGF support (in part or in whole) for conferences later published as edited collections.¹²³

In his self-evaluation, Fox contended, “The Foundation has played a crucial role during the 1970s in facilitating one important development in the thinking of social and biological scientists, namely the greatly increased recognition that evolutionary and genetic factors have an important influence on behavior.”¹²⁴ Many agencies and groups contributed to this effort, he asserted, but “the Foundation has played a role far out of proportion to the magnitude of its resources.”¹²⁵ Fox’s statement was self-serving but not wrong. For years, the Wenner-Gren Foundation had supported a great deal of primatological and anthropological research, especially through a program called “The Origins of Man,” which ran from 1965 to 1972.¹²⁶ Because of their increasingly dire economic situation, however, Wenner-Gren dramatically cut back spending on research and conferences in the 1970s. Funding from the National Science Foundation (NSF) failed to make up the difference.¹²⁷ In fact, social scientists had been so frustrated with the lack of consideration and attention they received within the hierarchy of the NSF that they strongly considered establishing a separate National Social Science Foundation.¹²⁸

The HFGF thus funded scientific research at the juncture of ethology and biological anthropology at a crucial moment in the crystallization of sociobiology as a discipline.¹²⁹ As research directors of the HFGF until 1984, Fox and Tiger successfully created a space where research on the human animal, with all of its gendered tropes, could be supported and sustained. Reacting to a perceived crisis of authority in the social sciences, they sought to incorporate an intellectually rigorous zoological perspective.¹³⁰ Earlier writers, like Lorenz, Ardrey, and Morris, had argued for the importance of biological instincts in defining human behavioral patterns, but they could not on

¹²³ E.g., *Violence and Aggression: Areas of Ignorance* (1972); *Female Hierarchies* (1974); *Biology and Politics, Recent Explorations* (1975); *Conference on the Origins and Evolution of Language and Speech* (1975); *Conference on Brain and Behavior* (1976); *Implications of Sociobiology for the Social Sciences* (1977, in conjunction with the American Academy of Arts and Sciences); *Conference on Kin Selection and Kinship Theory* (1978); and many more cosponsored events. *Reports of the Harry Frank Guggenheim Foundation, 1929–74 and 1974–8*.

¹²⁴ Robin Fox, “Overview of Research-Grant Activity of the Harry Frank Guggenheim Foundation,” attached to Donald R. Griffin to Peter O. Lawson-Johnson, 9 November 1978, in “History of the Harry Frank Guggenheim Foundation” (cit. n. 112).

¹²⁵ *Ibid.*, 6.

¹²⁶ E.g., John Buettner-Janusch, ed., *Origins of Man: Physical Anthropology* (New York, 1966); Phyllis C. Jay, ed., *Primates: Studies in Adaptation and Variability* (New York, 1968); Russell Tuttle, ed., *The Functional and Evolutionary Biology of Primates* (Chicago, 1972). The Smithsonian also funded at least one conference, published as J. F. Eisenberg and Wilton S. Dillon, eds., *Man and Beast: Comparative Social Behavior* (Washington, D.C., 1971).

¹²⁷ On biological funding within the NSF, see Toby Appel, “Allocating Resources to a Divided Science,” in *Shaping Biology: The National Science Foundation and American Biological Research, 1945–1975* (Baltimore, 2002), 207–34.

¹²⁸ Mark Solovey, “Senator Fred Harris’s National Social Science Foundation Proposal: Reconsidering Federal Science Policy, Natural Science–Social Science Relations, and American Liberalism during the 1960s,” *Isis* 103 (2012): 54–82; and Solovey, “Riding Natural Scientists’ Coattails onto the Endless Frontier: The SSRC and the Quest for Scientific Literacy,” *J. Hist. Behav. Sci.* 40 (2004): 393–422.

¹²⁹ The field was given a new name and impetus by the publication of E. O. Wilson’s *Sociobiology: A New Synthesis* (Cambridge, Mass., 1975); see Segerstråle, *Defenders of the Truth* (cit. n. 10).

¹³⁰ Laura Nader, “Up the Anthropologist: Perspectives Gained from Studying Up,” in *Reinventing Anthropology*, ed. Dell Hymes (New York, 1972), 284–311; Naomi Quinn, “The Divergent Case of Cultural Anthropology,” in *Primate Encounters: Models of Science, Gender, and Society*, ed. Shirley Strum and Linda Marie Fedigan (Chicago, 2000), 223–42.

their own transform the study of animal and human behavior in the United States. That work had to be done by academic insiders with financial resources at their disposal and a domestic network of influence—men like Fox and Tiger.

CONCLUSION

Whereas Ardrey, Fox, and Tiger saw their theories of human nature reified in their personal experiences with masculine professional networks like the Harry Frank Guggenheim Foundation, feminist scientists and humanists viewed both as illustrating how scientific theories could spring uncritically from the gender norms male scientists took for granted. The masculine stereotypes embodied in these scientific theories were part of a larger reimagining of the roles men played in American social life. Ozzie and Harriet may have represented an ideal life in the 1950s, but the immense popularity of Sloan Wilson's *Man in the Gray Flannel Suit* and David Reisman's *The Lonely Crowd* simultaneously spoke to widespread anxieties about the soullessness of suburban corporate life.¹³¹ By the close of the 1960s, both corporate culture and masculine ideals were rapidly changing and attracting the critical attention of popular writers and scholars alike. Greater numbers of women entered the work force as “career girls,” creating office spaces potentially fraught with sexual tension and fluctuating power dynamics.¹³² In this context, the importance of reinstating homosocial spaces emerged in both social and scientific imaginaries.

Fox has since lamented how wrong he and Tiger turned out to be in predicting the future of anthropology, even as other social sciences have variously embraced their Darwinian message. His faith still resides in the authority of biology, though. Alluding to studies of the human genome, he recently claimed that the “Family of Man is no longer a utopian slogan but a genetic fact.”¹³³ Tiger similarly maintains that after decades of battle over the precepts advanced in the “Zoological Perspective in Social Science,” he and Fox have been proven “largely right.” “Of course many disagreed then and disagree still,” Tiger wrote in 2011. “The low-oxygen post-modern this-and-that fog continues to dull reality . . . with a confidently glad anti-empiricism which neither Fox nor I . . . ever expected to become the viral suffocating force it became.”¹³⁴ Both men believe their case was won not by social scientists reluctant to adopt their perspective, but by geneticists. Yet as they are all too aware, the field of anthropology continued to change around them.

The (literal and figurative) masculine networks of academic authority exemplified by the HFGF and the sociobiological research it supported did not go unchallenged. Within biological anthropology, conceptions of the human animal quickly extended to encompass the wide variety of strategies female animals and women might utilize to structure the societies in which they lived.¹³⁵ Not only were pop-ethologists like Ardrey promulgating the biological origins of “men in groups,” so were professionals, and that provided stakes worth fighting for. As scientists confronted cultural changes

¹³¹ Sloan Wilson, *The Man in the Gray Flannel Suit* (New York, 1955); David Reisman, *The Lonely Crowd: A Study of the Changing American Character* (New Haven, Conn., 1950).

¹³² Helen Gurley Brown, *Sex and the Single Girl* (New York, 1962); Antony Jay, *Corporation Man* (New York, 1971).

¹³³ Robin Fox, “The Old Adam and the Last Man,” *Society* 48 (2011): 462–70.

¹³⁴ Lionel Tiger, “Full Circle,” *Society* 48 (2011): 500–1.

¹³⁵ For a stimulating reflection on this research, see Strum and Fedigan, *Primate Encounters* (cit. n. 130).

at home and in the workplace, their academic debates of the late 1960s and early 1970s laid the groundwork for deep skepticism of biological explanations of human behavior among feminist scientists and humanists in the decades to come.¹³⁶

¹³⁶E.g., Marian Lowe and Ruth Hubbard, "Sociobiology and Biosociology: Can Science Prove the Biological Basis of Sex Differences in Behavior?" in *Genes and Gender II*, ed. Ruth Hubbard and Marian Lowe (New York, 1979), 91–112; Janet Sayers, *Biological Politics: Feminist and Anti-Feminist Perspectives* (New York, 1982); Ruth Bleier, "Sociobiology, Biological Determinism, and Human Behavior," in *Science and Gender: A Critique of Biology and Its Theories on Women* (New York, 1984), 15–48. In the 1990s, feminism and evolutionary theories found more solid common ground; e.g., Patricia Gowaty, ed., *Feminism and Evolutionary Biology: Boundaries, Intersections and Frontiers* (Boston, 1997).