



British Journal of Educational Research
1(2): 107-143, 2011

SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org



Universities and the Construction of Knowledge in Anthropology, 1950-2000: A Study in the Sociology of Academic Discourse

G. V. Loewen^{1*}

¹Department of Sociology, STM College, University of Saskatchewan. 1437 College Drive, Saskatoon, SK. Canada, S7N 0W6.

Research Article

Received 15th July 2011
Accepted 26th August 2011
Online Ready 28th August 2011

ABSTRACT

Aims: To discover and describe how the presence of anthropology as taught within universities as educational institutions influences the construction of the knowledge that is taught as anthropological discourse.

Study Design: Ethnographic study.

Place and Duration of the Study: Canada, Britain and The United States. Ten years within the time-span of 1995-2009.

Methodology: 45 professional academic anthropologists who were either working or had worked at major universities in the three countries specified, participated in ethnographic interviews. These were supplemented by surveys, participant observation and field notes, as well as archival techniques and content analysis. Respondents from Britain completed e-mail interviews and surveys, all others were effected in person with the researcher.

Results: anthropologists constructed an auto-ethnographic account of how institutional atmospheres, specific persons or persona, texts or courses, or the structure of programs and departments influenced the construction of anthropological knowledge. The institutional presence of anthropology was seen as being only equal to the presence of anthropology within the institutional framework. For the first time, we have a personalist accounting of almost a half-century of the presence of anthropology as an academic discipline in a sample of the English speaking university system.

Conclusion: the ability of both anthropologists and anthropology to adjust to the symbolic and material constraints of teaching and thinking within an enlightenment and bourgeois institution must continue to be examined and questioned. Scientific knowledge is not immune from its place of dissemination, and does not translate in whole cloth to either students or scholars once it has taken its place as part of a discursive apparatus that includes competing and conflicting material and symbolic interests.

*Corresponding author: Email: gloewen@stmcollege.ca;

Keywords: Anthropology; anthropologists; universities; education; discourse;

1. INTRODUCTION

'Of course going to meetings gives you a chance to see people and to identify real people with some of the writings and theories behind them.'

'Students have too much of their own agendas these days, not caring too much either for knowledge or the university.'

There have been a number of studies of anthropologists as scholars and as members of their own academic 'tribe' (cf. Armstrong and Armstrong, 1992; Barrett, 1979; Burrige 1983; Comaroff, 2010; Curtis et al, 1970; Eggan 1974; Freeman, 1965; Inglis, 1978, 1982). As well, studies of anthropologists and related discourses who have some historical status in the discipline are well known (cf. Berger 1990; Cesara 1982; Fortes 1978; Good, 2011; Leach 1984; Mead 1959). Anthropologists and others have also been studied quantitatively within their respective institutional careers (cf. Breitborde 1989a; Brown 1989; Davidovitch et al., 2011; Davies et al., 1992; Fardon, 2011; Givens et al., 1996; Guppy, 1989; Hannerz 1987). These disciplines and their practitioners have also been subject to critical historical studies which attempt to turn their own lense towards themselves (cf. Daniels, 1974; Holmswood 2010; Kirsch 1982; Low and Merry, 2010; Vine 2011). Finally, anthropologists have been studied as pedagogues and their discipline understood as a specifically 'value-oriented' curricula (cf. Gabriel 1989; Gusterson 2011; Kemper 1989; Murphy 1994; Reck and Keefe, 1989; Reich 1989; Robins and De Vita 1985; Simmons 2010; Srivastava 1993). Yet there have been no personalist socio-ethnographic studies of anthropologists that combine all of these issues and aspects into an ethnological accounting of what anthropologists' themselves feel they are doing in the educational institutions - mostly universities - in which they work. What kinds of constraints were imposed on anthropological scholars who worked in academic institutions in the second half of the twentieth century? Forty-five anthropologists from Great Britain, Canada and The United States who were trained during this five decade period said the institutional context was and continues to be a major factor in the production of anthropological knowledge. This may be ironic because of the traditionally defined space of anthropology as being away from home, in the field.

Darnell suggests that a brief introduction to any ethno-history of anthropology might use a great-person idiom. Yet a study that involved "...institutional and research emphases would produce a more balanced view of the emergence of Americanist anthropology" would be more welcome. (Darnell 1996:6).¹ The horizon of this history is still relatively shallow. For example, in Canada, academic teaching of anthropology did not begin until 1925. Yet research participants often portrayed themselves as cut from the whole cloth of history. Anthropologists identified with both their discipline and the cultures it studies.

Research participants suggested that they had only local knowledge of a larger discourse. Each research participant occupies a certain locus of anthropology. These loci are defined by institutions. Such a definition includes the academic employment market, particular departments of anthropology, and publishing houses. They are the foci of concerns for these anthropologists. Such concerns are dominant in the day to day construction of anthropological knowledge.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

Over a period of ten years, 45 anthropologists and a number of other social scientists with related interests were surveyed, interviewed, and sometimes shadowed regarding their understanding of the institutional variables that shape the construction of anthropological discourse. Subject's libraries were viewed and sometimes catalogued, ranked lists of sources that each informant thought was of both personal and general import were developed, and longitudinal surveys were used to assess changes in the discipline over the time period discussed, though the vast majority of data on this point came from the memories of anthropologists. The goal was to bring as much of the ethnographic lens to the project, and while not attempting to construct another anthropological 'tribe' or culture, the researcher was interested in understanding both how anthropologists view themselves as employees of institutions within which they are mostly marginal academics and how they would react to their own field methods being present in their workplaces or homes. Data were hand-transcribed and collated into a kind of concordance, exemplifying the five topics discussed below. The researcher relied on the disciplinary expertise of the subjects to inform the analysis. Nevertheless, transcribed comments were sometimes compared with out-takes from published work, and during the production stage of this article, real persons comments were juxtaposed with their own published scholarship to get an idea of how the publication process alters the meaning and intent of anthropological knowledge. As this is not the subject of this particular article, and as it may have compromised the anonymity of the interview texts, this part of the analysis was left out.

With that in mind, five major areas can, however, be identified. They will be discussed in the following order:

- 1) These comments dealt with the general atmosphere of famous anthropological institutions. These include departments or schools which research participants felt were important to mention.
- 2) These comments were directed at or describing particular personalities or individuals. Such persons inhabited institutions at various times. They were an important influence for research participants' opinions on the content and place of anthropology.
- 3) These comments concerned textbooks and other course content. Research participants' felt that institutions circumscribed and defined some intellectual content for them. Such institutions were not necessarily academic. These limits left research participants with less space to teach or work in anthropology.
- 4) These comments have to do with a general history of anthropology. This was seen as a changing space of institutional knowledge and discourse. Finally,
- 5) Research participants' thoughts on the changes they identified as being important over the course of their journeys in anthropology and as anthropologists are noted. Many of these changes are related to epistemology.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Institutional Atmospheres

Let us begin with some examples regarding the structure of famous anthropology departments. Research participants did not recite a history of anthropology. Instead, the comments are personal and casual. They have a larger than life tone because the places discussed are important to anthropology as it tells its own story.

Not all research participants began in anthropology. In fact, more than half of the research participants in this study did not. Chemistry, physics, art, music, philosophy, history, literature, linguistics, archaeology and economics are all disciplines represented and more or less forsaken in the quest for something different. The following examples are fairly typical:

'I did not start out to be an anthropologist, and I think it is fair to say that I never had an anthropology course. I do not mention that very often! I would classify myself as an anthropologist through what I have been through at this point after being for 25 years in a department of anthropology. A department that hired me and then forgot that I was not an anthropologist and started me off teaching first year courses in ethnography which I felt very comfortable teaching. But it has been a process of 25 years of becoming what I was supposed to be. Admittedly that is probably not resulted in the things I might have thought it would. But one would presume that there would be a real sense of impostor syndrome there. And the fact is that I feel very much like an anthropologist who has risen through the ranks in the same way that other students do and I am now delighted to be deeply into all of the kinds of intellectual and personal issues that anthropologists are into.'

Perhaps even more typically such changes may start earlier in one's professional career:

'I suppose as you do philosophy courses and wonder about Greek thought and thought in general. You sort of start to wonder just what kind of line are you being fed by these philosophers. Surely there must be other people in the world besides the Greeks who can think! And I read a book at that time by a philosopher. Sort of a popular book discussing Greek art and so forth, and indicating that Greek art was the finest in the world, and Greek painting was excellent. And then this author indicated that it was really a tragedy that we do not have any examples of Greek painting! So, one gets a little skeptical about how great it is if one cannot actually see it. She said the Greeks told us how great it was. Well!'

Anthropology was seen as being more critical and open-ended even than some philosophy. Anthropology could question better what we accepted at face-value about our own culture. Even so, questioning the native's point of view regarding 'western' culture allowed some anthropologists not to question the native point of view about all others.

Many research participants found anthropology only available as a graduate degree. Today even these mere courses also seem larger than life:

'A few of us in the anthropology program took Clyde Kluckhohn's social anthropology course, which was another wonderful thing to do. It was he who was the head of the department then and defined as a great man. One of the books I had read informally was one of his because he wrote popular books. And here was the great man himself in the flesh you know, and I was taking his graduate course yet! With a couple of friends other than mine who were undergraduates. So we reinforced each other because that environment was a very highly competitive, highly charged graduate students. It was a very large class and they were trying to outdo each other and would argue with each other and show how wonderful they were. And there were three or four of us who were undergraduates so we were just doing it for fun, really, and so we were playing sort of ethnographer to the graduate students and Kluckhohn loved it.'

Research participants came into anthropology from other disciplines. Yet they also entered the discipline in vastly different institutional structures. This meant that they could be outsiders to anthropological knowledge. They could do so in a manner made more rare by contemporary programs. Hence even those mildly interested in anthropology could feel a kind of ethnographic experience. They watched, learned, and asked, 'What is this culture about?'. They discovered that the flavor of anthropology was constructed in part by disciplinary reproduction. As well, competition amongst students created a certain kind of atmosphere. Later, one research participant was directed on a certain course due in part to the rhetoric of great institutions:

'There was a general agreement that Chicago was the place to go for graduate education because one of the few specialists who had worked in the community I studied at was a Harvard graduate who was part of the same mafia. And that was what developed the connection with Chicago. And again lots of people were applying to graduate institutions in those days. But there were a lot of openings in graduate institutions and there was funding for graduate institutions. Not everybody got funding, but there was a lot more of it going around than today.'

As well, the structure of personal connections with those on the inside is important. The inside track was even more important if available graduate spaces were rare. For example:

'Well, I went into anthropology with a book and several publications already. So I went in, and as I said I was very grateful to get in. And you did not get in only because of your academic record. I guess mine was good enough. But you got in if you had money to support you. They did not want to take anybody who did not have money. And the year I got in, twenty-three people got in and 500 and something applied! Many of these must have fallen off because they did not have the background or the money or fell off because they did not have support. Michigan wanted to make sure that they did not let anyone in who was not going to be supported financially. And we had to list whom we wanted to work with on our application form and I put down his name and he seemed quite interesting. And I felt that this was the only person that I wanted to work with no one else was as important.'

The old adage about many being picked and few chosen applies well to famous graduate schools. On the other hand, some research participants were chased away from famous

schools. They attended those less prestigious because of what this very fame did to some of the universities' tenants. One particularly detailed example is cited here:

'I had a really bad experience with the Canadian anthropologists, unfortunately. I was accepted at the two biggest doctoral programs up there, Toronto and McGill and they were jerks. Absolute complete jerks! McGill sent me a letter that said you know I was accepted but they did not have any funding for me. And that they would probably never have any funding for me! I did not even respond to Toronto, because I thought that this was just really insulting, a dirty little form letter. Well at McGill I wrote back and I told them that you know, you did not offer me any money and I am broke. I just finished my M.A. I cannot afford to do a Ph.D. without funding. So things like that. And the chair of the department phoned me up at home, and said 'Well, do not be so hasty, because what we do here is we look at our incoming class and we get our acceptances and we do not offer money to anybody, and we see who will come without funding, and those who said they will come without funding then we offer them the money!' I got really angry with this guy.'

The politics of various departments always contributed to the construction of anthropological knowledge. What kinds of theories could be discussed? Would epistemology be an issue? Basic disciplinary knowledge might even be lacking at some famous institutions:

'I went to Houston, to Rice University. I was always looking to go along to some place that would be intellectually interesting but would be a departure from the kinds of things I had been doing. I knew about Marcus and Fisher being at Rice and they were at that time there was a lot of talk about post-modern anthropology and so on and so forth. So I thought it would be kind of fun to hang out with those guys. I knew the department was very interdisciplinary, so I did that and went down there for a year. It is a peculiar department. I felt that they had become so interdisciplinary, you know, getting graduate students from a lot of different fields. And they did not have undergraduate degrees in anthropology. I felt, and a lot of the students felt this way too, that they were not getting the basic knowledge of the field to build on. It is one thing to take an anthropology student at an undergraduate level and opening up the discipline, but when you do not give them a basis in the discipline to start with it becomes more problematic.'

Epistemology was often not so important as who was known and how they were known. Hence:

'It was not the theoretical connection that sort of got me hooked up with Chicago but it was the regional ethnographic connection and the fact that the department was defined as one of the best two or three in the Harvard definition of the universe. I thought of staying and working at Harvard because I sort of knew the people there and it was easy but they did not like that idea very much. They took to the exogamy, they marry out or die out tradition. So they thought Chicago was okay and it was not populated much by Harvard graduates. Berkeley was almost okay but there was nobody there doing my sort of work.'

Once at graduate school, memories of the way in which knowledge was constructed differ widely. The common thread is the sense that who was present would be influential. The figure of the great anthropologists was more important than theories from books. The tools of the trade inevitably seemed to be inherited from elders who were actually present. Five different examples suffice as evidence for this:

‘Toronto had this history of looking at communication, with McLuhan and Innes. In fact it was one of the first course I took and I could not make sense of the course. It was a course on communications, and we did some work in groups on gesture and the like. I mean he taught some of this in class. I had not realized it at the time but our group projects were actually to see how we used communication in these group projects! When I was aware of the significance of what he had done. When I was first there seeing the way this information was distributed, seeing very much like what he described in some of his experiments. And when I went back I tried explicitly to repeat some of his experiments in the ethnographic context. You know it worked with varying degrees of success. It is hard to construct artificial situations with people who do not understand experiments. But I was able to use a lot of the arguments that were there. In many ways I guess I feel more tutored more in his line although I only really had the one formal course with him.’

The influence here is the presence of an elder. The research participant felt intellectual kinship with him. Sometimes entire departments acted as a council of elders:

‘At Cornell there were no classes on Thursday afternoon. Every Thursday afternoon the students and faculty would all get together at a pizza parlor and drink lots of beer. It required an excuse if you were not going to be there. I mean you literally were not comfortable the next day if you did not start out not having been there the day before, explaining why you had not made it. And that was true for faculty and students alike. And these kinds of conversations were not all that rare in that kind of setting. Students and faculty would sit around and give a life story, and give a kind of apologetic for their particular brand of theory and as you say, it is really rare for students and faculty to sit around and do this anymore.’

Yet this type of transmission worked in many ways. For example, the following kinship was created mainly because of the way the university building itself was constructed:

‘Those at Michigan were where offices were arranged in little almost autonomous anterooms. With four offices each off a main corridor. So influences had to do with banal geography. In the set of offices I was in, there was Frank Livingstone and Eric Wolf. He and I talked a lot with one another, as well as Joe Jorgensen. The place was so huge. It seemed to have very or at least fairly diffuse social organization.’

Or, at the other extreme, the department itself had a general ethos which commanded respect. This set the course for what knowledge would be inherited. As well, how such knowledge should be represented a fitting into a general discourse was mapped out:

‘It was the Chicago milieu which was certainly very important in setting influences intellectually in what I was doing more concretely. In graduate

school you did what you were supposed to do, which was to focus in on something rather than everything. But you know I was caught up in the theoretical and methodological whirlwind that was happening at Chicago at that time which I was unaware when I got there. The people at Chicago took themselves very seriously as intellectual entities and that they were doing something new and exciting and different. You were either part of it or not part of it. And it took a while to find out what that meant because they were reading things I had never seen nor in a way I should have expected to.'

Another quite different example highlights a more casual interface amongst faculty and students:

'I went in and told him what I was going to do at Berkeley, and I remember him saying that, well we did not have to pass a proposal defense stage. So I told him this was what I wanted to do and we had a long, long session one day in which he told me the story of Kroeber and what he said to students many times. The ghost of Kroeber was very strong there, and Theodora was still alive at that time and would occasionally show up in the halls. But he said 'Well you know Kroeber, when a student went in to ask him what to do in the field, what do you take with you' - there were no fieldwork courses - 'Kroeber was always typing'... and he opened the door and the student says 'All right what am I going to need?' He said take a pad and a sharpened pencil!' As I said that story must have been told many times. So he told me that story. And since then I have read that story in various people's accounts.'

Research participants suggested that they were always conscious of political divisions or alliances. This consciousness existed no matter what kind of institutional atmosphere was present. Such politicized atmospheres required many research participants to exercise strength of character. This later becomes associated with the ability to do fieldwork. As well, it becomes important for working with colleagues of differing viewpoints. The following was the most direct statement of these personal matters:

'Some aboriginal groups, people with whom I have talked about it, simply say that it is courage or that it's your strong spirit. I do not know. I do not have any explanation for it. Part of it is a lot of trying to explain it sounds a lot like self-aggrandizing. Other people are ready to do battle in anyone's profession about why they do things.'

The inheritance of anthropological knowledge is tempered by personal and political forces. These might include factionalism and careerism. As well, political in-fighting and out-groups are important. It seems that anthropology as a discourse cannot be thought of as independent from such motives and organizations. For example, schools might have a casual atmosphere in the corridors and offices. In the examination rooms, however, things could be quite different:

'I know what it is like when some people go through here. It is hard here of course to get through that way. I mean in all the harsh horrible way, I was just very lucky. That I did a thesis that was extraordinarily different than what you think of as normal so. That was what was good about it. And I also had had a lot of fieldwork experience so I did not have to prove myself and also writing experience. So maybe they were somewhat conditioned by that and

were just glad to have someone go through without huge, huge problems, and we did not have the horrible defense thing. We had something else. But maybe it is a good thing, because you do need something to be advanced to candidacy.

The professionalization of these anthropologists often seems largely dependent upon such events and atmospheres. Yet, it is probably unfair to suggest that anthropology as a discipline is entirely dependent upon such experiences.

3.2 Personalities

The reality of being at an institution could be considered positivist. Direct experience lends authority to research participants' discourse. There is another positivist-like idea. This idea associates education with the presence of individual teachers and mentors. This is associated with the second series of comments listed above. Even so, memories differ widely on what positivistically we must consider to be 'the same' people. These teachers did not have the same effect on their students. This might be explained away by personality differences. A more radical option is degrees of beingness. For example, the reality of a single being in the positivist mode would be fractured. These parts would be mutually incommensurable. This would be more consistent with a post-positivist agenda. Yet such fracturing is apparently not a viable option for research participants. Witness for example two accounts of what is ostensibly the same department (Chicago) at the same time:

'At Chicago were Harvard students or people who got their Ph.D. at Harvard. A couple of them had gone from Harvard to Berkeley. The Chicago folklore in that situation was that Fred Eggan, who among other things had been Radcliffe-Brown's student, one of Radcliffe-Brown's American students, who was chairman of Chicago and had a great deal of authority and power over money when the department was expanding. He raided the Berkeley department and hired within two years three people to start afresh. It was the idea that anthropology was changing. He had a sense of that and saw some of the directions that might be going in. He hired Clifford Geertz and David Schnieder, two Harvard Ph.D.s at Berkeley and Lloyd Fallers, who was a British Ph.D., but identified as a Weberian, as did Geertz. They were the three new hot, bright, young men. So it differentiated them from the older generation like Eggan, Sol Tax and Robert Braidwood and some of the others who had been there in a more archaic phase. And Chicago's taking itself very seriously... everybody mentioned the new anthropology and that was their new anthropology and there was a strong Harvard connection through the Parsonian sort of thing.'

But another take emphasizes different memories of the 'hot, bright young men'. As well, of some of the older ones are remembered:

'Yeah, well I took some courses at Chicago, and they were in some ways rather pedantic. When I arrived at Chicago Fred Eggan was the chair of the department and of course he and Spicer were buddies so I had a fellowship. Anyway I went in and talked to Fred Eggan who was chair of the department, and said well I am new graduate student. He said 'Well, in our department we like to see all our new graduate students do our basic courses'... Schneider was there, David Schneider. And he was talking about kinship,

that section of the course. He put a huge diagram on the board. And then he got mixed up, and he tried to figure it out, and then he would give up and say 'come back tomorrow'. So we all left and came back tomorrow, and he put a huge diagram on the board, got mixed up, and could not figure it out, and said 'well forget about it'. So we all left. But Schneider was there, and Sol Tax, as I said, the others, the major orientation of the course. I did not pick up too much of that. Geertz did not stay there very long, I think. And Sol Tax of course had worked in Mesoamerica.'

'Being there' can mean many different things, as it does in 'the field', anthropology's traditionally mythic metaphor. Even so, there is always a sense of presence as giving authority. This authority exists beyond the memories of personalities and their effectiveness in the classroom. This 'there-ness' is indissociable from positivist assumptions of experience. Such authority from direct experience in the institution carries on when students go to the field. For knowledge to be inherited, its construction must take place in an institutionally bounded space. Within such a space, institutionally defined characters are placed so that a particular kind of learning occurs. Yet there are individual variants on this social role. These variants are often what research participants remembered. Persons were recalled rather than the structure of a certain official pattern of legitimate production and reproduction of knowledge. Sometimes, however, it was outside this structure that the most important learning took place:

'During my undergraduate years my fellow students were, I think, my greatest educational influences. I was on the periphery of a group of intellectual activist students who were being exposed to leftist ideas in several anthropology courses. We met informally for discussions as well as more regularly in a reading group at a local radical bookstore. It was especially during the last two years of my undergraduate schooling that I was exposed to the work of Marx and Engels, as well as the work of anthropologists such as Dell Hymes and Asad. In some respects, more important to me in the longer-term was the impact on me of my relationship to my peers in graduate school. We read feminist books and articles together, wrote articles for the department journal which we established, and together dealt with the often androcentric and sexist practical and more intellectually-based politics we confronted within the anthropology department at Toronto.'

Some research participants combated some aspects of the symbolic violence of a particular institution. In recalling this, other memories become privileged.² Whatever their content, research participants always remembered key events of their schooling. These influences are reinforced by the manner in which they are recalled. For example:

'My greatest influences in education were people as opposed to theories. There were as I said certain teaching styles. Macfeat treated graduate students as colleagues rather than as clients, in the patron-client kind of relation, who was kind. Whose nickname was 'sunshine' at the time! I still remember that. He was a sweet gentle person. He supervised a lot of people. He rescued a lot of people from the more politicized arenas. He was very broad. He was also interested in a kind of culture and communication. Kind of Bateson-like ideas and I explored a lot of that with him. Through him, Richard Lee became very friendly with me there, I took one course. I audited

it. Theory, not contemporary, but history, sort of pre-19th century theoretical stuff, because I wanted a better grounding in that, and got to know him pretty well I think. He was quite accessible to Ph.D. students.'

On the other hand, the affects of people within a disciplinary discourse could effect a student in a negative manner:

'It was even worse at the big American meetings, where you see the big attitudes marking out the hierarchies of institutions. And we always ranked very low in the hierarchy, because we were really laid back. And we go to the AAA and we wear jeans and a T-shirt, right? That is, we were from a really proletarian program, very, very laid back, and proletarian. And then you run into some guy from Columbia, where the grad students are reproducing the culture of this traditional disciplinarity. You know, they are wearing tweeds and sweaters with the patches on the elbows, and smoking pipes, and all these kinds of things. And we used to just make fun of our status by crashing these very prestigious universities' parties! Stuff like that, getting them really pissed off that we were contaminating their parties!'

The prestige of an institution can be manipulated in an arrogant and violent manner. This may further boundary maintenance. It serves to keep those on the inside assured of their relative privilege. In spite of this, one might already be on the inside. The insider constructed one's discursive circle differently:

'It was nice to be picked. And of course I did not know the kinds of problems other students had. The place I went to was a big place, a hard place to get into. It had a great reputation. I did not know. I thought I was going to a place with a bunch of huge superstars! So I went in a bit timidly. There were some with a really excellent background and he came in with quite a good background from Harvard. He had been in the Department of Social Relations, or whatever that department was called and knew Parsons as well as I knew Parsons, so! We hit it off from early on. And Don Johanson, who discovered 'Lucy' was there at the same time as me. There quite a few sort of interesting characters. But not all of them went on to interesting academic jobs though, which is a bit of a pity.'

Finally, important influences can be had from a strategic re-interpretation. Some research participants reconstructed an intellectual milieu somewhat outside the institution proper, which became important spaces of knowledge construction for them:

'By the way, a lot of my exposure to these postmodern guys comes from an inter-discipline called 'composition and rhetoric'. Not rhetoric in a shallow political sense, but in terms of English literature. So not rhetoric in the bad sense! But it goes right back to ancient rhetorical concepts for example, but is very much aware of inter-disciplinarity. We started a reading circle with some of these people from composition and rhetoric, reading through Bourdieu. Most of those people are very concerned with education and hence the differing disciplinary affiliations centred around Bourdieu's analyses of the system they are in. But logistical things must be considered of course, in terms of who shows up and who does not. I do not think you

can make too much of the fact that not too many social scientists made it to this particular forum. Sometimes though, it really is a bunch of us oddballs!

A rhetoric of continuity was employed by research participants, no matter what kinds of events or persons they remembered. The cultural memory of these anthropologists serves to reinforce narrative and to work against the concept of fractured being. Research participants tended to remember the continuous. Research participants assumed that this author would understand them as speaking of the past first. By using a linear chronology, research participants may be re-affirming their presence as an anthropologists today. For example:

'When I was first a graduate student that was when a lot of the cognitive anthropology work was being done. I guess I found it a little mechanical. I was more interested in socio-linguistics, but having done some of that as an undergraduate it made a lot of sense. I understood what they were after, and it felt more alive there than in many other places, like cultural ecology! And we got a fairly heavy dose of cultural ecology and Marxism. I remember at one point after we had these sort of beginning of the year interviews, and I said that I was interested in language and religion. And he said something to the effect of 'Well, language is the epiphenomenon of experience!' And I sort of felt rather put down!'

Not all accounts of professors were as intimate. This was so because research participants felt the awesome majesty of reputation surrounding some elders. This kept them at a distance, blurring the distinction between the physical presence of the elders and their discursive labels. Meetings with famous elders tended to take on the following appearance:

'I met Claude Levi-Strauss in Europe, and he lectured to graduate students. Or rather, took questions. He stressed fieldwork not only as salvage ethnography but as the fundamental work of anthropological work and experience. He also mentions this in an interview with Eribon here. It seems that Boas had less of an influence for Levi-Strauss than Lowie, who also got him out of France.'

Thus, one of the most famous names in anthropology was recalled as one who felt that the field was fundamental to disciplinary anthropology. Yet at the same time, Levi-Strauss had been critiqued for his lack of field experience. Even so, for research participants, the medium usurps the message. It is status enhancing to have met and been in some close contact with the sheer weight of discursive presence of a famous icon. This icon is assumed to have some kind of equally weighty content to impart. In this case, such content was the fundamental ontological bearing of the concept of the field.

Not all icons encountered were in fact anthropologists. Their discursive weight as labels for aspects of discourse, however, acted similarly:

'Hubert Dreyfus, he set up a course in phenomenology and existentialism. When he came and he asked to teach this course, a third year course in the philosophy department. And he ordered several hundred books! The department said 'What?! You are not going to get several hundred people in that course!' Even though phenomenology at that point was, and existentialism was becoming quite big partly because of the revolution and partly because of what was happening in philosophy. And he went on and

on, 'Well maybe I am being too presumptuous', and it turned out that he had 600 students registered to that course!'

Such encounters, especially if the course topic is fashionable, might continue the sense that soon-to-be icons are in fact already great. 'If someone gets six-hundred students, they must be good'.

Another example suffices to suggest that it is not only famous people who are great:

'I remember some very good courses. I especially remember a course with John Rowe, who was mainly an archaeologist who works in Cuzco I think every summer. But a true scholar, I guess, the only truly scholar I have ever met. In that he always insisted this when he taught a course, a graduate seminar, called the history of anthropology. And the first session in that was to remake all of us in terms of what he thought was proper citations and footnotes and the like. And he could draw from Spanish literature, he could draw from French literature. He could draw from all of these literatures. Well, he was one with two Ph.D.s. One was in archaeology and the other was in philosophy, so he was very well prepared.'

And some famous people were, perhaps, not all that great after all:

'The qualitative course unfortunately, was involved in this major shift in the department, and I sort of got caught in the middle of it. By this error I ended up taking two social statistics courses, as I said. And they had always been teaching this stuff. But until then they had never had a qualitative class before! And they were thinking, okay, how do we get into this. So they put this guy in charge of it, who was an old man. An old American anthropologist from Chicago, the old school! And so basically the class was him discussing his fieldwork! I mean, sure, I learned a lot by the fact that we did assignments. The whole thing was to pick a method and do a project with this method that shows the use of the method.'

As well, the less famous individuals have less famous texts to their credit. These texts are read differently. They may be read less often. More research participants read texts of authors of great renown. The presumed import of the canonical texts of anthropology prohibit intimacy with their authorial labels.

This lack of intimacy was sometimes seen as violent. This violence may be rife within the discipline. This may have a deleterious influence on scholarship and the pursuit of knowledge. Yet a post-positivist might suggest that such violence is how scholarship takes place. Some research participants did not dispute this:

'One of the most disturbing things of the time, for I served as editor was to read how nasty and how personal, and how egotistical some of the reviews were. Some were kind, some were well intentioned, good critiques, helpful. But too often people were taking really cheap shots at other people. And it got to the point where it seemed that half of the articles that I would get re-reviewed and put the person on a blacklist of my own and never ask them for another review because he had taken some Ph.D. student for whom English was their third language and was trying to come to terms with

something and pasted them all over the map, some fifty year old social anthropologist. It was like shooting fish in a barrel. And instead of trying to be helpful and concerned and constructive, in knowing that this was likely to be the person you are dealing with, they would go overboard. I mean it was like, gleeful, almost, for some individuals, and I found that really, really disturbing. To find this going on in anthropology I find it disturbing. In a discipline which purports to go much further and deeper. And then moralizing the psychology of the people in the discipline and not just the manifestations of it in writing and research in general. I found this particularly disturbing when I worked out there because it also applies to the way some professors treat students.'

We are getting closer to an intimacy which would take into account more than a textual survey could. This also provides more information than merely asking anthropologists what they do. The sociologist must ask research participants about what they have done in becoming an anthropologist. These responses are very different from the ones associated with the rhetorics of official historical accounts, curriculum vitae, and book and article reviews. The opinions of anthropologists carry important ethnographic data. To use the concept of 'opinion' in interview is to use a powerful expository tool. Anthropologists may feel more at ease. Their responses can and will be considered to be unofficial, individual, and idiosyncratic. Even with this there may be patterns of opinions. Anthropology is transformed into something other than its face value. Here is a different kind of example of what is seen by some as institutional violence:

'For twenty-five, for thirty years now I have been doing that with ethnographic community after community. I will probably never be promoted to full professor because largely what I have produced on that basis because what I have produced are things they asked me to do. Going back to that first commitment that I made, and what they want are ways to keep their own culture going. To maintain and revitalize their culture, and in their own schools they want someone who will listen to them and write in engaging kinds of ways what they have produced. Now here is the time line in an academic research project! You wait until the deadline for the grant application, and then you do some in triplicate or quadruplicate or whatever, an application, that takes months to produce, and is sniped at by, or agreed with, whatever, by your peers and this is a process which I validate. Nonetheless it is a very time consuming process, and there is at least a year lag time between conceptualization of the project and the arrival of the funds. The funds then come to you. And you as a ethnographer have funds to go out and create your own project. That is, walk into the community and say 'I am here with the money!' And even if you have the best intentions you are hiring them to do what you want to do. Now any ethnographic community that I know of considers that a very selfish way of approaching things.'

An implicit rebuke is directed at anthropology in these comments. The anthropology which sees itself as an academic enterprise is critiqued. Some ideals in anthropology do not always get along with one another. The ideal of community is broken into that academic and that indigenous. Anthropological knowledge is often evaluated academically. This evaluation effects the manner in which anthropological ideas are relevant to indigenous peoples. These political circumstances are part of the unofficial saga of academic anthropology and they

constitute the secret knowledge of this society (cf. Bailey 1969). And yet anthropology is not itself a secret society. Hence everyone knows about this saga. Decisions are made which effect lives and works, and some research participants see these decisions as violent:

'Social scientists ought to give communities they study a sense that they are in charge. And that the understandings that come out of them are ones in which they have participated in! And that they will end up with products that they can use. Of course the ethnographer will take away other notes and things that may have a broader application. Nonetheless, they were privately published by the community, the community's copyright, and in no way do they satisfy the kind of constipated evaluative metric that academics use! Now frankly, that is an extremely useful evaluative metric. I am not debunking the values of the academic world. But I want to make it really clear that I operate with a different set of priorities, ones which do not relieve me of rigor or responsibility! But based on the assumptions that there has to be some room on the academic world for people who are committed to providing native people with the things they want, and they are the people we study.'

There is a tension between personal goals and purposes and disciplinary roles. It seems that anthropology as a discourse is not merely constructed at the theoretical level. Often what gets created in theory never makes it as an aspect of the anthropological role, which is, for the most part, institutionally defined.

3.3 Course Media and Curricula

The institutional aspects of textbooks and course content influence the way in which anthropological knowledge is inherited. Along with this, however, the rhetoric of scholarship as a free and reasonable debate of ideas continues. How is one to reconcile material and political constraints with the freedom anthropologists ideally enjoy as member of the community of scholars?

One idea of the ideal of the teacher and rhetorician follows. This may be contrasted with those unnamed examples in the recent quotes. Such persons are seen by some research participants as the general case in anthropology. Cicero's summary of fair and reasonable scholarly debate follows. His ideas contain, however, the germs of scholarly violence and acrimony. These seem to be as old as the academy:

For what remains that is subject to the rules of art, except to begin the speech in such a manner as to win the favor of the audience or to arouse them or to put them in a receptive mood; to set forth the facts briefly, clearly, and reasonably, so that the subject under dispute may be understood; to prove one's case and demolish the adversary's, and to do this not confusedly, but with arguments so conclusive as to prove what is the natural consequence of the principles laid down to prove each point; finally to pronounce a peroration either to inflame or to quench the passion of the audience (Cicero, cited in Nietzsche 1989:107-9[1872-3]).

The naturalization of what Bourdieu and Passeron (1992 [1970]) call a 'cultural arbitrary' is important here. It convinces the realist minded audience that what one is saying is actually a truth. Truth is defined as being about something other than one's speech. It seems that

anthropology uses this form of classical rhetoric in the classroom. It also uses it at conferences, in journal debates, and in textbooks. Even so, this classical ideal of rhetorical argument is accompanied by political violence. Recently, this violence had the effect of denigrating the concept of rhetoric.³ 'Rhetoric' has become opposed to statement of 'fact'.

For anthropologists in this study, the rhetorical devices of the teacher must be evidenced by their research. Such research must be seen as having a basis in what anthropology traditionally defines as the world. Hence, anthropological knowledge can be validly performed only in reference to an object other than itself. Teachers of anthropology cannot remain relativists about their own rhetorical strategy. This is so precisely because the teaching takes place in an accredited institution. This institution has the ability to produce and reproduce disciplinary knowledge. For example, one research participant remembered this process, and was also in the process of rejecting it:

'I think the things that were highlighted were, looking back now, were whatever that person was interested in. So if someone's fieldwork was in Papua-New Guinea then they would talk about Malinowski. If it were somewhere else, then someone else. You see there did not seem to be a sort of schedule to it. There it was more of a local knowledge thing. I was not taught about feminist anthropology. I was not taught about post-modern anthropology. And when it was sort of the from the perspective of 'Oh, this is a really great thing', and no challenge or detail to it. And so I think basically we are taught all this old stuff, which was quite useful. But there was no discussion of the impact on cultures, or indigenous anthropologists, you know, like advocacy anthropology. That had been carried on from generation to generation. Sort of sitting there and hearing about someone's experience, with Evans-Pritchard! This is what anthropology is right now. So I do not think I have been taught anthropology.'

Hence both teachers and their tools of the trade must be regulated. And yet such regulations carry the ethnographer far from Cicero's ideals. For example, there was at least one case of the students regulating course and lecture material. This occurred as a reaction to the institutional view:

'They took a third seminar in sociology, with Smelser and Stinchcombe, which was very interesting because it was the first one that they had seen where the students essentially decided that they would make their own seminar. That is all right to say these days! Where seminars are essentially set up that way. But in those days they certainly were not! And Stinchcombe and Smelser came in, because it was one term, and had a whole bunch of readings and assignments and the students thought no, this is bunk. They had set the course up in terms of the great thinkers, Durkheim, Simmel and others, and this was the time of the student revolution and they said 'to hell with you!' Anyway, how it all happened I do not know because I was away in anthropology and it happened somewhere in the bowels of where sociology resided. And the students demanded Oscar Lewis, and Rainwater, who wrote a book on the working man's world. They wanted down to earth kinds of things. It is an earlier version of 'dead white men'! Which is what is going on now. They did not want the dead white man. They wanted the living white man who had done things like Lewis. So that change was actually made!'

Introducing students to the discipline most often occurs in the context where students do not know enough to question it. Hence this sort of change cannot come from competing discursive knowledge. Introductory pedagogy may be seen as a gradually constricting set of table manners. This manner of teaching is seen as especially important for introductory courses where anthropology perhaps wants to present what it believes to be its best and brightest image. Introductory textbooks are also part of this culture contact:

'Basic textbooks were a very different thing than they are now of course, where we have all the colored photos that are the big thing now. I was just thinking a week or so ago that the basic textbooks that we used you were lucky if you got a drawing. A neat drawing or two and that was it! Now they are all fancy and I think it is kind of a popularization of anthropology in a way. Probably this is true in many disciplines as well. I think textbooks have become glossy things here and there, and a lot more photos. And I guess its a lot more cheaper to publish now. Black and white photos are really reasonable to publish now. But I think probably the price has come down somewhat. I think really with the evolution of the technology it comes about. The evolution of slides are easier to make, and films and that, with T.V. and the video. I think there is a lot more in the way of illustrative material which I think is attractive to people and makes it interesting and so on and so forth. In the past for show-and-tell all you could bring in were a few things that you might have collected.'

Not everyone agrees with this positive account of introductory anthropology textbooks. Nor is it agreed that much has changed in their content. What has changed is their presentation, or performance. In other words, their rhetoric has changed. More interesting is why there has been such a change. There were a number of illuminating comments in this regard:

'My understanding of that is that it is a product of tax law, that when companies started taking inventories, that is when they started putting things out of print. One thing that means is one cannot keep on using the reading list year after year. Not that one would anyway. But it is combination of things going out of print and many books becoming very expensive. And another thing which is, I do not know whether this is sort of crabby old person talk, but you cannot count on many students having a library anymore, whereas you used to be able to count on that. So, the assumption I make with a course would be first and second year undergraduate course is that I have to produce pieces of paper. I have to make pieces of paper accessible to that student to take home.'

Such non-academic institutional constraints limit freedom of scholarly activity and dissemination. In turn, this creates a market for a certain type of discourse. Publishers would rather have something that will sell hundreds of copies rather than dozens:

'I do not really think too much about basic textbooks. But I think they have been more and more watered down gradually, in a way, and more and more popularized... But I think they are keen to impart a visual appeal, which I think is good, as I said. Material culture is interesting and exciting, and can get students really involved. It is fun to look at and it does give you a better feeling as to the images of the people you are talking about. But as we move further along into a seminar we talk less and less about the basic

textbooks. But the problem is that there so many out there, and all the publishers! This is a kind of gripe I have. All the publishers want you to do is write a basic textbook. Because for the publishers that is where they make the big bucks, and the book salesman do not care. They go 'who cares' what I use in that course because I only have thirty students. So I think that is why a lot of the money and a lot of the effort and a lot of the design effort has gone into these books which are only appropriate for really big classes, you see. And that may have driven the market as much as whether we want all these illustrations in our basic textbooks or not.³

The motives for the production of basic textbooks are questioned by these anthropologists. As well, the strategies involving copyright and printing of standard anthropological works used as texts in advanced courses is critiqued:

'I figured that a reading list, that a course outline and a reading list is the core artifact, really, that you produce it the previous spring, the previous term, usually. And then in a way you have done your major piece of pedagogical work until almost the course starts. But by the time you do that, you have tried to find out how available the materials are. Books going out of print makes it difficult. Books having become a lot more expensive. So that is one of the things that has changed. A fat ethnography book used to assignable in a class for which each student would pay 12 dollars. You know, a 300 page long thing. And you cannot do that. That would be 40 dollars or something like that. And if you are operating on the principle that students will not spend that much time in the library, at least in an anthropology course, you cannot assign that book.'

Texts and their availability constrain the reproduction of anthropological knowledge and narrow the horizons of that knowledge. Introductory textbooks are often deemed unimportant for these research participants' construction of both themselves and their discipline. Rather it is texts which never appear in basic textbooks that enable the scholar to think about theories of knowledge reflectively. In introductory textbooks, one is passively presented with watered down versions of epistemologies.

The Ciceronian resonance can ring hollow in the ideals of some anthropologists. This may be so because the process of educating their students is limited in so many ways. Compare the high ideals of the following with the unfortunate realities of the successive quote:

'You know the longer I have been at this the more I am convinced that you cannot be a great teacher for long. You might be a great performer, but you cannot be a really significant teacher if you do not do some research. And I do not mean just a little bit, you have to have an interest that makes you think. That makes you get surprised. That makes you discover because that is what you are trying to breed in students! And to inspire them in such a way that they find that the way they look at the material will expose them to. Or when you show them a new reading of it or new interpretations of it and guide them towards other things. They will continue to be surprised, occasionally shocked, pleased. But just essentially astonished, over and over and over again by what you are setting up for them, instead of becoming cynical or predictable or any of those things. And social science

can have a teaching attitude that stresses ability and control that eventually lead to cynicism about human beings and the world.'

The generalizing spirit of this quote is put in daily confrontation with the formal aspects of institutional settings:

'Speaking of constraints, what I was able to do by persuading enough people that they should were to get the course schedule to one and a half hours long for advanced and introductory so that I could show movies. Because most of the courses are one hour or three fifty minute slots, and you are constantly fighting the fact that you are giving them 58 minute pieces of T.V. And then you never start on time, finish on time, and people are shuffling out. So the only way I can make that work is with the one and a half hour. Fit them into the 90 minute slots. If students sense that you are spending a lot of time on something they see as marginal, especially at the beginning of the course, they figure you are wasting time and they lose interest in it. So the placing of the films and the use of that is a little delicate. And if you have done it, its very time consuming because you have to get all the material, see it yourself.'

Students must already be rhetorically convinced that the discourse is worthwhile. As well, they must believe professors are good representers of it. It often takes a long time to accomplish both of these ends. Finally, research participants suggest the graduating student is left with a certain kind of knowledge of the discipline. Perhaps some feel this may be little more than what the marketed publishing limitations allow. Some anthropologists, it seems, can be unwitting victims of their own ideals. For example, certain epistemological ideals are kept continually in print. These are also excerpted and summarized for introductory textbooks. They are presented as givens in ethnographic films and videos. They are cited as evidential arguments in lectures.

Students may also be unwitting victims of their professors' ideals. These might include an idea of the best way to learn and teach. Some research participants remembered these events as influencing their own pedagogy. As well, these ideals influenced how they would, or would not, construct anthropological knowledge in their terms:

'We had a course here that was a methodology and in that course we had to deal with different societies. Well, he was not quite a nasty character. He was really a very fine man, and I considered him one of my mentors. But what he decided he would do in having us interview was we had to construct an interview and he got us someone to interview. And he was going to sit over this barrier, double sided, and listen to the interview! And he had given us a woman whom he had coached to just be horrible to us! She reversed the interview and interviewed us. She was not going to answer questions. That was an awful way to teach us!'

Yet the teaching of anthropology does change over time. Students react in various ways to how they themselves have been schooled. This thread is part of a larger tapestry that connects the pedagogy and knowledge construction of anthropology to its own disciplinary history.

3.4 The Changing Institution

As well, the general commentary by research participants on the history of anthropological institutions limits the knowledge available concerning pedagogy, as one research participant suggested,

'For example, Steward was at Columbia for three years, and it was the center of everything at the time. Hence the career of cultural ecology got a huge boost. So the institutional position is at least as important as the intellectual position. How some changes may have been manifested were like at the AAA meetings even until 1960. There were no separate meetings. So everyone went to everything and kept up with the four areas. But now that is just not viable because perhaps less so of intellectual quality of anthropologists, but just the sheer amount of work. The incredible growth of the discipline and the academy in general during this period is the big influence.'

Boas was perhaps both the first and last omniscient scholar in American anthropology. His legacy of study, however, resonates through most of the major graduate schools on the continent. As well, a host of minor schools are indebted to it. Boasianism represents an ideal of what a kind of anthropology might be. Anthropology has an official history of great schools and persons. This history has seen a rapid expansion of the discipline. In spite of this, however, most research participants preferred their own experience of that institutional growth. Because things are so big now, what appears as a much larger discipline, is in practice and in individual intellect much smaller:

'It is networks of people who are in contact with each other who are chiefly thinking they are bringing about some kind of change. They define a world of good guys and bad guys. They are the good guys. They try to form alliances with some other people slightly more powerful. There is a dynamic to it which is, I imagine, the dynamic of relations in academic disciplines in relatively prosperous countries which at least pretend to a relatively democratic organization.'

These more intimate contacts seem to result not in an openness but something more inbred. The nuances of violence associated with the prestige hierarchies in the academy are important to its reproduction. As well, sources of potential prestige have reproductive influence. Funding agencies,⁴ or journal committees for example:

'It is in the conservatism, you know, that our discipline is no different than anything else. You know there are the elders who will be fairly conservative, and they also tend to be fairly influential in power. So you know you end up having to buck the system, I guess. And they will take swipes at you because they will be on the boards of journals and they will be the ones on the boards of granting agencies and stuff like that. I mean that is how individualism in the discipline is homogenized, right? I mean you try to write an article and submit it to a journal and try to do something different, right? And you get slammed for it. So what do you do? You need a job so you need some publications. Or you want a promotion so you need more publications. So you often give in. Change your article to put it back into the

mainstream. That is how it works. That is how the system works, unfortunately. It is not easy to buck it.'

It was also suggested a few institutions have monopolies on the production of scholars who would in turn occupy the positions in all other accredited institutions. This also led to problems in terms of inbreeding. Both knowledge and the scope of the discipline are affected. In North America, one research participant suggested such monopolies looked like this:

'I do not know what it is. I know what it is associated with in personality terms. It is also often associated with British training in social anthropology in the sense that they are schooled very much, and more traditionally they are an older generation than what you get here, in the cut and thrust of debate. Some of the more American trained people are superficially pleasant, but behind the scenes they are not. This may be worse because you do not know where it is coming from! Exactly. It does not leave much. And in smaller market areas also worse, as we see in Canada, with the people who went to Toronto or McGill or U.B.C., the big training grounds.'

How anthropology within the English speaking university system created its major alliances and monopolies is of great interest. The inbreeding and monopolization of teaching positions must have an influence on knowledge construction in anthropology. Such culture traits were also of interest to some of the research participants in this study:

'I have done a fair bit of reading on the 19th century in the U.S.A. in the period of American university reform. In the 1880s and the 1890s and around the turn of the century when the modern university as we know it was being invented. The format of regarding the profession as having a research component as well as a teaching component, the beginning of stressing research over teaching, having separate graduate programs, the professional training of graduate students, having facilities for graduate students, to back their research, all of that was new in North America and even relatively new in Britain. It was a German and French invention. The Prussian bureaucracy did say to von Humboldt, 'Do it!' Right, and he did. And not only to von Humboldt. And even in the United States the significant deans in the East at the time of university expansion they had very strong sort of evolutionist connections, or were doing amateur anthropology or something. So we are sort of there as an emergence and this relationship between Americans seeming to go their own way and then being defined by others as sort of benighted.'

Historically, there is a very deep seated sense of monopolization. Just as importantly, research participants discussed the mundane aspects of the institutional context of anthropological knowledge, tending not to emphasize general theoretical positions. Research participants also did not emphasize epistemological ideas. Instead, personalist accounts of particular events are seen as paradigmatic. First person accounts are possible because so much of anthropological knowledge is itself based on story-telling. The idea that anthropology is an oral culture maintains certain forms and formulae of how one becomes an anthropologist. One research participant regarded the mass of differentiating oral memories of anthropological history as grounds to discuss anthropologies, in the plural:

'Well there is not a single anthropology, so that is a hard question. For me, well I work in what I call the Americanist tradition. This is based primarily on studying the native peoples of this continent by people who have done it in a kind of way that has a lot to do with language and symbolic form. And it is less behaviorist than say British Social Anthropology. More textual and more emphasis on the words of research participants and on this stuff called interaction with people. And it is very different too. It seems that national traditions are not so important. And so within that tradition I think there is what calls a 'rhetoric of continuity' that is we all say that this is something upon which one builds. That has a history. And although we surely do not do some of the things that your predecessors did, you also do some of the things that they did. A sort of clearing the way for investigating the same matters now. So in that sense there is this continuity.'

Some of the passions in the preceding quote can be linked with the concept of vocation. Vocation may, however, wax and wane in anthropology according to opportunity. Perhaps the more romantic idea that it is suffering that produces culture and art has an influence as well. Regardless, the following was also typical in a differing way. A different kind of cycle or break is recounted. This particular example was commented on by many of the interviewed group:

'There is another kind of rupture there between the inside and the outside. And a lot of this came to a head in 1971 in the AAA debate on the role of anthropologists in the Vietnam War. And people were crying and shouting because there were accusations being made about friends, and whatever. And there are scars and wounds, whatever, to this day for the people who were there and remember it. That was not the way anthropology to me looked as an undergraduate! In the late 1950s, when the things of the world we were talking about were distant. They were not in the classroom. We were talking in the classroom of things that were far away. And they seemed less far away in the late 60s, and really less far away during the sit ins and the strikes and whatever which were led by anthropologists. There was the gang at the University of Michigan, Eric Wolf, Marshall Sahlins. Some of those people were very instrumental in organizing the resistance movements to the Vietnam War.'

Many anthropologists worked for the American government in espionage capacities during this period. Perhaps obviously, what was judged important was not the epistemology that one used as an agent for Central Intelligence, but the fact that you were or were not an agent.

In retrospect, these events have a larger than life ring to them. Privileging one's own generation's experience seems inevitable. Being enamored with one's own experiences may be universal. The manner in which historical narrative is set up by these anthropologists is part of the very institution of anthropology.

Another research participant agreed that this historical narrative may expose and highlight the boundaries of post-positivist terms such as 'auto-affection' and 'auto-privilege'. There is, however, a positivistic caveat to this. An example may be seen at the end of this quote:

'I think internal fieldwork is a reflection of the increasing reality of economics and logistical factors, decreased funding and such. In a sense, there is a tension here of which I am aware too of anthropology expecting itself not to change within its own changing institutional context. In terms of construction of anthropological knowledge there is both science, if you will, and political accruing of prestige and cultural and social capital. The limitations of the discourse might be working both ways. Any disciplinary endeavor must have these boundaries, and also perhaps must overcome them if such endeavors are to continue. They are a part of a field in Bourdieu's sense, a discursive field. These are gradually institutionalized by in fact becoming seemingly more autonomous and discursively bounded. The notion or just the fact that these are different is very important in the consciousness that politics and science are ongoing and in tension. I like very much the idea of breaking down the barriers between for example sociology and anthropology. Another local example here of this cross-fertilization of ideas is in cultural studies. But I find that if we get a group of those who are not well grounded in any one particular discipline we tend to get into a very mushy soup!'

Generations of anthropologists may telescope historical memory. Some events seem larger than life and not part of the present from the vantage point of students. This may in turn create problems for the teaching of anthropology. This author has, for example, no biographical memory of events which are of extreme importance for many research participants. Even so, there were other kinds of perennial events that might be more familiar to contemporary students:

'Almost all my friends wound up swimming in the tenuous stream as opposed to the tenure stream. If they were lucky, or maybe they were not even lucky if they did this, moving from one partial appointment to another. Where they taught their brains out, and had no access to research, or graduate students or anything else. Some of the fortunate ones, and some of the ones with a little more talent who were also fortunate, got three year post-docs with the North America post-doctoral fellow program. And they wrote books if they were good at it, and articles and did a little teaching. And so fiscally minded persons, or small minded ones had an influence. Well let me pause here. A lot of universities do their hiring, if you do this on a scale of ten, it is threes hiring fives at best. And when they run into an eight or a nine, man they head for a hole! They are scared as to what is going to happen. They feel inadequate. And they invent all kinds of reasons, spurious ones, to not hire the person.'

Hiring procedures also have a direct effect on what aspects of discourse get inherited, produced or reproduced. These effects are not generally documented. Their influence is all the more direct when economic constraints are more forceful.

3.5 The Changing Knowledge of Anthropologists

The institution is a major influence on the receding of positivist doctrine in anthropology. There seems to have been a gradual loss of faith in the goodness of and beneficent progress of science. This occurred after the end of the Second World War. It was due in large part to the advent of atomic weaponry. Later on environmental devastation was noted as a factor. This degradation of science was thought by some research participants to be

part of the story of a critical anti-positivism. This critique may have transformed itself into a post-positivist epistemological movement. Yet within these movements, there could be a characteristic lack of knowledge about the manner in which science works.

As well, the practice of science was not well defined. Not until Latour and Woolgar (1977) do we find any concerted and detailed attempt to understand scientists in the field. They attempt such an understanding by an ethnographic account. Scientists in their cultural context are described. This context, however, is not divorced from knowledge about the content of science. One cannot simply write an ideology critique of science. One anthropologist suggested there was a distinct lack of ideological will to propose science as a viable manner of knowledge. This atmosphere was aided and abetted by the decrease in public school education in the sciences. It was fashionable to critique positivisms of all kind. This critique occurred without realizing that many scientists (and social scientists) did not necessarily ascribe to the doctrines of positivism. Few critics made a distinction between scientism and positivism. Confusion and ignorance could be the only result. For example,

'What happened to science and scientists in that period would be part of the story. I mean part of the story if you are looking at the change of something moving through the 60s and 70s right up to the present, was the overwhelming significance of the fear of nuclear destruction. And that became a sort of metaphor for what happens when you rely on science too much. Science is scary not only in its content but in its future and its self-delusionary quality. And anthropology has always been critical. And certainly people in these elites saw themselves as being critical people, good at making better interpretations of what other people do than they do themselves. Very arrogant. That is one part of it I do not like very much. And as scientists they were doing that to people. Telling them that their thinking was wrong, immoral, and whatever. And then they shifted a little bit into the anti-scientists and the anti-nuclear movement. So the position of science and scientists in the post second world war world was changing quite rapidly. And the other side of it I think is that people knew less about science the people in our field. That the educational systems that we ourselves during that period had been brought up in some cases had less direct scientific knowledge. So people were talking about science without really having it. They found that you could talk about science and almost get a little of the legitimacy of science by being against it.'

It is possible that this cultural milieu shunned positivism. Anything that looked like positivism might be critiqued. Theories of knowledge do not collapse on their own. Perhaps they do not ever collapse completely. For example, some research participants identified themselves as interpretive or post-positive. Yet, as stated before, they continued to believe in positivistic method.

The gradual denigration of science education seems important in the demise of positivism. As well, anthropologists in this study suggested another important and unfortunate change during this same period. This was felt to be the general lack of basic scholarly ability to learn in their students. Year in and year out, faculty found that they had to work harder to get students to learn. They had to start slower. They also started at what was called a 'lower level'. As well, fewer and fewer students were so-called 'self-starters': 'The biggest single problem is that students cannot really read. They have a low reading ability. They do not read very much anyway. Language of many texts is too difficult. So by the process of

elimination, we come up with more and more shallow booklists. We also have to watch out for stuff not 'politically correct.' For some research participants, the more shallow the course outline and its readings meant that students learnt less and less over time. The course outline was referred to by most as the biggest single piece of pedagogic work before entering the classroom. This trend also has something to do with the format of textbooks. Perhaps what publishers keep in print is also an influence. This cultural swirl is not necessarily conscious. Even so, it can be self-supporting. In the meantime, research participants suggest a process of impoverishment. This occurs in the education and inheritance of anthropological constructions of knowledge. As well, market pressures and political ideologies may not suit the traditional concept of a liberal arts education. These pressures force students to listen to certain ideas. These ideas are also heard in certain structures:

'Our acting Dean for a while said it was just unbelievable the kinds of complaints people are bringing to Deans and to Chairmen and so on and so forth. So the course outline has to be even more so of a contract. And we protect it at all costs against any kind of anxieties that the students feel. It has to be very, very clear as to how students will be graded and how they will be tested. And the chair of the department has to have a copy of all course outlines. Or at least have them available to them. So the university as an institution has been gradually, I guess, more receptive to student anxiety. And it is certainly good in a way. I mean it is excellent that students initially know just exactly what is going on and what is wrong. I mean people used to come in and ask, and we were very flippant. You know you will get a grade sometime, but let's forget about all these things. That is not fair I think for students.'

This author has personally encountered these issues with my own students. The contractual nature of a documented agreement is not, as this research participant agrees, really the problem. The problems begin when students are pressured by institutional contexts both inside and outside the academy to learn in a certain manner. These manners of learning tend towards certain, and perhaps constricting, goals. Exam learning is an instance of this. Research participants suggested one must try to ameliorate this pedagogically. Yet this cannot be taken too far. One research participant was critical of possible 'disingenuous' attempt at democratization in the classroom, because

'In a sense it takes away from this air of expertise that people like to parade around with, that is why! You know the whole idea of reflexivity is important in this kind of thing. But even reflexivity when you look at it is not as self-critical as it could be or as it should be. Right now reflexivity in anthropology suggests that you should situate yourself within your research. Within the ethnography you are a human being. How did you feel when you were being told this? How did you feel being told that? I think that it has to go much further than that. You have to have a good discussion on bias and interpretation as part of the process of reflexivity. We tend not to do that because it does effect our ability to establish ourselves as authority figures. In fact, it is saying I am not an authority. And this becomes a problem because anthropologically if you are not an authority than why are you writing this, and why should I read this?! And why should we pay attention to you?'

Authority can be ameliorated by downplaying the purely descriptive historical or statement character of the discourse. Grading students on different media can also help. For example:

'Tell the students that it does not really matter if they have not read all of them because I have not either. And they are not reading for examinations. They should read it not for that point of view. They do not have to read it from the point of view of well 'I am going to be tested on this'. They are reading it from the point of view of 'I am writing an essay' on a little part of this and in another couple of weeks I will be writing another one, and so on. And they have to know enough to be able to do that by reading the stuff and talking to me and talking to each other hopefully. But they are not being examined on, even like 'Who was E.B. Tylor'? Even though I would expect them to know this when we talk about him in the classroom'.

One must also make various pedagogical and institutionally constrained assumptions about student's motives. Why is this student taking anthropology? What do they want to know? How is anthropology relevant to this life? All of this is a far cry from the atmosphere of most research participants' experiences as students. Ironically, many research participants saw the devaluation of the teacher-student relationship to knowledge begin:

'At that time faculty were actually frightened of student demands. Students would demand something. You had better see to it. Otherwise you would have demonstrations. They would have sit in. This was during the time when you would have women come to class and breast feed their babies! So it was a very, very different scene from what was happening now. And people went to class without shoes. And I can tell you I never ever did this! But it was the usual thing, especially in large undergraduate classes'.

The student may not be there merely to quest after knowledge for its own sake. Nor, on the other extreme, is the student always there to get a job. Research participants felt somewhat at a loss to explain student rationale. Yet they all agreed that such rationales for most students seemed to have changed radically.

At that time it was the students themselves who were radical. Now the radical constraints upon students have prompted them to toe the most conservative line. Along with this, one's expectations of what students know and do not know have changed. This occurred against the will of certain anthropologists. Some surprises await both beginning and veteran faculty in the give and take of classroom dialogue:

'The reason why people take a particular course in a particular time or a particular place is not a function of my sense of the time line of going to the first through the fourth year. Some take the first year course after they take the fourth year course! So one of the differences in the teaching between the early time of my teaching and now, though I think the same thing would be true now in any large institution, is that the sense of accumulation in a course program is difficult to presuppose. We could do it if we wanted to. We could do what some of the languages do and make extremely rigid requirements. But we also choose not to do that. On the assumption that we would be cutting our own throats and whatever it is we do it is not just creating anthropology majors. We want to make courses accessible to those who did not decide when they entered university that they wanted to be an

anthropology major. But that is the dilemma. On the one hand there is an accumulation model to be worked with. And then there is also a democratic populist model to work with. And they do not work together to well. But we also operate on the assumption that it is the student's problem and not ours! And when I can take off from the assumption that they are interested in anthropology I do not have to define or persuade them that it is an important subject, which is one's major job in a first year course, because it is not a subject that people tend to know very much about. And what they do know about it tends to be wrong. You are establishing the legitimacy of the discipline's subject matter, is what you are doing in a way that I do not think you do in chemistry or physics, or math.'

This structural dilemma is only part of the problem. What was seen as necessary to cultivate a sense of disciplinary knowledge in anthropology students was also critiqued. A lot of courses interconnected and graduated on an accumulative assumption might make an anthropology major. Yet others things must be sacrificed. One of the more important sacrifices was the notion of breadth of knowledge. This in turn effects content knowledge. It also effects the awareness of epistemological concerns. This is so because most of these concerns developed outside of anthropology. Lack of theoretical awareness seems to lessen the potential for students passion for learning in general:

'I do not think compared to any one person, for a lot of them were quite keen and quite interested and many of them were as good as a lot of the fourth year students and so on. Of course they bring diverse backgrounds. That is what I always sort of liked about anthropology and what I feel we have lost. You know just with the kind of structured program. A student comes along and wants to be a graduate student. They have to do at least two years or more to get the kind of background that we want to accept them into the program. Which means it gets quite inbred. The only people that are accepted are those that have done nothing but anthropology! Which I really do not approve of. But that is the way things are in this particular area.'

This structured institutional approach to learning continues in graduate school. It becomes even more competitive. As well, research participants thought that this too had changed over time. Perhaps it was not always the case. Some research participants disagreed with these changes. The intimacy of former incarnations of famous (and now much larger) anthropological institutions was seen as sacrificed. This difference was also an oft mentioned change. It was seen as having a direct effect on the specialization of learning. This was also seen as the irony of learning more and knowing less:

'When I was there they had only seven or eight or so. And that was a big Ph.D. program! They had a physical anthropologist and a linguist and a couple of archaeologists and a couple of cultural anthropologists who taught undergraduate and graduate courses. For students who wanted to do a graduate course you added on an extra paper or something like that. And you were working on a lot of archaeology and that sort of thing. And that was a big program! And as you know of course, and as I am sure other people have told you, things have changed quite a bit in that sense, I suspect.'

The second period of university expansion in North America saw the availability of employment correspondingly grow. How did this effect the relationship of anthropologists to their knowledge?

Q: I wanted you to maybe comment on the old idea that is anthropology more than the sum of its parts? How it might be more than that?

'Oh my! Well, we certainly have the notion that a department in the United States should do a little of this and a little of that. And if you get one more job most departments will look for someone who does something they do not have yet! Well, and I certainly lived through a period of one of those wild expansions. There were five people already hired the year I arrived and I think nineteen when I left! Most of that happened in the first seven years. So you are thinking about this and well 'Okay, one more position, well what are we going shopping for this time!' I do not know. I think some might identify with the profession. I think the strongest thing about anthropology is that you can change your mind about what it is you do. Even five years ago. And although people may say they are not interested in it, they almost never say 'that is not anthropology.'

There were tradeoffs involved in expansion. Even so, these would not necessarily be felt by individuals as they pursued careers at various institutions. Some research participants suggested this was due to the feeling that anthropology had a great opportunity to expand the scope of human knowledge. There were more of its practitioners about. There must in turn be more knowledge about culture. Instead, for some, what occurred was a specialization of knowledge. This created in and out-groups of scholars. These groups did not have the time to communicate with one another. Such communication would have been about more general issues. Amongst these issues would be epistemology and theories of knowledge. Other disciplines have in-groups of scholars devoted to these issues. Anglo-analytic philosophy is one example. Anthropology has never had this advantage. The flux of positivism and post-positivism in anthropology may in part be due to this. No single group has authority or is the source of epistemology.

This lack of epistemological awareness is only noticed later in one's career. It is noticed in a form not necessarily of theoretical reflection. Nor does it force attendant pedagogical action. It tends to be recounted as a narrative history of changes in institutional contexts:

'There was never any question looking back from the vantage point of the present of getting a job. It was not an issue at that time. Of course there were jobs. This was the period of the great American University expansion as it was in Britain and in Canada. Except a little later. And, of course you will get a job. So, maybe not a well paying job, you know, but, well at least there was a path to employment and that was not an issue. And research funds. That was never an issue. That there was not a great amount of research funds. But that there would at least be some research funds because the funding of the National Institutes of Health was becoming into line as well as the National Science Foundation. So this was the beginning of the flush period in American anthropology, right, when hopeful students could enter the discipline. They can bet a relatively comfortable and interesting academic based career could lay in the other end.'

It was also easier to market oneself in the period of university expansion. The assumptions of one's employers could be quite different. Research participants often paused in their recapitulation of their time looking for a job. They also included in their reflections memories about when they themselves hired others. These reflections occurred especially when these anthropologists thought about changing characteristics of job applicants over time.

Institutionally wrought changes also have had another effect. The way anthropology reflects on its own epistemological changes has changed. One could argue there has been a basic lack of reflection on epistemology and its potential shifts. This might mean that in the culture of certain anthropologists there has not been a shift. Shifts or fluxes in theories of knowledge construction cannot occur in a cultural vacuum. The employment market in anthropology in part reflects disciplinary interest or lack thereof in epistemological or theoretical issues. Yet the teaching of anthropology must continue. How it does so is the subject in the back of every employer's and candidate's minds:

'I think things were more general at the time, if somebody studied here in North America who can focus on ethnography. And someone who is ambivalent is good too, because they can teach sort of a general introductory course. There was an introductory course I was doing and it was an interdisciplinary kind of course that everyone had to contribute to. This was kind of interesting. And I guess I saw myself as a general anthropologist. So I think the market was such for a more general anthropologist. Only recently have students begun graduating with degrees and specializing, and saying 'Well I cannot really teach an introductory course, I only teach these certain courses in the syllabus'. And we scratch our heads and say 'Well, what do these people know after all'. Really! But earlier on, if there was a job, you sort of tailored what you could do to it. And of course in the meantime we taught it. So of course as we have already said, the programs were not so highly structured as they are now. And what you could teach was more varied. Usually it was just people who could do a general course. And not near as specialized as they are now. The discipline increased in size of course. And with this increase in size came more bodies, more anthropologists. So there were more people looking for things to study and got fascinated with specific areas I suppose. And with more people and more time to commit, you know, it just increased its levels of specialization. Just as the nation state is more complex than living in a band or a tribe or whatever. And I guess that happened in anthropology too, in that sense.'

The anthropological analogy comes precisely from this self-same period of university expansion. One might speculate if the neo-evolutionists were speaking more about their own culture than of small to medium scale societies. Some research participants suggested discomfort about their own growth. The important thing for some natives was the effect it might have on disciplinary integrity and intimacy:

'I realized that during the last time I went to a very big academic meeting. The American Anthropological Association of course. I flew there on public monies in order to give a paper. I listened to lots and lots of papers that I found unrelentingly boring, and should never have been presented publicly. Along with lots of others that were extremely good of course! And I realized as I was riding up the escalator passing 350 people coming down all of

whom had Anthropological Association 'Hi, I am so and so!'. None of whom I knew, that I was diminished by being in this atmosphere. Where there were literally thousands of people who did the same thing I did whom I did not know! I realized that I probably was not going to go to any more of those big mega-conferences because I felt it was taking myself seriously in a way that I was not really comfortable doing.'

The institutional culture of anthropology and other disciplines did not abate in its pressure on faculty. Part of this pressure concerned their abilities to teach. Research participants suggested the pressures got even more complex over time. The following is one account of this institutional context of disciplinary inheritance. It took place at a famous Ivy league university. This institution's rhetoric of the value of education was well known. Yet such rhetoric turned out to be equal only to its ruthless administrative policies. These policies concerned hiring and firing of faculty. The university also had an equally arrogant expectation of those it had previously hired:

'The university handled, I think, the Vietnam war situation very badly. They were rather crude and nasty at some points when they did not need to be. I mean it made the environment a lot less pleasant for the students and for the more progressive faculty than they had to. It was incompetence. It was not really political. I mean, it was reactionary! And they were also seeing down the line that they were going to institute a system that given the fact that they saw money beginning to dry up. To institute a system more like Harvard and Yale. Where you hired people into the university in a junior position and the assumption was that one out of four would stay. But that to me was not a problem. I had tenure there. But the plan for the future was one in which the administration, much against our protests, but they were doing this to the university as a whole, said that they were going to introduce this new system in which it was like one out of four. And a number of us decided that we could not live with that. That was no way to run a university!! And that fact that they did it a Harvard and Yale was not a legitimating factor for us! So over a two or three year period we all left.'

Yet more and more institutions began to operate under just these assumptions. Those who were hired into them at a junior position must also have made different assumptions. What do these kinds of pressures do to the quality of teaching anthropology? What do they do to its reflective capability? The building of personal political alliance networks does not occur without expense. It may occur at the expense of studying, writing, thinking, and working with students. This is bound to have a direct effect on scholarship. Certain areas like epistemology and theory are influenced in this manner. Faced with a limited amount of time, people tend to stick with what they already know. They expand in directions which they have already explored as safe bets for publishing. They do this in order to present themselves as job-worthy in this self-same system. Anthropology seems to have hired for a lengthy period based on culture area expertise. Hence, theoretical concerns might remain in the background. They would remain so for lengthy periods in individual careers. They might appear at the tail end of one's institutional journey. In the end, this appearance may have a remedial quality.

Furthermore, the employment situation currently is not what it was. There will be no tendency to ameliorate any seen theoretical vacuum. This is so even if more positions are based on theoretical work.

'Looking at anthropology as primarily an academic based institution which it is in terms of numbers. And that is not likely to change say in the next ten years, anyways. As to what universities and other places are going to look like what are the economies like. What are the universities like? The situation that created the opportunity for people like me to do what I do was a certain period of university expansion. This was preceded by a period of much larger expansion. So what I would want to know in answering that question would be how that is going to look over the ten, fifteen, or twenty years, and so I really do not know! Probably not good. But you know on the other hand, it so easy to say not good. There is no money. There are no jobs. A few more years and it will all be over. That may or may not be the case.'

This brings up the question of just what is a university about? There are conflicting reports on this topic from anthropologists in this study and elsewhere. Sapir sarcastically opined:

That an individual possesses the bachelor's degree may or may not prove that he knows, or once knew, something about Roman history and trigonometry. The important thing about his degree is that it helps him to secure a position which is socially or economically more desirable than some other position which can be obtained without the aid of this degree. Society has misgivings about the function of specific items in the educational process and has to make atonement by inventing such notions as the cultivation of the mind (Sapir 1949:567[1934]).

This seems to be part of what university education is about. Perhaps the recent call for relevance of academic knowledge to the outside world makes this aspect more important. Yet this can be contrasted with the following comments from this study. These suggest that both personal and scholarly skills can indeed assure better understanding of the general society. They can help one's coping with the whole gamut of human employment experience:

'Having discovered the issue of a good friend and the excitement of committee work which got me to know people in other disciplines very, very well, your phone starts ringing and you start talking to people all over campus. Not simply sticking your head in one of your neighbor's doors when you cannot stand it anymore! And you want to talk to someone. These two things have quite changed it for me. And even though if somebody had told me at the beginning of my career that I would spend thirty-five years in the same job I would have told them they were crazy! I am now absolutely delighted to be doing that after twenty-five years here. You know the folklore and you know the gossip. You remember the history. And you become a senior member. And that is a very, very pleasant thing to happen!'

Sometimes the university can change from the bottom up. Sometimes such changes are taught to the ground floor of the student career:

'What university is about, is about helping people learn how to think critically. And there are lots of ways you can do that. You can do that by adopting a kind of informed skepticism as a positivist. Even a Popperian

person teaching in a psychology department in experimental design would tackle this approach. I think which is the notion of skepticism, of an informed skepticism while constantly trying to test things out. I may disagree with their findings end of it, that they have actually discovered what they think they have, or negated what they think they have. But the approach is still a critical sense. And one of the major problems that students come to us with, and that society has as a whole that is, they cannot think critically. In that they cannot postulate an explanation other than the first one that comes to mind. If you ask them how someone else would explain that, they would, say, 'Well if I was someone else, then I would not be me, and I would not know', you know!'

These ideals may be noble. Even so, for others it still comes down to institutional opportunity. The transmission of these ideals in and as education must be afforded by such an opportunity. Such ideals may run counter to institutional ideology. They are all the less likely to find a home in that same institutional context. As this research participant implied, it is up to the teachers of these ideals and ways of thinking to translate them effectively. This translation should bear no loss of potential radicalism. Such ideas can be transported into contexts which are accepted by other institutions and political ideologies. Opportunities for this may or may not improve in the future. Yet most research participants saw little doubt in the notion that change was inevitable. The pattern of such change might even be cyclical:

'I think that what we say as much as what we do quite frankly will be a function of who has the opportunity to say something. And who has the opportunity to do something in a particular place in a particular time. And I do not know where that going to be. If it is going to be at Harvard or if it is going to be at a place like Calgary, there will be a difference in what people are going to be saying. You cannot predict what that difference will be but there will be a difference. So the university world is too unsettled as well as the world in which it is located. There may be institutional changes happening which are in a way reminiscent of the post-war period.. Just look at the discipline after World War II, and the scope of the difficulties different parts of the world are in is at least about the same.'

Knowledge of the entire human condition can be overwhelming. The evils seen during the period this research participant discusses necessitated optimism. This optimism can be seen directly reflected in an edited volume at the start of this period (Linton 1947[1945]). There is a doomsday introduction written in August of 1944. The Second World War reached a peak of allied effort at this time. Yet the dedication reads: "To all those who have applied the techniques of science to the solving of human problems" (Linton 1947 frontispiece [1945]). Could such a dedication be written today?⁵

Some research participants spoke of the currently perceived crisis in more casual tones. And yet there was still some menace:

'When our dean, who said in reply to me saying the 'Well, the university has had 800 good years, maybe that is over', the dean said, 'Well, the age of reason has had 400 good years, maybe then that's had it too!' But I can face that with some personal equanimity at least, I will be retired by then!'

Dark humor has replaced optimism for some anthropologists. Some research participants were born and bred into an era when the assumptions were that the university was about to come of age. Certainly the idea that it was about to disappear did not occur. There may be analogous limits to theories of knowledge. These may reach their heights of explanations exactly when they find their limits. There seems to be a shadowed area regarding epistemology which not even the most astute critics can access:

'Once again, in the educational system the people who most need to change - say in terms of a broader educational pedagogy and learning, the real practice of educators - their conception of cultural capital, are in fact those the least likely to change. For example, when the continental icons are invited over here, you know they are also wined and dined and put on a pedestal! So there is some jealousy over this in terms of people saying 'Why should we change just because he or she says so?'. But on the other hand, there is not much serious critique of these people. Like Bourdieu and Derrida for example. Because most of the criticism is motivated by jealousy or other things like that! Yet even Bourdieu (1984) is working within the system he exposes so well.'

Perhaps this residue of mystery helps the social scientist keep working. Yet we should leave the last word to another extract. This one discusses the institutional milieu. As well, its manners of professionalization are commented upon. This statement is neither malicious nor sarcastic. It is neither humorous nor critical. It looks at the institution not philosophically, but anthropologically:

'Professionalization is not a book of rules or a constitution or a code of ethics. But it is certain aspects of that hundred year history that we either choose to keep or are stuck with. The way institutions are structured. The way our work is put together. The kind of moral stances we tend to take. Those are sort of attributes of that hundred years. That hundred years of not quite solitude! And so that is my approach to presenting the profession as a as something that we all share a relationship to. And that is why I spend so much of that time dealing with issues of that sort in introductory courses. Because there is that. And students sometimes at the first year level find that kind of discussion delegitimizing it does not incite them to further thinking. But it sort of says 'Well, you know, if you do not know what you are doing, maybe who does? Why are you there?' And so in first year you need to establish your authority in the classroom. Which I do not find a problem! But then you cannot then delegitimize that authority by dwelling too much on the stupidities of either the past or the present. Because there is sort of still with the nature of the profession I find it to me there is this anthropological question. There are the institutions, the ideologies, and the agencies, and whatever. And to put that out on the table and say these are the parts I see. That compose what we consider to be a profession.'

There may be opportunities in the institution for radical critique. This critique can be directed at anthropology. As well, it may be directed against the reproduction of knowledge in general. The taking of such an opportunity is perhaps a movement towards an anthropological praxis. This praxis is not strictly positivist. It is also not strictly post-positivist. Even so, one would first have to subvert the very history of recent anthropological theory as it tells itself its own story.

4. CONCLUSION

It is not surprising that anthropologists were able to designate the social factors which led to the construction of not only their own personal reputations as scholars within a specific discipline, but as well the reputations and careers of certain anthropological ideas or leitmotifs. The resistance to turning the ethnographic or sociological lense towards themselves is ameliorated by the claims anthropologists make regarding the ethical nobility of their vocations. Whatever petty tribulations may exist in the academy, the field, or elsewhere, anthropologists in this study justified their determination in negotiating such travails by the sense that theirs was a calling higher than many of the other sciences and humanities. This was so because anthropology has both traditionally been a discursive outsider to the enlightenment project, but as well, and perhaps ironically, it fleshes out that project with the newfound perspective of the true universality of humanity. Kant's 'anthropologie' aside, the claims of the universal a prioris were shown by anthropology to be cultural in nature, and sometimes local in understanding. What the paradox of 'human nature' is most aptly reflected in the paradoxes of the work of anthropologists within an institutional system that chiefly tolerates such sometimes intrusive perspective, and treats its denizens with a mild disdain that can only reiterate the disciplinary and educational boundaries that these anthropologists have known and discussed so well.

Notes:

1. Indeed, some much more trivial instances of institutional influence on a person's career can be counted as well. 'The gratificatory propaganda from the big schools put me off, and I ended up going to a much lesser known place because they were far more personal and approachable'.
2. This association goes back to the earliest organized universities in the west: "Marcus Aurelius establishes two public schools, a philosophical one and a rhetorical one, the first with four departments..... each with two main representatives, and the second with two thronoi - sophistic and political disciplines. The professors received 10,000 drachmas per year. Later the number of teachers was raised to six. By the Emperor's will the name sophist was returned to honor. An extraordinary competition ensues. The main effort of the great rhetors, besides their school-teaching, was to gain a reputation for brilliant extemporizing, in order to move their pupils to stormy applause, for instance in competition with outside visitors." (Nietzsche 1989:239[1872-3]).
3. Yet, Bourdieu and Passeron suggest such memories of our schooling are part of a necessary masking process. The purpose of this masking is to further misrecognizance. As well, this occurs by the naturalization of symbolic violence (1992:8-9ff.[1970]).
4. Others had similar experiences: 'I met with his publisher and decided that we would edit a Canadian version of their book. And after a couple of weeks I got a letter from them saying that they had looked at the Canadian market and just did not feel that the market was big enough to merit it.'
5. Published the same year, and pointing to a nascent revision of some of socio-cultural anthropology's subject, Cayton and Drake's *Black Metropolis* has the following dedicatory quote on its respective frontispiece: "Anthropology, the

science of man, has been mainly concerned up to the present with the study of primitive peoples. But civilized man is quite as interesting an object of investigation, and at the same time his life is more open to observation and study. Urban life and culture are more varied, subtle and complicated, but the fundamental motives are in both instances the same." (Drake and Cayton 1945, frontispiece). This book was also mentioned by one anthropologist as a favorite. One can note the universal presumption of humanity underlying the variations of culture. This motif is echoed in others' expressions in the text that anthropology studies whatever is human.

REFERENCES

- Armstrong, P., Armstrong, H. (1992). Better Irreverent than Irrelevant, in Carroll, W.K., et al, (Eds) *Fragile Truths: Twenty-Five Years of Sociology and Anthropology in Canada*. Carleton University Press, Ottawa. pp. 339-248.
- Bailey, F.G. (1969). *Morality and Expediency: The Folklore of Academic Politics*. Aldine, London.
- Barrett, S. R. (1979). Social Anthropologist: marginal academic? *The Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology*, 16(4), 367-386.
- Berger, B. M., (Ed), (1990) *Authors of Their Own Lives: Intellectual Autobiographies by Twenty American Sociologists*. University of California Press, Berkeley.
- Bourdieu, P. (1988[1984]). *Homo Academicus*: Stanford University Press, Stanford.
- Bourdieu, P., Passeron, J.C. (1992[1970]). *Reproduction: In Education, Society, and Culture*. Sage, Beverly Hills.
- Breitborde, L.B. (1989a). The Dons, the Dean, and the Department Major: Competing Models for the Major in Anthropology, in *Urban Anthropology*, 18(1), 5-15.
- Brown, M.L. (1989) Anthropology in the Open Market: Course Selection and Content in the Absence of Program and General Education Requirements, in *Urban Anthropology*, 18(1), 77-83.
- Burridge, K. (1983). An Ethnology of Americanist Ethnology. In Frank E. Manning, (Ed). *Consciousness and Inquiry: Ethnology and Canadian Realities*. The National Museum of Man, Americanist Ethnology Service Paper Number 89E, Ottawa. pp. 306-320.
- Cesara, M. (1982). *Reflections of a Woman Anthropologist: No Hiding Place*. Academic Press, New York.
- Comaroff, J. (2010). The End of Anthropology, Again: On the Future of an In/Discipline'. *American Anthropologist*, 112(4), 524-538.
- Curtis, J.E., Connor, D.M., Harp, J. (1970). An Emergent Professional Community: French and English Sociologists and Anthropologists in Canada, in *Social Science Information*, 9(4), 113-136.
- Daniels, A.K. (1974). The Notion of Appropriate Professional Conduct: An Exercise in the Sociology of Sociology. *American Sociologist*, 9(4), 212-217.
- Darnell, R. (1996). *Toward a History of Canadian Departments of Anthropology: Retrospect, Prospect and Common Cause*. Paper presented at CASCA XXIII, at the Learned Societies Conference, St. Catherines, Ontario, May 27, 1996.
- Davidovitch, N., Soen, D. Sinuani-Stern, Z. (2011) Performances Measures of Academic faculty - a case study'. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 35(1), 355-373.
- Davies, S., Mosher, C., O'Grady, B. (1992). Americanist Sociology and Anthropology Graduates in the 1980s Labour Market, in *Society/Societe.*, 16(2), 1-6.
- Drake, S.C. Cayton, H.R. (1945) *Black Metropolis: A Study of Negro Life in a Northern City*. Harcourt, Brace and Company, New York.

- Eggan, F. (1974). Among the Anthropologists. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 3, 1-19.
- Fardon, R. (2011). 'Feigning the Market: Funding Anthropology in England. *Anthropology Today*, 27(1), 2-5.
- Fortes, M. (1978). An Anthropologist's Apprenticeship'. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 7, 1-30.
- Freeman, J.F. (1965). University Anthropology: early departments in the United States. *Papers of the Kroeber Anthropological Society*, 32, 78-90.
- Gabriel, A.H. (1989). Politics, Ideology, and Scholarship: Teaching Anthropology in Women's Studies, in *Urban Anthropology*, 18(1), 111-120.
- Givens, D.B., Jablonski, T. (1996). 1995 Survey of Anthropology PhDs, in *American Anthropological Association 1996 Guide*. Menasha, Wisconsin: The American Anthropological Association. pp. 306-317.
- Good, C. (2011). My Thirty Years in Mexican Anthropology. *Anthropology and Humanism*, 36(1), 36-46.
- Gusterson, D. (2011). Lowering British Higher Education. *Anthropology Today*, 27(1), 1-2.
- Guppy, N. (1989). Rank, Age, and Salary in Anthropology and Sociology. *Society/Societe.*, 13(2), 14-17.
- Hannerz, U. (1987). Anthropology's Other Press: Training Ground, Playground, Underground. *Current Anthropology*, 28(2), 214-219.
- Holmswood, J. (2010). Sociology's Misfortune: disciplines, interdisciplinarity and the impact of audit culture. *British Journal of Sociology*, 61(4), 639-658.
- Inglis, G. (1978). Anthropology and Canada. *American Anthropologist*, 80(2), 374-5.
- Inglis, G. (1982) In Bed with the Elephant: Anthropology in Anglophone North America. *Ethnos*. 47, (1-2), 82-102.
- Kemper, R.V. (1989). Anthropology and "The Common Educational Experience": Disciplinary and Interdisciplinary Teaching at Southern Methodist University. *Urban Anthropology*, 18(1), 17-32.
- Kirsch, A.T. (1982). Anthropology: Past, Present, Future - Toward an Anthropology of Anthropology', in Hoebel, E.A., Currier, R., Kaiser, S. (Eds). *Crisis in Anthropology: View from Spring Hill*. Garland Publishing, New York. pp. 31-47.
- Latour, B., Woolgar, S. (1977). *Laboratory Life: The Social Construction of Scientific Facts*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Leach, E. (1984). Glimpses of the Unmentionable in the History of British Anthropology. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 1, 1-23.
- Linton, R. (1947[1945]). *The Science of Man in the World Crisis*. Columbia University Press, New York.
- Low, S. M, Merry, S.E. (2010). Engaged Anthropology: Diversity and Dilemmas. *Current Anthropology*, 1(supplement #2), 51, 24.
- Mead, M. (1959). Apprenticeship under Boas, in Walter Goldschmidt Ed.). *The Anthropology of Franz Boas*. American Anthropology Association Memoir, Number 89. Menasha, Wisconsin: The American Anthropological Association, pp. 29-45.
- Murphy, M.D. (1994). Episodes of Accountability in the Teaching of Anthropology. *Human Organization*, 53(4), 323-328.
- Nietzsche, F. (1989[1872]). *Friedrich Nietzsche on Rhetoric and Language*. Oxford University Press, London.
- Reck, G.G., Keefe, S.E. (1989). Nonanthropologists Teaching Anthropology: Anthropology as Intellectual Hobby. *Urban Anthropology*, 18(1), 67-76.
- Reich, A. (1989). Cleaning up after the Show: Anthropology in a "Value-Centred" Curriculum. *Urban Anthropology*, 18(1), 121-127.
- Robbins, R.H., De Vita, P. (1985). Anthropology and the teaching of Human Values. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 16, 251-255.

- Sapir, E. (1949[1934]). Symbolism, in Mandelbaum, D.G. (Ed). Selected Writings of Edward Sapir. University of California Press, Berkeley. pp. 564-568.
- Simmons, D. (2010). Anthropology-Led Community-Engagement Programs. *American Anthropologist*, 112(4), 643-645.
- Srivastava, V.K. (1993) Anthropology is not a Romantic Pedagogy. *Eastern Anthropologist*, 46(1), 85-89.
- Vine, D. (2011). "Public Anthropology" in its Second Decade: Robert Borofsky's Center for a Public Anthropology. *American Anthropologist*, 113(2), 336-339.

© 2011 Loewen; This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.