Toward a History of Canadian Departments of Anthropology: Retrospect, Prospect and Common Cause[1]

Regna Darnell   *University of Western Ontario*

Abstract: This article presents a framework for documenting the institutional history of Canadian anthropology through the diverse experiences of the departments in which anthropology is taught. The historical baseline is the debate over whether or not Canada has a distinct national tradition in anthropology and, if so, what is its character. Early anthropologists in Canada are noted, with attention to their roles in the emergence of an institutional framework of professional organizations, publication outlets, professional training and employment opportunities. The present configuration of Canadian departments is discussed in terms of affiliations to related disciplines, degree programs offered and number of students enrolled in them, subdisciplinary specializations of faculty, professional age of faculty, emeritus faculty (our tribal elders) and country of highest degree of Canadian faculty. The next step in documenting the history of Canadian anthropology is to produce more qualitative participant-observation histories of particular departments across the country; there is some urgency as the founders of these departments reach the end of their careers. Given the financial exigencies now facing Canadian academic life, there seems some further urgency in documenting the existence of a distinguished anthropological tradition in Canada.

Résumé: Cet article présente le cadre pour la documentation de l'histoire institutionnelle de l'anthropologie canadienne par le biais de diverses expériences vécues dans les départements où l'on enseigne l'anthropologie. Ce qui en constitue la base historique est le débat sur la question de savoir si oui ou non le Canada a une tradition nationale en anthropologie qui lui est propre et si oui quel en est le caractère. Les premiers anthropologues canadiens sont reconnus pour leur rôle dans l'émergence d'une structure institutionnelle des organismes professionnels des points de publications, de la formation professionnelle et des perspectives d'emploi dans le domaine. La configuration actuelle des départements canadiens est abordée en termes d'affiliation à des disciplines connexes, de programmes offerts, de nombre d'étudiants inscrits, de sous-domaines de spécialisation des professeurs, de l'âge des membres de la faculté, de professeurs honoraires (nos anciens en termes de tribus), de pays dans lesquels les professeurs canadiens ont obtenu leur diplôme le plus élevé. La seconde étape de documentation de l'histoire de l'anthropologie canadienne est de produire plus d'histoires qualitatives basées sur l'observation participante de départements répartis à travers tout le pays. Il y a urgence, car certains fondateurs de ces départements sont en fin de carrière. Étant donné les exigences financières qui menacent la vie académique canadienne, il y a encore plus d'urgence à documenter l'existence d'une tradition anthropologique canadienne remarquable.

At present, there is no overview for the history of Canadian anthropology, although Richard Preston (1983: 293) called for a "substantive view of Canadian ethnology" through "the numbers, departments, Ph.D. programs, professional societies and professional journals" and provided some initial tabulations of the institutional setting of the early 1980s. He predicted that the future lay in applied anthropology, a somewhat idiosyncratic and now surprisingly dated position not clearly linked to his descriptive baseline.[2] There is little of the story of what individual Canadian anthropologists have done within the institutional frameworks.

This article acknowledges a considerable diversity in the contemporary discipline and calls for a comparative framework to document the history of Canadian anthropology through participant ethnographies of the institutional backbone of anthropology in Canada—the departments in which anthropology is taught. In this context, the coexistence, possibly even incommensurability, of the resulting diversity can be evaluated.

The project is of some antiquity: my own first effort at tabulating the state of the discipline in Canada (emphasizing its "eclectic" character) was presented as a paper at the 1983 International Congress of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences in Vancouver but never published. In the early 1990s, Richard Pope and I began to talk about possible generalizations from the experiences of anthropologists across Canada grounded in a description of institutional variations. The immediate context was urgent: the small but long-established department at the University of Regina, where Dick had taught for more than three decades, was threatened with merger into sociology and reduction to sociocultural anthropology alone. Colleagues rallied round—possibly to the surprise of Regina's administration that so many people could care so passionately about a small undergraduate program. The department, albeit considerably changed, persists.

At the CASCA meetings in Montreal in 1992, Dick and I organized a double session of departmental histo-

ries which was enthusiastically attended. At York University in 1993, we held another workshop with additional case studies. Attempts to publish these histories, however, have languished over the issues of representation and closure: although each department in Canada was invited to participate, many did not respond. We agonized over the sample size adequate to represent the diversity of cases. A workshop at CASCA in 1996 in St. Catharine's, Ontario, concluded that preliminary publication is most likely to encourage further and more systematic coverage. Thus, I offer this overview—and Trigger (1997) presents his history of anthropology at McGill—in the hope that more exemplars will follow as Canadian anthropologists reflect collectively on the variables underlying their diverse institutional experiences.

In 1996, financial constraints across the Canadian provinces increasingly offer a dramatic challenge to the autonomy and functioning of many anthropology programs, indeed of the academy itself. The modest size of our discipline among the social sciences in Canada makes us potentially vulnerable to budgetary sledgehammers; subdisciplinary diversity makes the restructuring of Canadian anthropology particularly complex. One possible line of defence is to demonstrate the existence of a distinguished anthropological tradition in Canada, characterized both by internal diversity and by common cause. A diversity of achievements and organizational structures both attests to our collective identity and increases our collective strength. A documentary project such as this cannot alone protect us from financial cutbacks, but it can provide ammunition; furthermore, it can encourage each Canadian anthropologist to examine the grounds of his/her professional identity and the legitimacy of the intellectual work that we, collectively, do in research, teaching and public service. We can begin to tell the story of the people, institutions and ideas constituting our discipline.

Comparative data are tabulated from the American Anthropological Association's *A Guide to Departments, 1996-97*. Data are incomplete because not all Canadian departments purchase a listing in this annual volume. The last Canadian guide was produced in 1991, jointly by the Canadian Sociology and Anthropology Association and the Canadian Anthropology Society/Société canadienne d'anthropologie. The CSAA/CASCA Guide is produced every decade rather than annually, making us dependent on external data for the interim periods. The Canadian data are further difficult to assess in terms comparable to the AAA data because "Anthropology, Archaeology, Sociology in universities and museums in Canada" are included in a single guide, reflecting the

characteristic diversity of Canadian institutional arrangements. One cannot always distinguish a sociologist from an anthropologist; indeed, many individuals pride themselves on an overlapping disciplinary space. For example, Stanley Barrett (1979) persuasively dissolves a series of alleged dichotomies between sociology and social anthropology.

The tables presented below omit programs not listed in the AAA Guide because contemporary data are not available. The largest BA program omitted is at Concordia, where, in 1990-91, the joint department of sociology and anthropology listed seven sociocultural anthropologists (in a department of 30); of these, one was trained in Canada, two in the U.S., two in France, one in Britain and one in the Commonwealth. Concordia has a new MA program in anthropology not yet reflected in the statistics.

In 1990-91, five unlisted institutions offered a BA in anthropology in a joint department with sociology. At Brandon, there are two anthropologists, both Canadian trained, and four sociologists; one is in sociocultural and the other in archaeology/physical anthropology. Guelph has 19 faculty in the joint department, five of whom are sociocultural anthropologists; three were trained in Canada, two in Britain. Mount Allison's joint program has three faculty who range between sociocultural anthropology and sociology. At Mount St. Vincent, two of ten faculty are identifiably sociocultural anthropologists trained in Canada. Four of six faculty at Prince Edward Island are sociocultural anthropologists, though one also does biological anthropology; one was trained in Canada, two in the U.S.A. and one in India. At St. Francis Xavier, two Canadian-trained anthropologists in a department of ten each combine archaeology and sociocultural anthropology.

And, finally, the University of Quebec at Montreal has five faculty members in its Department of Earth Sciences and Laboratory of Archaeology; of these, four were trained in France and one in Canada.

The Historiographic Baseline

The 1970s, in particular, produced intense discussion as to whether or not Canada had its own national tradition in anthropology. Reasons for pessimism in many quarters were part and parcel of the history of anthropology in Canada. In 1975, when I gave my first paper attempting to define the Canadian tradition at the Canadian Ethnology Society meetings in Winnipeg, it was greeted with considerable scepticism, especially on the part of graduate students aspiring to professional status in the discipline. These young scholars were not prepared to credit themselves with the dignity of an autonomous tradi-

tion. They came of age in a world with few professional anthropologists trained in Canada to serve as role models, in which many Canadian students were encouraged and/or forced to seek doctoral training abroad (Barker, 1987, quoting McIlwraith; Trigger, personal communication). In line with the political realities of the mid-1970s, graduate students were legitimately discouraged about employment possibilities and convinced that "their" anthropology was some bastard mixture of American and British parentage. Louise Sweet (1976: 845), for example, castigated Canadian anthropology, ironically in the *American Anthropologist*, for its complicity with neocolonial "American corporate capitalism and its ideology."

Demographic factors were especially powerful in Canada because academic professionalization coincided with the expansion of all university disciplines which began in the mid-1960s. By the time the institutional framework for a mature Canadian anthropology was in place, a period of contraction had begun. Nevertheless, many of the non-Canadian anthropologists who came in the expansionary period studied Canadian cultural communities and contributed to the institutional development of a national tradition. This commitment may be unique among the social sciences in Canada; certainly, many departments scoured their applications in search of young Canadian scholars as students and faculty.

A contrastive view of the relative prestige of the Canadian and American traditions is presented by Marilyn Silverman (1991) in an ethnography of a hiring committee in a Canadian anthropology department which rapidly and superficially dismissed all Canadian applicants on the tacit assumption that they could not possibly be as good as the foreign applicants. Canada's colonial past has not, in her analysis, receded sufficiently to allow self-confidence in a homegrown and internally sustainable national tradition.

Similar self-deprecating sentiments were echoed by Thomas McFeat (1976: 148) in an early plenary session on the history of Canadian anthropology: "While there were opportunities for a uniquely Canadian anthropology to develop, it did not." Nonetheless, he credited the National Museum of Man with maintaining "certain particular features and foci"—presumably the building blocks of a national tradition. In McFeat's mind, the problem was that anthropologists in Canada (as opposed to Canadian anthropologists) "recognized a living centre that was elsewhere" (1976: 148), that is, in the United States. He was, then, essentially arguing that the failure to acknowledge and describe a distinctively Canadian tradition in its historical context resulted from a widespread national inferiority complex. Kenelm Burridge (1983:

318) emphasizes implicit acceptance that "the ideas should come from elsewhere." Canadian anthropologists would merely debate which points of view would dominate in their national tradition.

Even at that time, however, it was possible to be more optimistic. In his introduction to the 1976 Canadian Ethnology Society symposium on *The History of Canadian Anthropology*, Michael Ames (1976: 2) noted:

> Canada has not lacked for anthropology over the years, but anthropologists in Canada have lacked a sense of their own history. History does not exist until it is invented by the process of description, and until recently, few anthropologists in Canada were interested enough to study the history of their own discipline. Perhaps it was assumed that anthropology was an international science, and therefore a national history would not be meaningful.

Ames cited my own argument the previous year that there are no features absolutely unique to Canadian anthropology but that the national discipline combines features of disciplinary organization and historical context in patterns that *are* unique.

Ames' position is consistent with that of Trigger (1990: 261) that "attitudes" may distinguish Canadian anthropology from its counterparts elsewhere. The distinctive features of the discipline here do not occur in "the same proportions as . . . elsewhere." For Trigger, the Canadian tradition is distinguished by the presence of more full-time professional anthropologists per capita than in the United States, by the avoidance of extreme determinisms of any theoretical stripe, and by the belief:

> . . . that human life is complex, that explaining differences is as important as explaining similarities, that even the most esoteric studies should be relevant— although not necessarily in practical ways—to the society that sustains them, and that the study of humanity cannot, and should not, be morally or ethically neutral.

At the same time, Trigger cautions that it is has been difficult for those situated within Canadian anthropology to see unifying attitudes of their discipline. Those Canadians returning from training abroad and foreigners hired in Canadian departments "came from many different backgrounds, were dispersed across a continent, and found themselves in departments that viewed anthropology from different perspectives" (Trigger, 1990: 247).

Whatever the intricacies of identifying the national tradition, Ames strongly urged Canadian anthropologists to get on with the business of inventing their own his-

tory based on materials which were already available (Ames, 1976: 3):

> If anthropology is to be rationally integrated into Canadian society—in universities and museums, with governments and the public sector, with other disciplines, and with the peoples we study—then it must be viewed in its social and historical context.

(This mandate in itself is peculiarly Canadian in scope, in contrast to the more thoroughly academic organization of American anthropology or the consistent association of British social anthropology with colonial administration.)

Contributors to the 1976 symposium stood in various relationships to the history of science as a disciplinary specialization. My own training and research fall directly within the history of anthropology. Several other contributors were participants in the events they described, e.g., McFeat, Marc-Adélard Tremblay and Richard Salisbury. Others approached their topics through historical scholarship. Richard Preston's paper on Marius Barbeau remained the primary commentary until Laurence Nowry's biography in 1995. Another approach to historical documentation is by way of the author's theoretical and ethnographic commitments within the discipline, e.g., the late Sally Mae Weaver on the political effectiveness or ineffectiveness of the Hawthorne/Tremblay report on Canadian Native peoples. The result was a healthy mixture, seeming to presage the development of consistent pride in a national tradition within Canadian anthropology. Unfortunately, this optimistic beginning has not been followed up in systematic ways, though various participants have done further related research (e.g., Ames, 1986, 1992; Darnell, 1986, 1990; Preston, 1986). Only a few of the papers in the Canadian Ethnology Society's attempt at assessing the state of the art of Canadian anthropology (Manning, ed., 1983) were focussed on institutional aspects of Canadian anthropology (see Burridge, 1983; Preston, 1983). Exhortations for a national disciplinary history, therefore, remain as compelling as they were two decades ago.

Early Anthropology in Canada

In the absence of such a systematic institutional history of the discipline, the self-perception of Canadian anthropologists has suffered from overemphasis on the contributions of individual anthropologists. Nonetheless, identification of the principal actors in an uniquely Canadian anthropology requires attention to the historical context of individual careers and the consequences of individual actions for the discipline. A review of the small but increasing body of serious scholarship on the lives and careers of early Canadian anthropologists moves us toward such a mature history of Canadian anthropology. Although the late Douglas Cole (1973) and McFeat (1980) ground the present discipline in Jesuit ethnographies with a time depth of 300 years, our concern here is with the transition to institutionalized professional anthropology.

Among the distinguished precursors of professional anthropology in Canada were Sir Daniel Wilson and the two Dawsons (John William and his son George Mercer) (McIlwraith, 1964; Trigger, 1966a, 1966b, 1990; Van West 1976). Their work called attention to the special potentials for ethnology in Canada; the Geological Survey of Canada provided an incipient framework for a professional discipline of anthropology. Sheets-Pyenson's biography of John William Dawson (1996) sheds light on the development of Canadian academic institutions, especially McGill, as well as on anthropology per se.

Special Canadian potentials for anthropological research were also recognized when Edward Burnett Tylor, the putative founder of anthropology as a discipline, addressed the British Association for the Advancement of Science in Toronto in plenary session in 1884. Tylor emphasized that Indian questions in Canada were more immediate and pressing than in the United States. The Canadian tradition, because of its distinct colonial history, would be able to retain stronger connections to British anthropology than the Americans; he clearly saw this as desirable. Thus, although Tylor was certainly not a Canadian anthropologist, he called international attention to the importance of Canadian data for the discipline elsewhere. His position, grounded in British colonialism, was both flattering and patronizing to would-be Canadian anthropologists.

There were some candidates for the status of Canadian anthropologist, though their stories have variable relationship to the country, the study of its aboriginal peoples and the development of professional anthropological institutions. To construct a narrative about early Canadian anthropology, therefore, requires contextualization of the careers of "great men."

Horatio Hale was an anthropologist who made a significant early contribution in Canada. His reputation was established in the United States in the 1830s and 1840s as ethnologist/linguist for the Wilkes Exploring Expedition. Hale moved to his wife's native Canada in the 1880s, where he worked with a committee of Iroquois chiefs on a history of the Six Nations Confederacy, producing a Mohawk and Onondaga version of the Iroquois book of rites in 1883 (Fenton, 1984). This work established him as a "Canadian" anthropologist, whose pres-

tige undoubtedly enhanced the standing of Canadian anthropology within the BAAS in the late 19th century. His contribution to the development of a Canadian anthropological tradition, however, must be carefully distinguished from his stature in the anthropology of his day.

Alexander Francis Chamberlain, a Canadian, received the first North American PhD in anthropology, under the direction of Franz Boas, at Clark University in Worcester, Massachusetts, in 1894. Chamberlain remained at Clark after Boas resigned in the same year and did not further distinguish himself in the history of the discipline. He had no influence on anthropological developments in his native country, although he took courses in anthropology from Daniel Wilson at the University of Toronto before moving to the United States (Trigger, personal communication).

Franz Boas, the major figure in 20th-century American anthropology, did most of his field work in Canada (on Baffin Island in the early 1880s, later on the Northwest Coast) and was closely involved in Canadian Aboriginal issues, for example, protesting the outlawing of the potlatch in 1882 (Cole and Chaikin, 1990; Darnell, 1984). Boas's early field work on the Northwest Coast was supported by the BAAS, in conjunction with the Bureau of American Ethnology in the United States; in his relations to the former organization, Boas chafed under the supervision of Hale, the established mouthpiece of the BAAS in Canada (Gruber, 1967). In spite of his field research in Canada, however, Boas's primary institutional base remained in the United States.

Boas most dramatically influenced the institutional development of anthropology in Canada when he recommended the appointment of his former student, Edward Sapir, as the first director of the Anthropological Division of the Geological Survey of Canada in 1910. Sapir shared Boas's near fanaticism about the need for professional training of anthropologists and systematic organization of anthropological research on a broad, in this case national, scale.

Although Sapir failed to create the institutional base for a distinctive Canadian anthropology, his appointment has been represented as a Boasian takeover. John Barker (1987: 253) cites Cole (1973) on Sapir's "firm command of scholars trained or influenced by Franz Boas in the United States." Ralph Maud (1978, Vol. 1: 11) refers to "the temperament of the one man who set the tone and pattern [for anthropology] in the Northwest." In Maud's view, Boas's scientific distancing of himself from native people was "elevated ... into a theory." This theory mitigated against professional recognition of Charles Hill-Tout, whose ethnographic work Maud has republished and contextualized. Hill-Tout, though lacking academic

training in anthropology, was encouraged to do ethnographic research by Daniel Wilson and was peripherally associated with the survey research program of the BAAS which sponsored much of Boas's early work on the Northwest Coast. Boas disapproved on Hill-Tout's speculative work. The latter's relegation to the category of "dilettante" was cemented by Sapir's appointment in 1910 when "the Boas school took over" (Maud, 1978, Vol. 1: 14). Marius Barbeau, Maud continues, "explains" that this appointment marginalized the Canadians in Canadian anthropology.

There is no attempt to frame Barbeau's perceptions in terms of his own frustrated ambitions due to competition with Sapir, his failure to succeed the latter as Director of the Anthropological Division in Ottawa, and lack of the doctoral credentials which were the new standards of scientific professionalism. For Barbeau, Hill-Tout and other Canadian anthropologists of the time, these new standards were associated with Boas and thus perceived as unfair because they were externally imposed. Preston (1976) and Darnell (1976, 1984, 1990), moreover, indicate that a motive for Hill-Tout's antagonism to Boasian anthropology was Boas's recommendation to University of British Columbia President Wesbrook in 1916 that the university would be better not to teach anthropology than to hire Hill-Tout, an amateur, as its professor.

McFeat (1980: 7-8) characterizes Sapir as "Boas's man in Ottawa" and argues that Sapir applied the Boasian culture historical method to the detriment of contemporary ethnography; the latter being the wave of the future. Preston (1983: 287) notes that Sapir failed to leave an institutionalized position behind him when he left Canada for the University of Chicago in 1925; surprisingly, he did not hire Americans to enhance the Boasian anthropological empire. Marius Barbeau (Nowry, 1995; Preston, 1976) and Diamond Jenness (Jenness, 1991) were both Oxford-trained, though neither held a PhD, which was, in the United States, becoming the necessary credential for a professional anthropologist. Sapir's impact was "modest" because he did not follow through his ideas with a firm institutional basis.

Preston (1983: 288) argues that Barbeau was more influential. In part, this may have been because he "complained about Sapir's Boasian influence"; after 1925, there was no defence for the Boasian position in Canadian anthropology and the contest was settled by default. Burridge (1983: 306) considers Barbeau "the first professional Canadian ethnologist of modern times"; he was "in touch with the European tradition" rather than the American. For whatever reasons, however, the simplified myth of Boasian takeover has been persistent. For exam-

ple, Berger (1996: 81) asserts that Sapir's appointment "is usually taken as an indication of the displacement of an indigenous, amateur Canadian tradition by one oriented to Boas and the United States." Nonetheless, the Boasian emphasis on professionalization was not entirely an American import. Boas's ideas about professional science reflected the intellectual climate of his native Germany and, in the United States, largely supplanted an earlier, semi-professional tradition. Indeed, Boas's "non-American-ness" was a source of bitter contention, culminating, during World War I, with attacks on him by native-born anthropologists at Harvard University and in the Bureau of American Ethnology. Boas's eventual virtual control of American anthropology by about 1920 came through the shift in emphasis from government and museum to the university as the institutional framework for the emerging profession (Darnell, 1969; Darnell, 1998; Hinsley, 1981; Stocking, 1968).

Because of his unique position at the head of the only fully professional anthropological organization in Canada from 1910 to 1925, Sapir spearheaded the developments of the institutionally formative period (Darnell, 1984, 1990). Many contemporary Canadian anthropologists, however, have been reluctant to recognize his contribution.[3] That he was European-born (and Jewish) mattered less in retrospect than that he left his adopted country of Canada in 1925 to accept a university position at the University of Chicago. Ambivalent Canadian colleagues concluded that he did not value what he had created. The abortiveness of his efforts to create academic anthropology in Canada, moreover, did not mitigate the perceived betrayal. That Sapir was not happy in Ottawa for personal reasons reinforced the sense that he was an unappreciative transient who left the working out of his initiatives to his successors. Nonetheless, Sapir's commitment to professionalization, and his development of systematic field research programs and publications in a museum context, were integral to developing the institutional framework of Canadian anthropology. Barker (1992: xxv), for example, notes in passing that "Sapir retired in 1925"—an odd foreshortening of the last 15 years of Sapir's life and of the continuing ties between the Canadian and American anthropologies.

This examination of some of the "great men" of early Canadian anthropology with a view to assessing their "Canadian-ness," suggests that institutional and research emphases would produce a more balanced view of the emergence of Canadian anthropology. Indeed, the institutional framework was quite distinct from that which developed in the United States; collegiality, with an emphasis on undergraduate teaching rather than pro-

fessionalism, was the keynote (Barker, 1987). Preston (1983: 289) refers to the "ambience ... of the small, cohesive university college." The emergence of academic anthropology in Canada appears to be the key to weaving individual careers into a narrative which includes institutional parameters.

University teaching of anthropology began with Sir Daniel Wilson at the University of Toronto. The first chair was held by Sir Bertram Windle in 1919 at St. Michael's College; he became Special Lecturer in Ethnology at Toronto in 1922 (Barker, 1987: 253). In 1925, Thomas F. McIlwraith was appointed to a full-time lectureship at the University of Toronto and curatorship at the Royal Ontario Museum. An independent department of anthropology, however, did not appear until 1936.

Although McIlwraith was trained at Cambridge, Trigger (personal communication) reports that he considered himself a Boasian and regarded his *Bella Coola* as an exemplar of the Boasian paradigm. Trigger, a Canadian with a Yale PhD, is in a position to know that Yale claims McIlwraith as one of its own; in his view, McIlwraith's British MA may have had less influence on his professional development than his year at the Yale Peabody Museum before returning to Canada. Barker, however, emphasizes his affiliation to the British school. McIlwraith "became a participant in Muxalk memory culture" (1992: xxiv); he acknowledged Rivers and Haddon, assessed the reliability of various informants, and was forced by volume of material to abandon the native-language text method associated with the Boasians. Barker sees an emphasis, remarkable for the time, on integration of institutions. As McIlwraith himself observed (1992: xl-xli):

> I was definitely under the influence of the English school of anthropologists. ... As a broad generalization, the attitude of American anthropologists to field work in America is very different. Indians live near at hand; well-educated interpreters and informants are usually available; there is no thought of gleaning information from suspicious natives at the ends of the earth; and ... so much of Indian life has disappeared that the American anthropologist must learn by interview and question, rather than by observation and participation. The American school has tended to return repeatedly , often for short periods, to a small group or even to a single informant, and to publish intensive studies of aspects of culture with which the investigator is concerned.

Barker (1987: 255), however, acknowledges Boasian elements as well: McIlwraith "combined the Boasian style of working closely with selected informants with the

methods of the 'intensive study of a limited area' then being developed in Britain." Barker (1987) stresses McIlwraith's attempts to use texts, a core of the Boasian method (see Darnell, 1992).

In any case, Canada lagged behind in institutionalizing anthropology. In the United States, Daniel Brinton held the first professorship in anthropology, beginning in 1886; Boas was appointed to a similar position at Columbia University in 1899. The Bureau of American Ethnology was established by the U.S. government in 1879, the Division of Anthropology under Sapir only in 1910.

In Canada, the Depression, followed by World War II, derailed institutional expansion of anthropology. McIlwraith long remained the only anthropologist at the University of Toronto. His monumental ethnography of the Bella Coola (Barker, 1992) languished unpublished until 1948 due to lack of finances, government bureaucratic objection to "obscene" material in the texts and damage to the manuscript itself. McIlwraith did no further field work and directed his teaching and publication to a general audience. Students had to go outside Canada for professional training in anthropology. For Barker (1987: 264), however, the "warm and fuzzy" character of McIlwraith's anthropology has been lost with the subsequent specialization of anthropology in the academy.

A.G. Bailley received a PhD in history from the University of Toronto in 1934, working with economic historian Harold Innis as well as with McIlwraith. His ethnohistorical dissertation dealt with the emergence of Canada from European contacts with Algonquian cultures in the 16th and 17th centuries. This set the tone for Canadian anthropology in the intersections of anthropology, history and economics (McFeat, 1980: 5-6).

It was 1947 before full-time anthropologists appeared at McGill and the University of British Columbia. Ethnology was combined with folklore at Laval, history at the University of British Columbia and sociology at McGill (Barker, 1987: 265). The influx of veterans after the war began the expansion of Canadian universities, especially in arts (including the social sciences. The British tradition of university teaching without a PhD continued, reflecting "what has been labelled a 'colonial mentality' in the hindsight of the 1970s," but "was probably thought of by most [Canadian] academics as cosmopolitan and intellectually excellent until sometime in the 1960s" (Preston, 1983: 289).

Canadian Professional Organizations

In spite of a lag in the formalization of anthropological work on a national scale, Canada developed scientific institutions at the period of the international professionalization of science. The BAAS was established in 1831, the Geological Survey of Canada in 1842, the Canadian Institute in Toronto in 1849 and the Royal Society of Canada in 1882. Anthropology, however, perhaps because of its continuing ties to sociology in Canada, is still not fully identifiable with any single professional association.

The second-largest department in the country administratively encompasses sociology and anthropology, albeit with separate programs; some faculty members cannot be identified uniquely as anthropologist or sociologist. The Canadian Sociology and Anthropology Association attracts primarily anthropologists with sociological leanings. Within the CSAA, in spite of its constitutionally mandated alternation of officers by discipline, sociology inevitably dominates because it is so much larger. Left out of this disciplinary alliance, Canadian archaeologists, physical anthropologists and linguists developed their own separate organizations. Indeed, for the first 15 years of its history, the present Canadian Anthropology Society was known as the Canadian Ethnology Society. At its founding meeting,[4] representatives of the subdisciplines were hesitant to risk their own autonomy, perhaps mindful of the *de facto* dominance of sociocultural anthropology in the American Anthropological Association. Moreover, the early 1970s were years of justified concern over the threat of Americanization of Canadian academic life. The link to sociology, and to other social sciences, along the lines of British social anthropology, seemed to many to present an alternative which might more easily aspire to become (or remain) distinctively Canadian. But the expansion of anthropology during the 1960s and early 1970s also seemed to call for autonomy from sociology.

So, in a compromise which retrospectively appears peculiarly Canadian, the CSAA option was left intact with the establishment of a new society focussed around ethnology. This served to incorporate museum anthropologists as well as sociocultural anthropologists who saw sociocultural anthropology as broader than ethnology but distinct from sociology. The subdisciplinary organizations remained distinct, but individuals from them were encouraged to participate in the CES as well. Not appropriating the umbrella term "anthropology" was a compromise constructed to protect the autonomy and legitimacy of the subdisciplinary organizations.

In practice, sociocultural anthropologists have largely switched their primary allegiance to the CES/CASCA. CASCA's annual meetings have also incorporated the Canadian organizations for medical anthropology and applied anthropology. Only in 1990 did professional identities seem sufficiently secure to return to the label

"Anthropology" for the umbrella professional organization. Anthropology is the name under which most of us explain who we are and what we do. What was contentious two decades ago has become established reality over that period and is now reflected in the name of the Canadian Anthropology Society.

Table 1
Subdisciplines of Full-Time Faculty in Canadian Departments of Anthropology, 1996-97 (excluding professors emeriti)

	Socio-cultural	Linguistics (in anthropology)	Archaeology	Physical	Total
A) *Doctoral Programs*					
Alberta	8.5	2.5[a]	5.5	3.5	20
British Columbia	12	2[a]	5	1	20
Calgary					
Anthropology	8	—[a]	—	3	11
Archaeology	—	.5[a]	6.5	1	8
Laval	18	1.5[a]	—	.5	20
Manitoba	8	1.5[a]	4	2.5	16
McGill	12	—[a]	4	—	16
McMaster	8	1	3	3	15
Montreal	10	3[a]	5	4	22
Simon Fraser					
Archaeology	—	—	9	1	10
Anthropology	8	—	—	—	8
Toronto	12	3[a]	7	9	31
York	13	—	—	—	13
B) *Masters Programs*					
Carleton	11	—[a]	—	—	11
Dalhousie	7	—	—	—	7
Lethbridge	7	—	—	1	8
Memorial	11	—[a]	5	2	18
New Brunswick	5	—	1	—	6
Saskatchewan	4	1	1	1	7
Trent	4	2	4	2	12
Victoria	7.5	.5	1	2	11
Western Ontario	6.5	2.5	2	2	13
C) *Bachelors Programs*					
Lakehead	2	—	2	1	5
Laurentian	1	—	1	1	3
Northern BC	3	—	1	1	5
Regina	4	—	.5	.5	5
Saint Mary's	2	1	1	1	5
Waterloo	2	—	1	1	4
Wilfrid Laurier	3	—	1	—	4
Windsor	2	—	1	1	4
Winnipeg	2	—	1	2	5

a Independent department of linguistics.

There is still no single organization that purports to represent the four subdiscipline approach to anthropology on the American model, although the majority of Canadian anthropology departments espouse this ideal at least in principle. A minority, however, specialize in social anthropology along British lines—which, in the North American context, emphasizes institutional and intellectual connections to sociology. Assessing the Canadian university programs with a PhD program by 1980, Preston (1983: 299) notes a structuralist/Marxist focus at Laval, development anthropology at McGill, symbolic anthropology at U.B.C., ethnology and ethnohistory at McMaster, archaeology at Calgary and Simon Fraser (also social anthropology) and the foursquare model at Montreal, Manitoba, Toronto and Alberta.[5]

Linguistics is taught in independent departments in many institutions (see Table 1) which has led, in some institutions, to minimal recognition of special ties to anthropology in the eyes of either linguists or anthropologists. The virtual absence of linguistics in the British definition of the scope of anthropology may have been an additional factor in the relatively low priority apparently placed on linguistics within Canadian anthropology.

The remainder of this article will examine the empirical evidence for the diversity of Canadian academic programs in anthropology, in an effort to clarify both the range of organizational arrangements and the degree to which the national tradition can be characterized overall. The statistics presented in this discussion need to be supplemented by "emic" descriptions, particularly by Canadian anthropologists who are still active members of the departments they helped to found. The realities of anthropology on a local scale may seem pragmatic and unproblematic in isolation. But they become much more intriguing when framed against the diversity of the Canadian discipline in its multiple local contexts. The history of our science can, and should, be approached with the same systematically comparative interpretive methods that we use in the construction of any other ethnography.

Contemporary Canadian Departments

Eleven Canadian institutions grant a PhD in anthropology. Laval and Montreal, the francophone universities in Quebec, have limited contact with anglophone programs (in spite of the constitutional mandate that the presidency and other offices of the Canadian Anthropology Society alternate between francophone and anglophone candidates). Toronto has the longest established program and the largest by far. The PhD has been offered for some time at McGill, British Columbia and Alberta. More recent additions are Manitoba, Simon Fraser and McMaster. The most recent additions are York and Calgary. There is no PhD program in the Maritimes.

Nine additional institutions offer an MA in anthropology: Dalhousie, Memorial and New Brunswick in the Maritimes, Lethbridge in the Prairies, Victoria in British Columbia and Carleton, Trent and Western Ontario in Ontario.

Bachelors programs in anthropology are offered at Winnipeg and Regina in the Prairies, Saint Mary's in the Maritimes, Lakehead, Laurentian, Waterloo, Wilfrid Laurier and Windsor in Ontario and the new University of Northern British Columbia.

Anthropology is not always a separate department with a standard subdisciplinary content. Anthropology is combined with sociology at British Columbia, Carleton and several smaller institutions across the country. Calgary and Simon Fraser offer anthropology and archaeology in separate departments; at Simon Fraser anthropology is combined with sociology. First Nations/Native Studies coexists with anthropology in several institutions, for example, Northern British Columbia, Manitoba, Trent and Lakehead. The only Aboriginal post-secondary institution in Canada is the Saskatchewan Indian Federated College in Regina.

Anthropology does not appear to be fully integrated into the Canadian liberal arts education at all levels. Most universities (Queens is the most notable exception) offer at least a BA/BSc in anthropology. But professional training of anthropologists has been considerably less widespread. Particularly in the Prairies and in Ontario, the tendency is for all to offer the Bachelors degree, with MA programs more specialized and PhD programs quite restricted in number in each provincial post-secondary system.

The expansion of anthropology programs in Canadian universities took place primarily in the late 1960s and early 1970s. This explosion of demand for anthropology preceded training of professional anthropologists in Canada, necessitating recruitment from outside the country (although many of those recruited were Canadians who had been required by the absence of Canadian programs to go elsewhere for their training). In spite of considerable emphasis on Canadianization of Canadian anthropology departments, however, the employment patterns set in the 1960s have continuing effects. The scholars who came during the period of expansion have tenure and are only beginning to retire. They have trained several generations of Canadian PhDs, but, the age of expansion over, academic positions remain scarce. Table 2 correlates rank of anthropologists with the decade of highest degree; the clustering of senior people from the period of expansion and the modest number of positions for recent PhDs are equally clear. Table 3 lists

emeritus professors of anthropology from Canadian universities, with their subdisciplines, Canadian institutions and institutions granting their highest degrees. These are our elders and the creators of the contemporary mix of backgrounds and perspectives which constitute Canadian anthropology.

Emphasis on citizenship as an index of Canadianness obscures the fact that many of the Americans (and others) who came in the 1960s are now naturalized Canadians. Country of training, therefore, may be a better indicator of the point of view from which contribution to the Canadian national tradition proceeds. But this fails to capture the commitments of the Canadians who went abroad for their education and returned to Canada to practice their profession. Moreover, statistics are not available for place of birth or citizenship. It also should be noted that many of the immigrant anthropologists have devoted themselves to the development of anthropological institutions in Canada—journals and professional organizations as well as academic programs—and have carried out, and trained their students to carry out, research in and on Canadian society itself. In spite of the development of academic programs in anthropology in Canada, however, many Canadian students still seek doctoral training abroad. "Canadian-ness," then, cannot be captured by any single or easily quantifiable index.

Table 5 records the country of highest academic degree for all anthropology faculty in Canadian departments in 1996-97. The choice of a single year is, of course, somewhat arbitrary. Nonetheless, general trends can be seen clearly in relation to data from Darnell, Preston and Burridge—all representing the early 1980s. Since 1982-83 (Darnell, 1983), Canadian-trained faculty have increased dramatically—from 86 out of 312 to 141 out of 343. The increase in professors with Canadian degrees is considerably more than the increase in total number of academic anthropologists. Modest growth in the size of the discipline (measured by number of faculty and by number of programs at the BA, MA and PhD levels) has been accompanied by a relatively dramatic increase in the proportion of instruction by Canadian-trained anthropologists.

Nonetheless, only 41% of these professors are Canadian trained (up 5% since 1995-96, presumably indicating substantial hiring of Canadian-trained anthropologists relative to retirement of non-Canadian-trained colleagues). Although the greatest number, 149, still hold American PhDs, this is 31 less in absolute numbers than in 1982-83 and only eight more than the Canadian-trained professoriate of 1996-97. This relative decrease in American degrees has been accompanied by a substan-

Table 2
Ranks of Full-Time Faculty in Canadian Departments of Anthropology
by Decade of Highest Degree, 1996-97

	Professor	Associate	Assistant	Emeritus
British Columbia				
1940s/1950s	—	—	—	4
1960s	3	1	—	2
1970	2	6	—	—
1980s	—	5	1	—
1990s	—	—	2	—
Alberta				
1960s	2	—	—	5
1970s	7	2	—	—
1980s	2	6	—	—
1990s	—	—	1	—
Calgary				
Anthropology				
1960s	1	—	—	—
1970s	2	4	—	1
1980s	—	3	—	—
1990s	—	—	1	—
Archaeology				
1930s	—	—	—	1
1950s	—	—	—	2
1960s	1	—	—	1
1970s	1	1	—	—
1980s	1	3	—	—
1990s	—	—	1	—
Carleton	No ranks indicated			
1950s	2 all ranks			
1960s	1 all ranks			
1970s	8 all ranks			
1980s	1 all ranks			
Dalhousie				
1960s	1	—	—	—
1970s	1	1	—	—
1980s	1	1	1	—
1990s	—	—	1	—
Lakehead				
1970s	1	1	—	—
1980s	1	—	1	—
1990s	—	1	—	—
Laurentian				
1970s	1	—	—	—
1980s	—	1	—	—
1990s	—	—	—	—
Laval	No ranks indicated			
1960s	3 all ranks			
1970s	10 all ranks			
1980s	5 all ranks			
1990s	1 all ranks			
n.d.	1 all ranks			
Lethbridge				
1970s	1	1	1	1
1980s	—	—	3	—
1990s	—	—	2	—

	Professor	Associate	Assistant	Emeritus
Manitoba				
1960s	1	—	—	1
1970s	3	9	—	2
1980s	1	1	—	—
1990s	—	—	1	—
McGill				
1960s	1	—	—	—
1970s	6	5	—	—
1980s	—	3	—	—
1990s	—	—	1	—
McMaster				
1950s	—	—	—	1
1960s	2	—	—	3
1970s	5	1	—	—
1980s	—	6	—	—
1990s	—	—	1	—
Memorial				
1960s	3	1	1	—
1970s	3	2	—	—
1980s	—	4	—	—
1990s	—	—	4	—
Montreal				
1940s/1950s	2	—	—	—
1960s	2	—	—	—
1970s	8	1	—	—
1980s	1	5	2	—
1990s	—	—	1	—
New Brunswick				
1970s	2	—	—	—
1980s	—	3	1	—
Northern BC				
1980s	—	1	—	—
1990s	—	—	4	—
Regina				
1960s	1	—	—	1
1970s	—	—	—	—
1980s	—	2	—	—
1990s	—	—	1	—
Saint Mary's				
1970s	2	—	1	—
1980s	1	—	—	—
1990s	—	—	1	—
Saskatchewan				
1960s	—	2	—	—
1970s	2	—	—	—
1980s	1	1	—	—
1990s	—	—	1	—
Simon Fraser				
Archaeology				
1960s	—	1	—	2
1970s	4	2	—	—
1990s	—	—	3	—

Table 2 (continued)

	Professor	Associate	Assistant	Emeritus		Professor	Associate	Assistant	Emeritus
Simon Fraser					Western				
Anthropology					1960s	1	—	—	1
1950s	—	—	—	1	1970s	3	1	1	—
1970s	3	1	—	—	1980s	—	2	—	—
1980s	—	1	1	—	1990s	—	2	3	—
1990s	—	—	2	—	Wilfrid Laurier				
Toronto					1970s	1	3	—	—
1950s	1	—	—	2	Windsor				
1960s	7	1	—	4	1970s	—	1	1	1
1970s	5	6	—	1	1980s	—	1	—	—
1980s	1	6	1	1	1990s	—	—	1	—
1990s	—	—	3	—	Winnipeg				
Trent					1960s	1	—	—	—
1960s	2	—	—	1	1970s	1	—	—	—
1970s	5	2	—	1	1980s	—	3	—	—
1980s	—	2	—	—	York				
1990s	—	—	1	—	1950s	—	—	—	2
Victoria					1960s	1	1	—	—
1960s	3	1	—	1	1970s	1	6	—	—
1970s	2	1	1	—	1980s	1	2	—	—
1980s	1	—	—	—	1990s	—	—	1	—
1990s	—	—	2	—					
Waterloo									
1960s	1	—	—	1					
1970s	—	2	—	1					
1980s	—	—	1	—					

tial increase in the number of British degrees (from 22 to 35); three more were trained in former British Commonwealth countries. Of these, however, there is no way to identify Canadians who have gone abroad for their final degrees and returned to Canada to teach.

Burridge (1983: 308) suggests that "the American influence is not as overwhelming as many may have thought it to be." In 1980, the University of Chicago, with its uncharacteristically American influences from the Anglo-French tradition, was the most frequent influence in the training of Canadian professors, 55% of whom were American trained. A substantial 24.4% were Canadian trained, mainly from British Columbia, Toronto and Laval; 11.6% were trained in Britain.

Interestingly, museums are more Canadian than universities. They have expanded more recently and thus have been able to hire graduates of the PhD programs that emerged in the 1960s. Unfortunately, they are also less oriented toward research and publication, other than in-house papers and monographs, and have lacked the professional visibility—particularly internationally—of their longer-established academic colleagues.

Canada is a multilingual country whose official bilingualism recognizes the founding nations, the British and the French. The francophone universities record eight (and a half) professors with a French final degree (the half in Table 5 lists two doctoral credentials); no French degrees are found outside Quebec universities. At Laval, all nine Canadian degrees, and at Montreal seven out of eight, are from Quebec institutions. McGill, the longest-established anglophone university in Montreal, has no French-trained professor on its full-time faculty; there is one cross-appointment. McGill's two French-Canadian faculty members were trained in Canada and the United Kingdom (Trigger, personal communication). American-trained anthropologists predominate in spite of an increasing Canadianization of the training of the professoriate. The stereotype that anglophone and francophone anthropologies are quite distinct and non-interactive, forming "deux solitudes," may be somewhat oversimplified. Francophone anthropology, however, does not contribute to an anglophone national tradition outside Quebec; rather, it forms a viable but isolated unit, looking to France rather than Britain for anthropological theory and practice. Americanization debates have been less intense in Quebec. Only six Canadian professors were trained in "other" countries, down slightly from the 1982-83 figures.

In sum, the diversity of training of Canadian anthropologists cannot be said to be extensive. Americans

Table 3
Emeritus Professors in Canadian Departments of Anthropology, 1996-97

University	Name	Highest Degree	Subdiscipline
Alberta	Alan L. Bryan	Harvard	Archaeology
	Harold B. Barclay	Cornell	Sociocultural
	Anthony D. Fisher	Stanford	Sociocultural
	Ruth Gruhn	Radcliffe	Arch/Linguistics
	Henry T. Lewis	Berkeley	Sociocultural
British Columbia	David F. Aberle	Columbia	Sociocultural
	Cyril S. Belshaw	London	Sociocultural
	Kenelm O.L. Burridge	Australian National	Sociocultural
	Harry B. Hawthorne	Yale	Sociocultural
	Helga Jacobson	Cornell	Sociocultural
	Wm. Robin Ridington	Harvard	Sociocultural
Calgary			
Archaeology	David H. Kelley	Harvard	Archaeology
	Jane H. Kelley	Harvard	Archaeology
	Richard G. Forbis	Columbia	Archaeology
	Peter L. Shinnie	Oxon	Archaeology
Anthropology	Joan Ryan	British Columbia	Sociocultural
Carleton	Frank Vallee	LSE	Sociocultural
Lakehead	Kenneth C.A. Dawson	Toronto	Archaeology
Lethbridge	Keith Parry	Rochester	Sociocultural
Manitoba			
Senior Scholars	Roderick E. Burchard	Indiana	Sociocultural
	John Matthiasson	Cornell	Sociocultural
	C. Thomas Shay	Minnesota	Archaeology
McMaster	David Damas	Chicago	Sociocultural
	Richard Slobodin	Columbia	Sociocultural
	David Counts	Southern Illinois	Sociocultural
	William Noble	Calgary	Archaeology
	Richard Preston	North Carolina	Sociocultural
Regina	Richard K. Pope	Chicago	Sociocultural
Simon Fraser			
Archaeology	Roy L. Carlson	Arizona	Archaeology
	Richard Shutler, Jr.	Arizona	Archaeology
Anthropology	Ian Whitaker	Oslo	Sociocultural
Toronto	W. Peter Carstens	Cape Town	Sociocultural
	John J. Chew	Yale	Linguistics
	Bruce Drewitt	British Columbia	Archaeology
	R. William Dunning	Cambridge	Sociocultural
	Thomas F.S. McFeat	Harvard	Sociocultural
	Ajit K. Ray	Leiden	Physical
	William J. Samarin	British Columbia	Linguistics
	Rosamund Vanderburgh	Pennsylvania	Sociocultural
Trent	Kenneth A. Tracey	Kiel	Physical
	Romas K. Vastokas	Columbia	Sociocultural
Victoria	Donald H. Mitchell	Oregon	Archaeology
Waterloo (Adjunct)	Dorothy Counts	Southern Illinois	Sociocultural
	Matthew Hill	Southern Illinois	Archaeology
Western Ontario	Lee Guemple	Chicago	Sociocultural
Windsor	Ripudaman Singh	Oregon	Physical
York	Philip H. Gulliver	London	Sociocultural
	Frances Henry	Ohio State	Sociocultural

slightly predominate in spite of increasing Canadianization of the professoriate. French-trained scholars are found only in Quebec. British anthropologists are concentrated in a few departments: Toronto, the original bailiwick of British social anthropology in Canada, has four, as does York, the only large department to concentrate solely in social anthropology. Both British anthropologists at British Columbia have retired, leaving no British-trained anthropologist in a joint department of anthropology and sociology. Memorial lists two British degrees, in a province which faces across the Atlantic Ocean. In Quebec, surprisingly, there are seven British-trained anthropologists, four of them teaching in francophone universities. No other department lists more than one British-trained faculty member.

Table 4
Number of Students in Degree Programs in Canadian Departments of Anthropology, 1996-97 and Degrees Granted, 1995-96

University	Graduate	Under-graduate	BA/BSc	MA/MSc	PhD
Alberta	62	283	91	11	3
British Columbia	46	113	40	6	5
Calgary					
Anthropology	23	148	29	8	0
Archaeology	29	94	29	2	0
Laval	85	214	35	19	5
Manitoba	38	100	22	2	1
McGill	43	202	58	5	4
McMaster	52	288	95	5	6
Montreal	221	437	99	27	4
Simon Fraser					
Archaeology	33	183	35	3	1
Anthropology	33	133	39	1	0
Toronto	112	95	20	15	5
York	50	283	71	8	3
Carleton	47	126	23	11	—
Dalhousie	7	20	13	2	—
Lethbridge	2	40	17	2	—
Memorial	17	237	42	3	—
New Brunswick	8	154	20	1	—
Saskatchewan	22	123	29	8	—
Trent	22	367	67	5	—
Victoria	16	117	54	5	—
Western Ontario	17	312	65	5	—
Lakehead	—	122	22	—	—
Laurentian	—	76	12	—	—
Regina	—	62	N/A	—	—
Saint Mary's	—	77	8	—	—
Waterloo	—	57	11	—	—
Wilfrid Laurier	—	86	18	—	—
Windsor	—	144	12	—	—
Winnipeg	—	83	10	—	—

Table 5
Countries Granting Highest Degrees of Full-Time Faculty in Canadian Departments of Anthropology, 1996-97 (excluding professors emeriti)

University	Canada	U.S.A.	U.K.	Common-wealth	Other
Alberta	7	11	2	—	—
British Columbia	6	14	—	—	—
Calgary					
Anthropology	6	5	—	—	—
Archaeology	3	4	—	—	1
Laval	9[a]	3	1	—	7[b]
Manitoba	6	10	—	—	—
McGill	5	8	2	—	1
McMaster	6	5	3	1	—
Montreal	8[c]	8.5	3	—	2.5[d]
Simon Fraser					
Archaeology	6	3	1	—	—
Anthropology	4	1	2	1	—
Toronto	9	16	4	1	1
York	4	5	4	—	—
Carleton	4	5	2	—	—
Dalhousie	2	4	1	—	—
Lethbridge	4	3	1	—	—
Memorial	9	7	2	—	—
New Brunswick	5	—	1	—	—
Saskatchewan	2	4	—	—	1
Trent	2	8	1	—	1
Victoria	2	8	1	—	—
Western Ontario	6	7	—	—	—
Lakehead	4	1	—	—	—
Laurentian	2	1	—	—	—
Northern British Columbia	4	1	—	—	—
Regina	2	2	1	—	—
Saint Mary's	2	2	1	—	—
Waterloo	3	—	1	—	—
Wilfrid Laurier	3	—	1	—	—
Windsor	3	1	—	—	—
Winnipeg	3	2	—	—	—

a All from Quebec.
b All from France.
c 7 of which are from Quebec.
d Includes 1.5 from France.

Interestingly, the British influence is not numerically based. Prestige is apparently attached to British training, a subjective factor augmenting the influence of British social anthropology. This influence may, further, be seen as a conscious balance to the threat of Americanization which operates in anthropology as in Canadian cultural and intellectual life generally.

The clearest difference between the British and the American traditions is the emphasis in American (i.e., Boasian) anthropology on four subdisciplines. Most Canadian departments (as shown in Table 1) attempt to

offer all four, although sociocultural anthropology predominates. Archaeology runs a close second, physical anthropology is growing rapidly, and linguistics is the subdiscipline most likely to be omitted, perhaps because it is institutionalized as a separate discipline, at least in larger universities. Several departments list scholars in other departments who are linguistic specialists.

There are independent departments of linguistics at Alberta, British Columbia, Calgary, Laval, Manitoba, McGill, Montreal and Toronto at the doctoral level, with only McMaster, Simon Fraser and York lacking such a program. Only Carleton and Memorial at the MA level have departments of linguistics (as well as Concordia, which is not included in the statistics), while none of the BA programs are in institutions with independent linguistics departments. The University of Ottawa has linguistics but not anthropology. The autonomous status of linguistics seems to be correlated more with institutional size than with decisions internal to anthropology.

No department of anthropology lacks sociocultural anthropology. The two departments of Archaeology, at Calgary and Simon Fraser, however, depend on the parallel departments of Anthropology for their sociocultural expertise. At the PhD level, York is the only department to restrict itself exclusively to sociocultural anthropology. However, sociocultural anthropology is the largest component of the program (measured by number of faculty) at all institutions (excluding the two departments of Archaeology).

Excluding the two universities where archaeology and anthropology are separate departments, only York and Laval fail to offer archaeology; every other PhD program has four or more archaeologists.

Physical anthropology follows a similar pattern with smaller numbers. Among institutions offering the PhD, only York, McGill and Simon Fraser (Anthropology and Sociology) lack physical anthropology; Laval has one individual divided between sociocultural and physical. Toronto has the largest program, with nine physical anthropologists, followed by McMaster with three and Montreal with four. Physical anthropology is the most recent expansion in the discipline, across North America as well as in Canada. Toronto has trained the majority of the physical anthropologists hired in other Canadian universities in recent years. This growth appears to be continuing.

Toronto also has the largest contingent of linguists teaching in anthropology departments (although two of the five listed are emeritus). Montreal has three linguists and Laval one and a half, suggesting that linguistic anthropology thrives in Quebec's francophone universities.

Alberta, British Columbia and McMaster also maintain linguistic anthropology. Most of the PhD-granting institutions, however, have separate departments of Linguistics. Manitoba and British Columbia, for example, have considerable work done in linguistics on Aboriginal languages spoken in Canada.

There are more gaps in subdisciplinary coverage in departments with only an MA program. Western Ontario, Victoria, Trent and Saskatchewan offer all four traditional areas. Victoria is weak in linguistics; Western Ontario has something of a specialization (with two and a half linguists and a long-established overlapping focus in symbolic anthropology), given the small size of the subdiscipline across the country. Linguistics at Trent collaborates with Native Studies in studying First Nations languages, as do various other institutions across Canada. Memorial maintains a considerable emphasis on archaeology, with five of its 18 faculty members sharing this specialization. Carleton, a joint department with sociology, and Dalhousie have only sociocultural anthropology; Lethbridge has one physical anthropologist and the rest are sociocultural. The MA programs, in general, attempt to offer all subdisciplines, but their size often precludes more than a nominal representation outside sociocultural anthropology.

Almost all departments that offer only an undergraduate degree aspire to a foursquare program, although the largest faculty complement in this category is six. The major exception to this pattern is Northern British Columbia where the anthropology is all sociocultural and First Nations Studies includes sociocultural and linguistic anthropology. Of the other eight institutions, six of them in Ontario, only one manages to offer linguistics. Only Wilfrid Laurier lacks a physical anthropologist. The others range between half a person and two persons each in archaeology and physical anthropology. Regina is unique in having faculty with interests that cross subdisciplinary boundaries in all four subdisciplines.

Conclusion

This historical and comparative overview of Canadian anthropology departments clears the ground for specific departmental histories where participants may reflect on reasons for the interaction of local variables in making program decisions. McFeat (1980) has suggested approaching the history of Canadian anthropology by regions, producing "an ethnography of anthropology" following lines established by what anthropologists actually do in the field in different parts of Canada. Burridge (1983) likewise proposes applying the methods of anthropology to disciplinary history. As ethnographers, we

know how to do this. We are trained to use oral histories, structured within the thought-worlds of our consultants, alongside archival documentation. We are able to listen to individual "great men" (some of whom, of course, are women) and to subsume (without denigrating) their achievements in a complex historicist context of ideas, institutions and social networks. This article has attempted to set out some of the contexts within which contemporary Canadian anthropologists, many of them the founders of the discipline in Canada, have built anthropology at this particular time and place in human history. A series of institutional histories can provide the kind of comparative baseline that we seek in our ethnographic work and legitimately apply also to our own understanding(s) of our discipline. Although each of our knowledges is situated, combining them provides an overview, a means to delineate both the particularity and the diversity of the Canadian national tradition in anthropology.

Notes

1 The genesis of this project and the hope that others will meet the documentary challenge it sets are clear in the narrative of the text. Each department, indeed each Canadian anthropologist, has a story which is partly unique. I want to thank Dick Pope, Bruce Trigger and John Barker for their particular contributions to the project and to this article, though of course neither is responsible for the idiosyncrasies of my standpoint toward or interpretation of Canadian anthropology.

2 Preston (1983: 297) proposed a series of binary oppositions in which he clearly favoured the constellation of generalist, technocratic (vs. intellectualist), applied/humanistic, socially responsive, holistic transferable skills, left-wing ethnology.

3 My evidence for this assertion is a series of personal communications while writing a biography of Sapir (Darnell, 1990) and surrounding the Sapir Centenary Conference in Ottawa in 1984.

4 The meeting was structured around department representatives, indicating that the building blocks of the national traditions were understood to be the departments. This author represented the University of Alberta.

5 Preston actually categorizes Alberta as three-square, lacking linguistic anthropology. Having been "the linguist" at Alberta at the time, backed by my colleagues Ruth Gruhn and Carl Urion, and sustaining a Cree-language teaching program, I have taken the liberty of correcting the interpretation. Alberta was, by intention and practice, foursquare.

References Cited

American Anthropological Association
    1996 *A Guide to Departments, 1996-97*, Washington, DC: American Anthropological Association.

Ames, M.
    1976 Introduction, *The History of Canadian Anthropology*, Jim Freedman (ed.), Proceedings of the Canadian Ethnology Society, 3: 1-6.
    1986 *Museums, the Public and Anthropology*, Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.
    1992 *Cannibal Tours and Glass Boxes*, Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

Barker, J.
    1987 T.F. McIlwraith and Anthropology at the University of Toronto, 1925-1963, *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology*, 24: 252-268.
    1992 Introduction to T.F. McIlwraith, *The Bella Coola Indians*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Barrett, S.R.
    1979 Social Anthropologist: Marginal Academic, *Anthropology*, 16: 367-386.

Berger, C.
    1996 *Honour and the Search for Influence: A History of the Royal Society of Canada*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Burridge, K.
    1983 An Ethnology of Canadian Ethnology, *Consciousness and Inquiry: Ethnology and Canadian Realities*, Frank Manning (ed.) (Mercury Series, Canadian Ethnology Service Paper No. 89E) Ottawa: National Museum of Man: 306-320.

Cole, D.
    1973 The Origins of Canadian Anthropology, 1850-1910, *Journal of Canadian Studies*, 8: 35-45.

Cole, D., and I. Chaikin
    1990 *An Iron Hand upon the People: The Law against the Potlatch on the Northwest Coast*, Vancouver: Douglas and McIntyre.

Darnell, R.
    1969 *The Development of American Anthropology, 1879-1920: From the Bureau of American Ethnology to Franz Boas*, Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.
    1975 Towards a History of the Professionalization of Canadian Anthropology, *Proceedings of the Canadian Ethnology Society*: 399-416.
    1976 The Sapir Years at the National Museum, *The History of Canadian Anthropology*, Jim Freedman (ed.), Proceedings of the Canadian Ethnology Society, 3: 98-121.
    1983 *The Eclectic Character of Canadian Anthropology*, Paper read at the Eleventh International Congress of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences, Vancouver.
    1984 The Sapir Years in the National Museum, Ottawa, *Edward Sapir: Appraisals of His Life and Work*, Konrad Koerner (ed.), Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins: 159-186 (revision of Darnell, 1975).
    1986 The Integration of Sapir's Mature Intellect, *Perspectives in Language, Culture and Personality*, William Cowan, Michael Foster and Konrad Koerner (eds.), Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins: 553-588.
    1990 *Edward Sapir: Linguist, Anthropologist, Humanist*, Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
    1992 The Boasian Text Tradition and the History of Canadian Anthropology, *Culture*, 17: 39-48.

1998 *And Along Came Boas: Continuity and Revolution in Americanist Anthropology*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Bejnamins.

Fenton, W.
1984 Horatio Emmons Hale, *The Dictionary of Canadian Biography* (Vol. 12: 400-403), Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Gruber, J.
1967 Horatio Hale and the Development of American Anthropology, *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, 3: 5-37.

Hinsley, C.
1981 *Savages and Scientists: The Smithsonian Institution and the Development of American Anthropology, 1883-1911*, Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution.

Jenness, S.E. (ed.)
1991 *Arctic Odyssey: The Diary of Diamond Jenness, 1913-1916*, Ottawa: Canadian Museum of Civilization.

Manning, F. (ed.)
1983 *Consciousness and Inquiry: Ethnology and Canadian Realities* (Mercury Series, Canadian Ethnology Service Paper No. 89E), Ottawa: National Museum of Man.

Maud, R.
1978 *The Salish People: The Local Contribution of Charles Hill-Tout* (4 Vols.), Vancouver: Talon Books.
1982 *A Guide to B.C. Indian Myth and Legend*, Vancouver: Talon Books.

McFeat, T.
1976 The National Museum and Canadian Anthropology, *The History of Canadian Anthropology*, Jim Freedman (ed.), Proceedings of the Canadian Ethnology Society, 3: 148-174.
1980 Three Hundred Years of Anthropology in Canada, *Occasional Papers in Anthropology*, 7: 1-19, Saint Mary's University.

McIlwraith, T.F.
1964 Sir Daniel Wilson: A Canadian Anthropologist of One Hundred Years Ago, *Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada*, 2, Series 4: 129-136.
1992 [1948] *The Bella Coola Indians*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Nowry, L.
1995 *Man of Mana: Marius Barbeau*, Toronto: NC Press.

Preston, R.
1976 Marius Barbeau and the History of Canadian Anthropology, *The History of Canadian Anthropology*, Jim Freedman (ed.), Proceedings of the Canadian Ethnology Society, 3: 122-135.

1983 The Social Structure of an Unorganized Society: Beyond Intentions and Peripheral Boasians, *Consciousness and Inquiry: Ethnology and Canadian Realities*, Frank Manning (ed.) (Mercury Series, Canadian Ethnology Service, Paper No. 89E), Ottawa: National Museum of Man: 286-305.
1986 Sapir's "Psychology of Culture" Prospectus, *Perspectives in Language, Culture and Personality*, William Cowan, Michael Foster and Konrad Koerner (eds.), Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins: 533-551.

Reimer, W. (ed.)
1990 *Guide to Departments, 1990-1991: Anthropology, Archaeology, Sociology in Universities and Museums in Canada*, Canadian Anthropology Society and Canadian Sociology and Anthropology Association.

Sheets-Pyenson, S.
1996 *John William Dawson: Faith, Hope, and Science*, Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Silverman, M.
1991 Dispatch I. Amongst "Our Selves": A Colonial Encounter in Canadian Academia, *Critique of Anthropology*, 11: 381-400.

Stocking, G.W., Jr.
1968 *Race, Culture and Evolution*, New York: Free Press.

Sweet, L.
1976 What Is Canadian Anthropology? *American Anthropologist*, 78: 844-850.

Trigger, B.G.
1966a Sir Daniel Wilson: Canada's First Anthropologist, *Anthropologica*, 8: 3-28.
1966b Sir John Wilson Dawson: A Faithful Anthropologist, *Anthropologica*, 8: 351-359.
1990 *Anthropological Literature, The Literary History of Canada: Canadian Literature in English*, William H. New (ed.) (2d ed., Vol. 4), Toronto: University of Toronto Press: 241-262.
1997 Loaves and Fishes: Sustaining Anthropology at McGill, *Culture*, 17: 89-100.

Tylor, E.B.
1884 American Aspects of Anthropology, *Popular Science Monthly*, 26: 152-158.

Van West, J.
1976 George Mercer Dawson, *Anthropological Journal of Canada*, 14: 8-12.