National Culture, Political Economy and Socio-Cultural Anthropology in English Canada

Thomas Dunk *Lakehead University*

Abstract: The apparent absence of a unique national tradition of anthropology in Canada has been the subject of discussion since the 1970s. Howes (1992) proposed that, in fact, a Canadian anthropological canon can be identified and that these works share, along with Canadian culture more generally, a commitment to the principle of bicentrism. This article questions the idea that principles such as bicentrism and/or multiculturalism are reflective of a distinctive Canadian national/popular collective will. It argues that, in English-Canada, there is a widely recognized intellectual tradition of political economy and that this tradition offers a better model for understanding what is or is not different about English-Canadian anthropology.

Résumé: L'apparente absence d'une tradition anthropologique nationale unique au Canada a fait l'objet de discussions depuis les années 1970. Howes (1992) a soumis l'idée qu'en fait un canon anthropologique canadien peut être identifié et que les travaux qui en relèvent partagent, en accord avec la culture canadienne en général, un engagement envers le principe du bicentrisme. Le présent article remet en question l'idée que des principes tels que le bicentrisme et/ou le multiculturalisme reflètent une volonté collective populaire nationale distinctement canadienne. Il soutient qu'au Canada anglais, il y a une tradition intellectuelle d''économie politique largement reconnue, et que cette tradition offre un meilleur modèle pour comprendre ce qui est ou ce qui n'est pas différent en anthropologie canadienne anglaise.

Introduction

Whether or not Canada has its own national tradition of anthropology has been a subject of discussion since at least the 1970s. Recent efforts (Darnell, 1998) to trace the history of the discipline in Canada have enriched our knowledge of the development of the institutional bases of Canadian anthropology but have not identified a distinctive intellectual or theoretical anthropological tradition that reflects or expresses a unique Canadian culture. To date the most explicit effort to specify a distinctive Canadian anthropological paradigm is Howes' (1992) proposal that canonical Canadian anthropological writings express the principle of bicentrism.

In this paper I engage Howes' argument about the relationship between a distinctive Canadian culture and the tradition of Canadian anthropology. Since the specific objects of study in physical anthropology, linguistic anthropology and archaeology are diverse, and anthropology in Quebec is different from the rest of the country, for the sake of clarity of focus I concentrate on socio-cultural anthropology in English-Canada. In contrast to Howes' argument that the Canadian anthropological tradition is shaped by and reflective of the principles embedded in the constitution of the federal Canadian state, I posit that if there is something distinctive about socio-cultural anthropology in English-Canada it is explained by political economy. Indeed, political economy is one intellectual field where there is a widely recognized, unique English-Canadian theoretical paradigm. The issues of concern within this particular approach help us understand both what may be different about English-Canadian socio-cultural anthropology and the politico-economic structures that work against the emergence or recognition of a clearly defined national tradition.

State, Nation, and Culture in Canada

Discussing the concepts of a national culture and a national tradition of anthropological research is fraught with potential complications because both depend on the idea that there is a distinct nation which could generate a national tradition. While it is true that nationalism has been a powerful force in world history in the last two centuries, in many cases the existence of a national culture can be, and often is, contested. If a nation is an "imagined community" (Anderson, 1991), there are many states that are not yet nations. What and whose imaginary it is that is to count as the expression of the "community" is the subject of heated and sometimes violent conflict. Even in states where political unity is not in question, there are likely to be a variety of opinions about the content and form of the national culture.

Canada is one of the modern states which lacks consensus about its national culture; indeed, in this sense it is more accurate to speak of the Canadian state rather than the Canadian nation precisely because there is not one hegemonic imagined community. Officially, there are at least two as in the notion, embedded in the Canadian constitution, of the two founding nations, the French and the British. The First Nations have vigorously argued for and won a unique constitutional position by virtue of being the first peoples, thus giving at least three nations, and perhaps hundreds if we consider the cultural and political heterogeneity of the First Nations. Canada is officially a multicultural nation suggesting that competing ideas of Canadian culture and identity are welcome. Beyond these formally recognized expressions of different ideas about the national culture are the regional ones: the east, the west, and the centre, and even within each of these regions there are differences between the urban regional centres and the extensive hinterlands that they control politically and economically. To complicate matters further, and as I will discuss below, some of these regional cultures are fuelled, in part, by a backlash against the official state policies of bilingualism and multiculturalism. One of the elements of the national setting in Canada is that there are competing ideas about what the nation is and should be; cultural difference based upon historic settlement patterns, linguistic difference, and regional political economy is foregrounded.

Within the Canadian state there is no neat correspondence between one culture, an imagined community, and the political boundaries of the state. It is true to say, however, that English-language Canadian culture is the dominant culture in the simple sense that the majority of the population are English speakers, outside of Quebec and perhaps New Brunswick, and the important national and provincial economic, political and cultural institutions—the mass media, the educational system, the government bureaucracies, work places, and trade unions—operate primarily in English and cater to an English-speaking population. It is this culture that the Quebecois, the First Nations and many ethnic groups feel they must accommodate and protect themselves against. Ironically, this dominant culture may not actually exist; or at least we need to recognize that English-Canadian culture is notoriously hard to define. English-Canadian nationalist scholars and writers swerve anxiously between attempts to define or express a national/popular collective will and bemoaning the fact that it either has been or is about to be swamped by a dominant imperial culture (see, for example, Angus, 1997).

It is symptomatic of the apparent absence of an identifiable English-Canadian culture that there is not a recognized English-Canadian tradition of anthropological research and theorizing. If one tries to conjure up the notion of English-Canadian anthropology there are no relatively clear theoretical orientations that come to mind in the same way that happens if one thinks of French, British, or American anthropology (cf. Howes, 1992: 155). To be sure, this is not to suggest that any of these traditions, if examined closely, are devoid of debates about just exactly what they are and what they should or could be, or that within France, the United Kingdom, and the United States there are no arguments about the efficacy or even reality of these national traditions. But there is, in the broader anthropological community, recognition that there is some historical connection between these nations and broad theoretical paradigms. Although studies of Aboriginal cultures form a prominent part of the subject matter of anthropology in English Canada (Darnell, 1997), there appears to be no equivalent English-Canadian theoretical paradigm to call upon. It is perhaps a logical expectation that in a state that lacks a strong sense of a national culture one is hard-pressed to find a national theoretical tradition of anthropological research.

Bicentrism: A Tradition That is Not One?

Thus if one is to try to explain what is distinctive about English-Canadian culture, and socio-cultural anthropology as one small element of that culture, one must set about trying to explain an evident lack, the presence of an absence so to speak. This problem is often seen to have its origins in the fact that, as the official state ideology would have it, Canada as a state was founded by and has henceforth tried to protect its two founding cultures as well as various others. Thus, whereas other nation states try, in the official ideology, to describe who they are—in other words to formulate a core identity—Canada has, officially at least, resisted this. Its official state policies of bilingualism and multiculturalism promote the maintenance of cultural difference. What is said to make Canada distinctive is its diversity.

Recent analyses of what has been called bicentrism—an inability to imagine a whole that is not internally divided—have taken it to define a distinctive English-Canadian psyche which is reflected in English-Canadian culture and in English-Canadian anthropology (Harries-Jones, 1997: 251-252; Howes, 1992).[1] What defines English-Canadian culture is its very lack of a singular definition. English-Canadian identity is forever contingent and English-Canadian anthropology is, thus, a "'tradition that is not one,' like the identity of which it is, in part, an expression" (Howes, 1992: 155). Although the notion of Canadian content as employed by state bureaucrats out to promote or protect Canada's cultural industries is dismissed as "preposterous" (ibid: 156), a distinctively English-Canadian culture is said to be identifiable on the basis of its formal structural properties, its bicentrism (ibid: 163-164). The "best in Canadian anthropology," as in high culture more generally, thus, are works that express this "tendency towards bicentrism" (ibid: 166). This is juxtaposed to an American tendency towards "concentricity."

This analysis is interesting for at least two reasons. Firstly, it is an effort to go beyond the tendency to lament the absence of a distinctive English-Canadian culture and English-Canadian anthropology by shifting our attention from content to formal, structural principles. What seems to be missing at first glance is said, in fact, to be there, but seeing it requires looking at organizing principles rather than content. Secondly, it explains the particular nature of this formal structural principle of English-Canadian thought by reference to a unique Canadian psyche, one that is reflected in and influenced by Canadian political and legal history.

On the other hand, such reasoning runs aground on a number of conceptual and empirical problems. For example, it is not clear that bicentrism as a formal structural principle is unique to English-Canadian culture, especially given the current configuration of global economics and culture. Furthermore, while the principle of bicentrism may indeed be reflected in certain politico-legal documents such as the Canadian constitution, it is questionable as to whether this does represent a national/popular collective imaginary, as opposed to the particular thinking of a class or class fraction within the social formation. Finally, there are some other straightforward political, economic, and cultural realities that the Canadian state has always had to deal with, and which a distinctive brand of English-Canadian political economy has tried to address. The structures of importance are not in the Canadian psyche, but rather in global political economy.

The inability to imagine a whole that is not divided within itself, argued by Howes to reflect something unique about English-Canadian culture, is increasingly said to be true of all cultures. The common idea that English-Canadian identity consists solely or primarily of contingent relationships—that, for example, it primarily is defined as the binary opposite of American culture—is reflective of the principal of identity formation in much poststructuralist theorizing which emphasizes the relational, contextual and contingent nature of all meaning (Laclau and Mouffe, 1985). From such perspectives, to say English-Canadian national culture is characterized by an absence of essence, or that it is bicentric, no longer clearly separates it from any other national culture or identity. It may reflect a much more widespread "postmodern" condition, that is only now being recognized in numerous other locations; a condition which is, if one follows thinkers such as David Harvey (1989), a symptom of the compression of time and space brought on by recent technological and economic developments.

The literature on English-Canadian identity vacillates between assertions that English-Canadian culture actually does reflect an openness to diversity and assertions that this is what English-Canadians should strive for. It slides between arguments about what is and arguments about what ought to be. For example, in his recent intensive discussion of the relationship between English-Canadian identity and the intellectual culture of English-Canada, Angus (1997: 135-169) presents multiculturalism as an important intellectual and social ideal. He provides a convincing argument as to why the principle of multiculturalism ought to be embraced by English-Canadian nationalists. But the very fact that he structures his argument as a defence of the principle of multiculturalism implies a recognition that it is not as widely accepted as one may wish. In other words, it is not reflective of an English-Canadian national/popular collective will, although there are many good reasons why Canada would be better off if such values were embedded in English-Canadian culture.[2]

The juxtaposition of English-Canadian bicentrism and American concentrism reflects the familiar idea that the United States is a cultural "melting pot," whereas Canada is a state that respects, indeed even protects, cultural diversity. This is why defining an English-Canadian culture is so difficult. Americans know or are told what they are to be or become; English-Canadians have never settled on a uniform vision of who they are, other than the empty negatives of not-American or not-Quebecois.

While there can be no doubt that the political constitutions of the two states reflect different ideas about the relationship between the state and individuals, and that this does have important real consequences, there can also be no doubt that the differences, especially with regard to the respect for cultural variation within the two states, are often overdrawn. The history of the treatment of First Nations people by the Canadian state and non-Native populace, and the efforts to assimilate non-Anglophone immigrants to dominant ideas about identity, behaviour and culture, show that indeed there were and are powerful ideas about, and desires to impose, an "appropriate" uniform English-Canadian identity on the population—at least the population living outside of Quebec (Stasiulus and Jhappan, 1996; Valverde, 1991). These ideas may not be embedded in the constitution and they may not now form part of the official state doctrine, but they were and are present. Anxiety about threats to an imagined homogeneous culture underlies the English-Canadian history of racist reactions to immigrants, especially Asian immigrants (Ward, 1978). English-Canadians have, periodically, expressed the same yearning for social, cultural and biological homogeneity as have other nationalities. Ideas and images about who are "real Canadians" may be derivative forms of "Britishness," or "whiteness," but they are, nonetheless, forms of "concentric" thinking, expressing a will for a more concentric culture in the sense of one that subsumes otherness within a homogeneous totality.

There is a long tradition of sociological work comparing Canadian and American values. While much of this research supports the idea that Canadians and Americans differ with regard to issues such as the emphasis they place on individualism and competition—indeed this research is premised on such binary oppositions—these differences are of a statistical rather than an absolute nature (see Lipset, 1990 for a recent overview of this argument). Moreover, research on levels and kinds of prejudice and discrimination in the two countries suggests that, with regard to these issues, the differences between Canadians and Americans are rather limited (Reitz and Breton, 1994). The Canadian conceit that we are more tolerant of "otherness" than our American neighbours is both self-serving and inaccurate, even if as a medium-sized state Canada is not guilty of the kind or extent of imperialist crimes historically committed by, say, the United Kingdom, France or the United States.

There is also a tradition that interprets Canada's bilingualism and multiculturalism as a form of ideology rather than an expression of an essential English-Canadian form of thought. Bilingualism and multiculturalism are seen as attempts to undermine Quebecois nationalism by, in essence, drowning the minority French language and culture in a sea of competing otherness and/or co-opting unassimilated Quebecois and other ethnic leadership. In other words, the Canadian state's multiculturalism may reflect a technique for solidifying a uniform Anglo-dominated bourgeois hegemony, rather than a deep bicentric structure of the English-Canadian mind (Moodley, 1983).

Such an analysis is supported by a growing literature on the ways in which contemporary multiculturalism meshes a little too easily with contemporary global capitalism. Mitchell (1993), for example, has shown how multiculturalism is used by those speaking on behalf of international capital when they are opposed by local populations who perceive their lifestyles and economic interests jeopardized by developments brought on by foreign capital. Homeowners opposed to the secretive real estate dealings of Hong Kong investors are derided as racists and Canada's multicultural heritage is celebrated by those wishing to attract and benefit from this foreign investment.[3]

Multiculturalism plays an important ideological role in the reproduction of the power and influence of capital in Canada and on a global scale. The notion of multiculturalism focusses attention on ethnicity as the core form of identity—as opposed to a multitude of other potential sources of identity, such as social class, occupation, gender, and region. A state policy and ideology of bilingualism and multiculturalism foregrounds vertical divisions—different but equal cultures—albeit privileging the British and French cultures within the constitutional framework. As long as the state promotes this idea, it draws attention away from the horizontal divisions of class, gender, race and ethnicity that involve differentials of power and wealth.

In a world in which capital is increasingly homeless, in the sense that large multinational corporations and huge investment firms look upon the whole world as their field of action, local efforts to resist its designs, in its actual home nations as much as elsewhere, are dealt with ideologically as expressions of outdated localism, nationalism, or even racism. Multiculturalism is a congenial idea for the upper- and upper-middle classes who have the means and ability to benefit from the free-flow of capital, goods, and services. At its core, however, there is a certain "falsity":

> The falsity of elitist multiculturalist liberalism thus resides in the tension between content and form which characterized already the first great ideological project

> of tolerant universalism, that of freemasonry: the doctrine of freemasonry (the universal brotherhood of all men based on the light of Reason) clearly clashes with its form of expression and organization (a secret society with its rituals of initiation)—the very form of expression and articulation of freemasonry belies its positive doctrine. In a strictly homologous way, the contemporary "politically correct" liberal attitude which perceives of itself as surpassing the limitations of its ethnic identity ("citizen of the world" without anchors in any particular ethnic community), functions, *within its own society*, as a narrow elitist upper-middle-class circle opposing itself to the majority of common people, despised for being caught in their narrow ethnic or community confines. (Zizek, 1997: 47)

In the current context, such facts and ideas should at the very least lead one to question the notion that Canada's bilingual or multicultural constitution reflects some primordial English- or French-Canadian essence that one can see reflected in high culture and intellectual pursuits such as anthropology. If bicentrism is a constant in either English- or French-Canadian culture, it may say more about the peculiar class/ethnic/regional structure of the dominant class or class fractions in Canada, or about the way in which the dominant social categories are integrated into global capitalism, than it does about a unique Canadian psyche. Underlying this apparent official respect for ethnic variation is a uniform set of social relationships that stultify anything other than superficial difference.[4]

The argument about the relationship between official state policies and national culture or cultures in Canada is premised on there being a simplistic expressive relationship between a national/popular collective will and state policy. Howes (1992: 156) argues, for example, that the merit of the criteria (evidence of bicentrism) he proposes for deciding whether or not a work should belong to the Canadian anthropological canon stems from the fact that they are general and "constitutional (that is, they are legal and cannot therefore be dismissed as 'purely political')." This is a curious claim. Laws and constitutions are the product of very political processes; they are the object that political institutions and processes explicitly produce. They may not be "purely political" but they are highly political.

A Marxian-influenced perpective would begin not by positing the autonomy of the legal system but by asking how the legal system reflects relationships of power and which segment of society, in terms of social classes or class fractions, it is that dominates the law-making process. In other words, which class's specific interests become embodied in laws that are then projected as an expression of national will and imposed upon everyone? The question that emerges from this perspective is whose interest is represented in the Canadian constitution?

The processes by which a new state is created are always complex. However, it is well-known that the "fathers of confederation" were largely merchant capitalists concerned, among other things, to secure a substantial hinterland for their control, a hinterland threatened by forces from within and without that sought to achieve political independence or absorption into the United States. The original Canadian constitution reflected the accommodation reached by an ethnically divided class fraction so as to foster circumstances which allowed it to proceed in its goal of creating economic opportunities from which its members would benefit. Contemporary state policies such as bilingualism and multiculturalism reflect a particular concatenation of political, economic, and cultural forces, but it is doubtful they reflect a national/popular collective will. Populist political movements in English-Canada and avowedly nationalist ones in Quebec are explicitly critical of these policies.

This is not to suggest that there were not, or are not, real divisions between the English-speaking and French-speaking populations that transcend a simplistic class analysis, or that a reductionist Marxist argument suffices to explain the form and content of the Canadian constitution. Nor is it to suggest that the state should be interpreted only as a vehicle of class domination and oppression. Bilingualism and multiculturalism are partly the product of struggles by subaltern groups in Canada to use the state for protection from dominant political, economic and cultural forces (Angus, 1997: 19-20). I simply want to draw attention to the fact that it is another form of simplistic reductionism to suggest that the constitutions of states can be read as expressions of some national essence or imaginary. They are, rather, the product of a relatively small political elite overwhelmingly drawn from a particular social class, not to mention gender.[5]

Indeed, it is arguable that the threats to national unity in Canada are at least partly a product of the fact that the Canadian constitution does not reflect the real Canadian imaginary, whatever it might be. Howes argues that the "bicentric propensity, this refusal to synthesize, is a manifestation of the strength of the Canadian constitution" (1992, 164). This is very much the official line, and one particularly meaningful among the central Canadian educated middle or upper class, especially Anglophones in Quebec and Francophones in Ontario. It is precisely the perspective that is under attack from many regions in the country, particularly the West, but also in the regions where Quebecois separatism is strongest, and among segments of the Anglophone white working class. In English-Canada, the strength of the populist right wing lies partly in its more or less explicit demand for a less bicentric understanding of what it means to be Canadian (Leach, 1998, 1997; Patten, 1996.) The constitution may reflect an admirable principle of bicentrism, but it is a principle that many segments of the Canadian population find disagreeable.[6]

All of this suggests that if we want to understand what is unique about Canadian culture, we should look beyond the constitution and unresolvable questions about the particularity of a Canadian psyche or imaginary. What makes Canada unique is the particular way in which the human populations living within the country have been, and have resisted being, tied into a global economy over the last 500 years. Indeed, a uniquely Canadian theoretical perspective has been developed precisely to try and understand this political and economic experience.[7]

Canadian Political Economy and the Absence of a Strong National Culture

There is at least one widely recognized "homegrown" Canadian intellectual tradition. Indeed, in communication studies, it is referred to as the Canadian school (Martin, 1997: 39-45). This tradition originates in the work of Harold Innis in the 1920s and focusses on the relationship between political and economic organization and the means of transportation and communication, a concern derived in part from analyzing the problems the Canadian state faced trying to generate a functioning political entity and economy over a vast and thinly populated territory.

In a broader sense, Innis's perspective and the processes and situations that were its central concerns foreground many of the issues that are now seen to be important issues on a global level. In this sense, both the relationship between the state and national culture and identity within English Canada and the Innissian tradition, arguably, can be understood as ahead of their time.

Canada, as a state, has always dealt with what is now seen to be a widespread phenomenon: the decentring of identities and cultures that deep embeddedness in global markets seems to entail and the inevitable reactions and backlashes that this experience generates. This may be explained in the Canadian case in part by reference to some of the principal concerns of Innis's political economy, particularly relationships between natural environmental conditions, technology, world markets, and the spatial organization of production, distribution and settlement in Canada. In the words of Daniel Drache, one of Innis's main contemporary interpreters, a central focus of Innis's work was "the costly and uncontrollable effect of international markets on people and communities" (Drache, 1995: xiv).

Innis's theory of staple development and its effects on Canada (Innis, 1956: 383-402) foreshadows at least some of the current concern in anthropology and other disciplines with globalization and its spatial dislocations and reorganizations. The staple theory argues that because of the unique and specific characteristics of reliance upon the export of staple products (themselves partly determined by environmental conditions) Canada's economic and cultural development took specific forms. Issues such as the environmental limits to certain kinds of economic activity, problems inherent in a reliance on export-led growth, import penetration of domestic markets, foreign ownership, and the arguable absence or relatively weak position of indigenous entrepreneurs meant that exogenous forces have played a role in Canadian economic and cultural history that they may not have elsewhere.

Another prominent theme in the staple theory is that the development of staple products and their export involves huge public investment in infrastructure which leads, in turn, to high levels of public debt, which then limit the state's options in terms of economic, social, and cultural policy, especially given a reliance on high levels of foreign investment and access to foreign markets. These themes are central to the current discourse on globalization, the nation state, public finances and the restructuring of production, distribution and culture.

Following the general outlines of this approach, if Canadian identity is fractured, it is the product of each region's historical origins as staple-producing zones, rather than the hegemonic ideology of bicentrism. Newfoundland culture, tradition, and folklore is rooted in the fact that it was based upon the production of codfish for the, mostly, European market. Features of both the cod itself—being a natural resource whose ecology meant it could not easily be incorporated into systems of private ownership—and the market—being European peasants and workers and therefore with a limited price ceiling but a very elastic floor—had important consequences in terms of settlement patterns, returns on investments, and the social relations of production, that included, for example, the merchants' drive to externalize the costs and risks of production. Changes in markets, technology, the regulation of the resource and the organization of production in the postwar years have had devastating effects on the environment and on the communities dependent on the fishery (Kennedy 1997).

Quebecois culture is, of course, derived at one level from its French origins. But the Canadian side of French Canada is also inextricably bound up with the unique agro-forest economy developed in relationship to the early fur trade, the slow development of commercial agriculture, the 19th-century square timber trade, and the 20th-century pulp and paper economy. Moreover, current issues such as Quebec nationalism have their origins, in part, in the differential success of Quebec and Ontario (Lower and Upper Canada) in the early wheat economy. Because of environmental and economic conditions, petty commodity producers in Upper Canada/Ontario enjoyed a success which stimulated backward and forward linkages and thus contributed to the development of a more dynamic industrial capitalist culture in Ontario than in Quebec. Quebecers' sense of being "poorer cousins" in the confederation stems partly from this historic economic situation which in certain respects they are still trying to overcome, but whose origins lie not in culture but in environment and markets.[8] That the West historically has been reliant on grain, coal, oil and gas production and the boreal forest region of central Canada has relied on the production of fur, timber, and pulp and paper have, similarly, had a significant influence on the nature of migration, settlement, labour markets, and cultural identities in these regions (Dunk, 1991; Stymeist, 1975).

The relationship between Aboriginal people and the anthropological community in Canada has a long and important history and some of the principal concerns of that research over the years address the role of Aboriginal people in the fur trade and the importance of the fur trade in Canadian economic development (Innis, 1956). As the importance of the fur trade in the national economy waned, the Canadian state concerned itself with removing Native people so that other kinds of staple production could proceed—a process that is still ongoing in the endless battles between the federal and provincial governments and various Aboriginal communities about forestry, mining, oil, gas and hydro-electric projects. As Darnell (1997) shows, what she calls the "Americanist" tradition has been a central theme in Canadian anthropology. One of the first "anthropological" PhD dissertations produced in Canada was focussed on the interactions between Aboriginal people and Europeans (Bailey, 1969 [1937]). Notably, Harold Innis was involved as an advisor, although the dissertation was supervised by McIlwraith. According to Darnell (1998: 159), this dissertation "set the tone for Canadian anthropology in the intersections of anthropology, history and economics."[9] The ongoing conflict between Aboriginal people, the Canadian state, and non-Aboriginal public and private enterprise has generated employment and research opportunities for many anthropologists (cf. Dyck and Waldram,1993).

Thus, English-Canada's lack of a homogeneous cultural identity historically is rooted in Canada's long and regionally variegated integration into global capitalism. Staple theory, as a unique Canadian contribution to political economy, attempts to both explain and express this historical experience. Innis's political economy has hardly gone unchallenged but its central themes have remained ongoing subjects of debates and analyses and, with the current interest in political ecology and globalization, there may even be a renewed interest in his ideas.[10]

By the 1970s, Innisian political economy was being reworked in what was referred to as the "new Canadian political economy" to avoid what some perceived as its environmental determinist overtones and to better fit with the "dependency" literature, the origins of which lay in efforts to understand the development of underdevelopment in Latin America. In this context Canada was seen as an anomaly—a rich, but nonetheless underdeveloped, nation. Emphasis was placed upon the role of imperialism and the problems of foreign control over key economic sectors in thwarting what was seen as a "normal" course of industrialization.

This literature was soon enough subjected to a neo-Marxian criticism; namely, that in its emphasis on exchange and trade patterns it ignored social class, particularly the constitutive role of class struggle in determing the actual living conditions of subaltern populations and the range of power and options open to both indigenous and foreign capitalists. Class relations within Canada from the 19th-century were very different from Latin America. Of particular importance was the fact that petty commodity producers and wage labourers were formally free, unlike much of Latin America where bonded forms of labour were far more common. This had important repercussions for the development of market relationships, and a system of commodity production based upon the purchase of commodities in Canada, and the lack of such an outcome in Latin America (see Panitch, 1981 for a particularly good summary of the argument and its critique).

One element of this critique that is particularly pertinent to the current discussion is the way it focussed on the cultural aspects of Canada's domination by imperial powers such as the United Kingdom and the United States. It is here that one finds a potential political economic explanation of Canadian anthropology being "a tradition that is not one." In the postwar era, the role of American culture in Canadian life has been overwhelming. As Leo Panitch expressed it almost 20 years ago:

> ... it is not the state that primarily sustains American imperialism within Canadian society. The imperial relation is secured and maintained more fundamentally within civil society itself—in the integration of all the dominant fractions of capital under the hegemony of the American bourgeoisie, in a continental labour market and international unions, and above all, in our culture—not so much the "haute culture" of the intellectuals but the popular culture which is produced and reproduced in advertising, the mass media, and the mass educational system." (1981: 26)

The Anthropological Labour Market in Canada

Anthropology developed as part and parcel of the postwar growth of the mass education system in Canada and this was made possible by, and Canadian anthropology has been indelibly shaped by, the nature of the continental intellectual labour market during this period. The growth of mass postsecondary education was a characteristic feature of what some political economists now refer to as the Fordist era, the period of mass production for mass consumption during which the state attempted to regulate the inherent conflict between labour and capital by smoothing out economic fluctuations with public expenditure to stimulate demand when necessary and by providing non-market sources of social support for those who needed them. It also invested heavily in education. Canada's version of this "mode of regulation" has been dubbed "permeable Fordism." According to Jenson (1989: 78), "since 1945 the Canadian economy has been permeated by international—or, more exactly, continental—effects. Its Fordism was designed domestically but always with an eye to the continental economy."

When exactly the Fordist era ended in Canada is a matter of debate. For some, its termination is signified by the 1975 federal budget when the national government officially repudiated its commitment to full employment so as to pursue its war against inflation (McBride 1992: 50-52). Others see the Free Trade Agreement of 1989 as the end of the attempt to regulate the economy at the national level (Angus, 1997: 23). In any event, this era is now clearly at an end. It may be more than coincidental that the growth of anthropology as a profession took off during the Fordist era, in Canada as elsewhere, and that the apparent crisis or sense of unease about the future of the discipline, is part and parcel of intellectual life in the so-called post-Fordist age.[11]

The permeation of the Canadian economy by continental (and global) effects is, as is well-known, reflected in the anthropological labour market. The profession of anthropology in Canada is most distinguished from other national situations by the extent to which it relies on practitioners who were trained elsewhere, especially in the United States. A recent review of the history of departments of anthropology in Canada shows that between 1982-83 and 1996-97 the number of Canadian-trained faculty has "increased dramatically—from 86 out of 312 to 141 out of 343" (Darnell, 1998: 161). However, even with this "dramatic" improvement, only 41% of faculty in Canadian anthropology departments are Canadian-trained.

While it would require a more extensive research project to do a global comparison, a day spent reading the faculty listings in the AAA *Guide to Departments* will reveal the extent to which, compared at least to the United States or Britain, Canadian anthropology departments continue to rely upon faculty trained outside of the country. Foreign-trained faculty are at best a small minority in anthropology departments in these other nations, while they form the majority in most Canadian departments of anthropology. This is especially important in those departments that are producing the new generation of PhD-wielding anthropologists, the individuals who are supposedly going to fill the faculty vacancies that are predicted in the near future.

The numbers become more interesting (or depressing?) if one relates the composition of departments in terms of where faculty members received their doctorate to the level of the programs (undergraduate and graduate) the department offers. In PhD-granting departments the percentage of faculty who are Canadian-trained is 38 percent. It is virtually the same (39%) in departments that offer an MA in anthropology. In rather stark contrast, in the departments without graduate programs, 65 percent of the faculty are Canadian-trained. According to Darnell's figures (1998: 165), in the Departments of Archaeology at Simon Fraser University and the University of Calgary the majority of faculty are Canadian-trained. If these departments are not included in the count, only 36 percent of the faculty in departments that offer a doctorate in anthropology received their PhD from a Canadian university. The figure declines to 29 percent if one counts only the faculty in these departments whose field of expertise is socio-cultural anthropology. If Laval and the University of Montreal (the two French language universities offering a PhD in anthropology) are excluded from the calculation, we find that only 25 percent of the socio-cultural anthropologists in PhD-granting departments in English-Canada received their doctorate from a Canadian university.[12]

There are a number of reasons for this unique situation. Anthropology was established in universities in Canada only after the second World War. Harries-Jones asserts that a brain-drain from Canada to the United States, Great Britain and elsewhere in the 1960s contributed to a shortage of Canadian-trained personnel for the expanding university system (1997: 250). This may or may not have been a causative factor in the shortage of Canadian anthropologists but there is more to the story than this, particularly given the hegemonic influence American culture has within Canada. Until the late 1960s, there were relatively few PhDs granted by Canadian anthropology departments (Preston and Adelard-Tremblay, 1988). As the universities launched their rapid expansion in the 1960s, they had to look elsewhere for the skilled labour required to staff them. In doing so they were following a common pattern in Canadian history, one whose explanation lies in part in Canada's historic staples-based economy. Shortages of skilled labour have often been overcome by importing this labour from elsewhere, rather than training and educating Canadian workers (Swift, 1995: 70-93).

The situation may be about to change as hundreds of academics reach retirement age. There is now a steady supply of new PhDs in anthropology produced every year by the bigger Canadian universities. There is, however, another factor at work besides the earlier shortage of university-trained anthropologists which is likely to mean that foreign-trained faculty will continue to be highly valued in Canadian anthropology programs.

The higher education system is, in certain respects, influenced by the same trends that exist in the world of popular culture. Individuals and institutions always have looked to a global culture for legitimation. Success within English-Canada is often dependent upon initial recognition and approval in the United States or, to a lesser extent, Europe. Unless the pattern changes, the transmission of the anthropological culture in English-Canada is always going to be through the filter of perspectives that derive from elsewhere because degrees from certain foreign countries and universities are always going to be more highly valued by Canadians themselves than are degrees from Canadian institutions. Silverman's (1991) "self-reflexive" ethnographic account of how Canadian-trained candidates are deemed "uninteresting" illustrates how deeply the culture of English-Canadian anthropology departments may be embedded in this essentially neo-colonial mentality. This same mentality may be responsible for the fact that only at the smaller undergraduate institutions, many of which are in the "hinterlands," do Canadian-trained anthropologists predominate.

Of course, English-Canada is not alone in being heavily influenced by the intellectual traditions that derive from the major present or past imperial nations. The grand philosophical orientations that guide most social research can be historically connected to certain nations: German idealism, French rationalism, British empiricism, and American pragmatism. The intellectual cultures of all the smaller nations have been influenced by these traditions to some extent and even today the global domination of the United States and, to a lesser extent, the United Kingdom, France and Germany is seen in such everyday realities as the fact that most "world-class" journals and publishers are based in one of these countries. To become a "known" international scholar requires being published in journals that, despite their particular national origin and setting, project and/or are perceived to reflect universal interests and concerns.

Grand Theory versus the Ethnography of the Particular

The difficulty in identifying a distinctively English-Canadian anthropology thus stems, in part, from the nature of the anthropological labour market and the neo-colonial mentality, at least when it comes to identifying "significant" theories and issues that form the ether in which English-Canadian intellectual culture is bathed. Of course, English-Canadian anthropologists may not be very different from those from any other national tradition in their apparent neglect, for the most part, of the way their own occupational culture influences their work practices (D'Amico-Samuels, 1997).

But there may be something distinctive about an English-Canadian culture that is the product of the political and economic realities that Innis was trying to understand. English-Canadian scholars are caught in a paradox common to the intellectual culture of all subordinate or peripheral states or nations. As Angus expresses it:

> Distinctiveness seems to require that one's own be located in elements that are not shared with any other humans. The search for self-identity thus seems to be shunted towards uniqueness, non-general elements, parochiality—which consequently leaves the search open to the often-encountered criticism that it only

> deals with what is non-essential and of merely local interest.... One seems to be faced with a choice between defending one's own in a merely parochial fashion and ceasing to be concerned with it in the name of the universal." (Angus, 1997: 106)

Intellectuals coming from imperial cultures do not necessarily have to deal with this issue simply because "reality" does not endlessly force recognition of their own particularity on them. Projection from the particular to the universal is a "natural" step. Part of the reason it may be difficult to identify a distinctively English-Canadian anthropological tradition is that it tends to highlight local, regional, and national contexts and thus never seems to achieve the apparent level of universal significance of some of the other national anthropological traditions. There are analogies in cognate scholarly disciplines. Carroll notes that in Canadian sociology there is a strong emphasis on "idiographic accounts rather than nomothetic explanations" (1992: 2). This is, at least in part, related to the difference between Canada and the United States in terms of their relative places in global political and economic structures. "This concern with grasping specificity has continued to distinguish Canadian scholarship from the more ambitious—and some would say imperialistic—aims of American sociology, namely to construct universal theories of human behaviour and social relations, typically on the basis of research conducted in the United States" (Carroll, 1992: 2). Apparently the attempt to develop a distinctive English-Canadian version of cultural studies faces somewhat similar challenges:

> ... the amalgam of traditions this new area has brought together is not only imported. It derives from countries—mainly England, France, and the United States—whose intelligentsia have been able to read their local urban cultures as straightforwardly exemplifying global developments, without needing to think about the specific relation of those developments to their national context. (Wernick, 1993: 300)

One of the most well-known books produced within the British Marxist cultural studies tradition is Paul Willis's (1981) *Learning to Labour: How Working Class Kids Get Working Class Jobs*. It is a very local study based upon a small group of high-school-age boys in a city in the West Midlands of England, but Willis presents it as if it is of universal relevance. Class and gender are significantly foregrounded while the importance of place is absent, despite the fact that the ethnography focusses on profane, everyday, male, youth culture. It is hard to imagine a comparable Canadian study that would not pay significant attention to its regional and local setting.

That scholars, including anthropologists, who are based in the major powers are more often able to project (consciously or not) their research interests and theoretical arguments as having universal significance than are those based in less powerful states needs to be recognized. The culture of anthropologists is as deeply enmeshed in the powerful cultural, social, and economic forces which comprise the hierarchical global system as is any other transnational subculture and this is inevitably reflected in what come to be seen as important theoretical, methodological, or even topical developments in the discipline.

In terms of themes, Canadian anthropology, arguably, is defined by the importance of research on and with First Nations. Darnell (1997) refers to this as the "Americanist tradition." According to Darnell, at one time the ethnography of Aboriginal peoples living inside the boundaries of the Canadian state—work often carried out by foreign anthropologists—was central to the theoretical development of the discipline. The more recent work conducted mostly by Canadian (or Canadian-based) anthropologists has not had the same level of visibility or influence in the discipline of anthropology as a whole. As Darnell puts it: "The work is there but has proceeded on a local basis without fanfare—perhaps this low-key pragmatism is the Canadian way" (Darnell, 1997: 278).

This may be part of the explanation for what appears to be the relative lack of influence this Canadian-based work has had on the discipline as a whole. But if low-key pragmatism is a Canadian cultural characteristic it needs to be explained. The pragmatic side of this research has much to do with the nature of the relationship between Aboriginal people, the Canadian state, and Canadian civil society (both English-and French-Canadian). It may also reflect the English-Canadian tradition of favouring idiographic accounts, which are concerned with the details of local specificities, over generalizing nomothetic explanations, a tradition that may be the product of Canada's history as a colony and then a neo-colony of more powerful nation states.

The terms of debate(s) within the discipline as a whole are set by researchers based in the major Western imperial powers, that is, primarily by researchers based in the United States and to a lesser extent (reflecting their faded imperialist status) the United Kingdom and France.[13] In these states, relationships with Aboriginal people never were, or in the United States no longer are, a central political problem, at least not compared to relationships with external former colonies or contemporary neo-colonies. Moreover, Canada's relatively late industrial expansion into its hinterlands involved more explicit state planning and direction and the negotiations that these more corporatist arrangements have involved have defined particular research contexts and employment opportunities for anthropologists in Canada.

Anthropology based on research conducted outside the borders of the state is more important in other national contexts. There is, therefore, a division of labour of sorts. The distinction between "home" and "the field" has been problematized in recent years, especially anthropologists' seeming unwillingness to apply the same critical and analytical perspectives to the understanding of the culture of anthropologists as professionals that they use in their research and interpretations of the cultures of their research subjects (D'Amico-Samuels, 1997). In terms of conducting their research, anthropologists working in foreign locales have to deal with the day-to-day realities of living and working with their "subjects." But in terms of their academic careers, the day-to-day survival strategies are focussed on negotiating their way through the middle- and upper-class intellectual culture of the universities at home where they live and work. The disjunction between theory and practice is thus matched by a disjunction between home and away. In the rarefied atmosphere of the university world, the sometimes ploddingly practical concerns of anthropology focussed on Canadian political, economic and cultural interactions simply lack the feel of heightened "erudition" that academic culture celebrates.

English-Canadian anthropologists working on First Nations issues are not immune to these same divisions but the reality of Canadian political and university life is such that one simply cannot escape the practical issues of Aboriginal peoples by returning to your university base in the same way that one can when one's principal field site is in another country. The subjects of so much anthropological research are simply too close to avoid; indeed they may comprise a significant portion of the student body at the university where one teaches.

If English-Canadian anthropology is characterized by a form of thought that eschews concentric, homogenizing principles in favour of bicentrism or even multicentrism, it is the product of the particular political and economic realities that have defined Canada. As a relatively small (albeit wealthy) power in the global system, Canada has been heavily influenced by the nature of regional geography and the way particular locales have been articulated with dominant global political and economic forces. This has consequences for English-Canadian intellectual culture as well as for profane, everyday, mass and popular culture. To the extent the Canadian psyche is uniquely bicentric—a problematic generalization as I have tried to show—it may be because what Dorothy Smith argues is true for women working in disciplines and living in an everyday world based on masculinist language and concepts may be true of all subaltern social groups. Canadians may have developed a "bifurcated consciousness" (Smith, 1990: 11-28) trying to negotiate their way through a world dominated by more powerful states and national cultures while at the same time having to develop cultural modes appropriate to immediate local environmental, economic and cultural settings.

Conclusions

Anthropology's relationship to imperialism is by now, of course, an old subject. It is still relevant, however, if one wishes to understand the nature of the anthropological tradition, or lack of tradition, in English-Canada. The common subjects of anthropological research within English-Canada are peoples who have been colonial (or neo-colonial) subjects of the dominant central Canadian Anglophone society—Aboriginal people, Quebecois, and Newfoundlanders—groups that have a historically unique connection to Canada's staple-based economic history. Beyond this, Canadian anthropology reflects the influence of Canada's historic relationships to imperial powers, particularly with the United Kingdom and the United States on the Anglophone side while the historic cultural connection to France is visible on the Francophone side.[14] In other words, anthropology practised within Canadian borders has reflected the parameters of internal colonial and neo-colonial relationships, relationships which are, to a significant extent, the product of Canada's history of deep entanglement in global economic processes of the kind that Canadian political economy has attempted to understand. Canadian-based anthropologists practising in foreign lands have pursued global issues and theories as defined by anthropologists based in the leading imperialist nations. The "tradition that is not one"—that is English-Canadian anthropology—reflects the global political and economic forces that have forever determined the English-Canadian experience. The tools for understanding this tradition ultimately may be derived from a recognized distinctly Canadian intellectual tradition.

Notes

1 Howes refers to Canadian culture. I prefer the more restrictive adjective—English-Canadian—because the specific cultural and anthropological works he discusses closely (see note 8 below) were written in English by individuals based at universities in English-Canada. Howes' discussion and

my own in this paper do not address the works of French socio-cultural anthropologists in Canada.

2 This ambivalence is evident at various points in Angus's book. Perhaps his most explicit admission, that the multicultural identity he is advancing is not dominant in English Canada, is evident in his assertion that openness to the claims of Aboriginal people and Quebec will happen only if English-Canadians think of themselves as having a distinctive culture:

> Instead of discovering ourselves mainly on the rebound from our encounters with others, we may also define ourselves through the coming to self-consciousness of the cultural and political identity of English Canada itself, through our own definition of our national identity. In this way we may at last begin to appreciate the claims and desires of the other two main groups. It may even be good for us. There has been a significant tradition of social and political thought in English Canada that has urged us in this direction of national self-expression, though its impact has never been mainstream. (Angus, 1997: 27)

As I discuss further on in the paper, I agree that there is much evidence that significant segments of English-Canada are not appreciative of the claims and desires of Aboriginal people, Quebec, or other "others." This "concentric" thinking may be quite mainstream.

3 British Columbia does have a history of racist reaction to Asian immigration and there can be no doubt that such influences are operative in the backlash against the real estate dealings of Hong Kong investors. But as Mitchell deftly argues, there is far more to these conflicts than racism, and both the charge of racism and the invocation of Canada's multicultural heritage deflect attention away from the experiences of those displaced by these developments and the class and spatial conflicts which they involve.

4 This is not to suggest that tolerance and respect for racial and ethnic variability is not a desirable goal—something we should all be striving to achieve. Rather, it is a matter of comparing actually existing multiculturalism with the idea of an egalitarian, culturally diverse society. An analogous situation might be the comparison of the idea of socialism with the reality of what were "actually existing socialisms." To critique actual practice is not necessarily to refuse the more utopian idea. Nor is this to suggest that, because culture in the multicultural sense is superficial, it is without significance. Rather than get caught in the debate between deterministic Marxism and its insistence on the priority of the "base" vis-à-vis the "superstructure" and post-structuralism and its tendency to reduce everything to surface, it is more useful to maintain the significance and potential efficacy of both appearance or surface and hidden deeper structures, whether they be economic, social, linguistic or psychological factors. Thus to say that underneath multiculturalism lurks the deadening uniformity of global capitalism is not to suggest that people will not go to great lengths to defend or eliminate perceived cultural differences. See Zizek (1997).

5 One of the issues here is that mainstream anthropologists and sociologists seem to believe that cultural artifacts such as state constitutions actually do reflect some broad-based interest. In other words, they buy the ideology of representative democratic systems, rather than analyzing their actual workings. On a simple empirical note in the case of both the United States and Canada, there were, obviously, no opinion polls conducted at the time the American constitution was written and/or that the rules of Canadian confederation were worked out, so we cannot possibly say what the populations really thought about the form or content of such documents, or for that matter what percentage of the populations actually knew what they said or what were the implications of the wording. We simply do not know if Canadian constitutional documents have ever reflected a widespread Canadian cultural psyche or set of values. If recent Canadian attempts to amend the constitution are any indication, one would have to conclude that a popular consensus about the constitution is an elusive goal, especially when the proposed revisions are aimed at legally recognizing and giving some meaning to the notion of diversity within unity. In other words, recent constitutional developments seem to indicate that bicentrism is not a deep structure of the Canadian psyche. When given a chance to comment on constitutional issues, the "public" seems to want a more concentric official definition of the nation rather than one that allows for special recognition of certain segments of the population.

6 Demographic trends also undermine the notion that bicentrism based upon the constitutional recognition of the two founding nations is a definitive feature of Canadian identity. By the time the 1991 census was taken, individuals of single British or French origin were a minority. The proportion of the population reporting single "other" origins was 31 percent as opposed to 21 percent British and 23 percent French. It is true that so far the politics of these "others" have been less problematic for the Canadian state than the politics of the French/British divide or the demands of First Nations. Nonetheless, it is reasonable to doubt that all these "others," not to mention all those of multiple origins, necessarily share some unique bicentric pysche, that is, unless one assumes that the state ideology of two founding nations and "unity within diversity" is easily imposed on passive subjects (see Stasiulus and Jhappan 1995). The reality is that opposition to bilingualism and multiculturalism in regions such as Western Canada reflects the fact that the majority of the inhabitants of this region is neither British nor French in origin and they thus perceive, rightfully or not, these historical language struggles as irrelevant to their lives.

7 A few comments about the anthropological works that Howes uses as examples of the best in Canadian anthropology: David Turner's *Life Before Genesis,* Michael Lambek's *Human Spirits: A Cultural Account of Trance in Mayotte,* Janice Boddy's *Wombs and Alien Spirits: Women, Men and the Zar Cult in Northern Sudan,* and Bruce Trigger's *Natives and Newcomers: Canada's Heroic Age Reconsidered.* This list is not meant to be comprehensive, of course. While I can understand Howes' argument that each book in some way illustrates his principle of bicentrism, one can just as easily read them as in fact falling within established intellectual paradigms. Certainly, Boddy's and Lambek's works could

just as logically be classified as fitting into the paradigm of American symbolic anthropology, while Trigger's book can be read as a British-style materialist history, at least in terms of how he interprets action. I am less sure how to categorize Turner's work but it is heavily influenced by Durkheimian ideas about the relationship between social structure and thought. These brief comments are not meant to call into question the considerable merits of any of these books or their contribution to anthropological research or theory. The point is, rather, that the dominance of the bicentric principle in each of these analysis is, potentially at least, open to argument, and that each of these works can be quite easily categorized in terms of existing theoretical paradigms that have little to do with a specifically Canadian imaginary.

Indeed, Howes' discussion of "what is good for Canadian anthropology" is derived explicitly from the representational theorizing of Durkheim and Mauss, especially their argument that thought and representation reflect social structure. One might ask, then, if Howes' own analysis is thus reflective of a Canadian form of thinking, or of a French form of thinking? Certainly, the Durkheimian analysis does not have the univeralizing intent of Levi-Strauss's structuralism in so far as it recognizes that different social structures will produce different forms of thought and representation. However, Durkheimian functionalism can be said to tend towards the concentric (in the sense of inclusiveness) which Howes identifies as typical of American (and presumably French) anthropology in so far as the theory is considered to be applicable to all societies—all minds may not operate in the same way but all societies do in the sense that, in each, thought processes are determined by social structures.

The criticism of the 1950s and 1960s functionalist anthropology and sociology emphasizes functionalism's inability to deal with social change and social divisions of various kinds, and its tendency to treat cultures as closed, territorially-grounded entities. All of this has come under attack from a number of perspectives that emphasize the importance of history, of internal contradictions, and of the importance of external forces and reactions to those external forces in all cultures. So we have yet another irony: to excavate the deep bicentric structures of Canadian culture and thought so as to identify truly Canadian anthropological work requires a totalizing, French, social theory.

It is also worthy of note in this regard that Howes' list of the greatest producers of Canadian culture consists of Alex Colville (visual arts), Glenn Gould (music), C.B. Macpherson (political theory) and Marshall McLuhan (Canada's greatest thinker)—a high culture elite. Of course, the list is not intended to be exhaustive and I do not want to misrepresent the importance Howes would attach to any of the names. This is a list of individuals who are well known among the university-educated middle and upper classes, perhaps, but they are virtual unknowns among significant portions of the population. Here, once again, the "best" in Canadian culture in fact reflects the official Canadian state version of the best, or an educated, middle- or upper-class version of the best, but can hardly be said to represent a national consensus, at least if the imagined community of the nation is thought to be shared by more than a highly educated and (high) cultured minority.

None of these names would be recognized by the working-class individuals I have written about (Dunk 1991, 1994, 1998). Their idea of Canada's cultural best is more likely to include the Canadian comedians who have frequented American television shows such as *Saturday Night Live* (Dan Akroyd, Mike Myers) or rock groups such as Rush (only recently officially recognized by the Canadian state for their contribution to Canadian culture), or more recently internationally famous performers such as Shania Twain or Celine Dion. Their sense of regional and class disadvantage certainly does not derive from a feeling of being deprived of as much Glenn Gould, Alex Colville, or Marshall McLuhan as they would like. In fact, it is more likely to be stimulated by a perception that they do not have as much access to elements of a global (read predominantly American) culture as do their fellow Canadian citizens who live in the metropolitan regions, especially the corridor that runs from Quebec city to Windsor.

8 As Panitch summarizes: "In the case of Quebec, where the farmer was unable to produce a wheat staple competitively, mainly due to climatic factors, and which lacked a substantial internal market that would allow the development of commerical substitutes for wheat, a more subsistence, non-market oriented form of production prevailed.... [T]he distinguishing feature separating rural Quebec and Ontario in the 19th century was not the entrepreneurial innovativeness of one set of farmers as opposed to the other, but nature and markets. And whereas inability to engage in the world market forced the Quebec farmer into poverty or emigration, the very linkage of Ontario with the world market through the wheat staple provided the conditions for industrial development extensive enough to absorb many farmers into wage labour when natural and competitive conditions shifted wheat production further west. To ascribe the failure of Quebec to industrialize in the 19th century to the anti-industrial attitudes of the Montreal merchants, not only ignores the fact that such industry as did develop in Montreal did so mainly to service the Ontario market, but also the fact that when American "entrepreneurship" arrived it came not to Quebec where cheaper labour was available in abundance but to Ontario where skilled craft labour and a domestic market were in place." (1981: 15)

9 Bailey's PhD was actually in history. There were no PhD programs in anthropology in Canada at that time. Unfortunately Darnell does not really develop her idea that Canadian anthropology is situated in the intersections of anthropology, history and economics. This would nicely compliment my thesis; namely, that if there is something distinctive about Canadian anthropology, it is the way it has had to pay more attention to historical and economic circumstances than has been the case for other national traditions. Certainly, this is more important than the principle of bicentrism.

10 See, for example, the comments by David Bell in his introduction to Bell and Keil (1998).

11 This statement about the state of unease of the discipline is based upon my reading of the contributions and debates within the American Anthropology Association's *Anthropology Newsletter* over the last two years. Certainly one of the ongoing concerns expressed in *AN* is that anthropology has

lost its ability to influence public policy debates and that the discipline is fragmenting along subdisciplinary lines.

12 These last two figures are based upon the entries in American Anthropological Association 1997-98 *Guide to Departments* (1997) rather than upon Darnell's (1998) figures which were taken from 1996-97 AAA *Guide*. The 11 departments are: Alberta, British Columbia, Calgary, Laval, Manitoba, McGill, McMaster, Montreal, Simon Fraser, Toronto, and York. By my calculation there were 142 socio-cultural anthropologists listed in the 1997-98 *Guide*. In terms of national origins of the PhD degrees held the breakdown is as follows:
United States = 66
Canada = 41
United Kingdom = 19
Other = 16
Twenty socio-cultural anthropologists were listed for Laval, nine of whom received their PhD in Canada. Twelve socio-cultural anthropologists were listed for the University of Montreal, four of whom received their PhD in Canada.

13 And, even for British and French scholars, global intellectual prominence now may be dependent upon acceptance and reinterpretation in the United States. See, for example, Lamont's (1987) discussion of Jacques Derrida.

14 This is how I would interpret the differences Maranda (1983) notes between Francophone and Anglophone anthropology in Canada. The influence of Marxism and semiotics among Canadian Francophone anthropologists reflected the dominant intellectual currents in France at the time, while the dominance of American anthropology among Anglophone anthropologists reflected the influence of the US culture in English Canada.

References Cited

American Anthropological Association
1997 *A Guide To Departments, 1997-98*, Arlington: American Anthropological Association.

Anderson, Benedict
1991 *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, rev. ed., New York: Verso.

Angus, Ian
1997 *A Border Within: National Identity, Cultural Plurality, and Wilderness*, Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Bailey, Alfred G.
1969 *The Conflict of European and Algonkian Cultures 1504-1700: A Study in Canadian Civilization*, 2nd ed., Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Bell, David and Roger Keil (eds.)
1998 *Political Ecology: Global and Local*, New York: Routledge.

Boddy, Janice
1990 *Wombs and Alien Spirits: Women, Men, and the Zar Cult in Northern Sudan*, Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Carroll, William K.
1992 Introduction: Social Movements and Counter-Hegemony in a Canadian Context, *Organizing Dissent: Contemporary Social Movements in Theory and Practice*, William K. Carroll (ed.), Toronto: Garamond: 1-19.

D'Amico-Samuels, Deborah
1997 Undoing Fieldwork: Personal, Political, Theoretical and Methodological Implications, *Decolonizing Anthropology*, Faye V. Harrison (ed.), Washington: American Anthropological Association: 68-87.

Darnell, Regna
1998 Toward a History of Canadian Departments of Anthropology: Retrospect, Prospect and Common Cause, *Anthropologica*, 40(2): 153-168.
1997 Changing Patterns of Ethnography in Canadian Anthropology: A Comparison of Themes, *The Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology*, 34(3): 269-296.

Drache, Daniel
1995 Celebrating Innis: The Man, the Legacy and Our Future, Introduction to Harold A. Innis, *Staples, Markets, and Cultural Change*, Daniel Drache (ed.), Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Dunk, Thomas
1998 "Is It Only Forest Fires That Are Natural?": Boundaries of Nature and Culture in White Working-Class Culture, *Sustainability: The Challenge—People, Power and the Environment*, L. Anders Sandberg and Sverker Sörlin (eds.), Montreal: Black Rose Books: 157-167.
1994 Talking about Trees: Environment and Society in Forest Workers' Culture, *The Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology*, 31(1): 14-34.
1991 *It's A Working Man's Town: Male Working-Class Culture in Northwestern Ontario*, Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Dyck, Noel and James B. Waldram (eds.)
1993 *Anthropology, Public Policy, and Native Peoples in Canada*, Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Harries-Jones, Peter
1997 Canadian Anthropology in an International Context, *The Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology*, 34(3): 249-267.

Harvey, David
1989 *The Condition of Postmodernity*, Oxford: Basil Blackwood.

Howes, David
1992 What is Good for Anthropology in Canada? *Fragile Truths: Twenty-five Years of Sociology and Anthropology in Canada*. W.K. Carroll, et al. (eds.), Ottawa: Carleton University Press: 155-169.

Innis, Harold A.
1995 *Staples, Markets and Cultural Change: Selected Essays*. Daniel Drache (ed), Montreal: McGill-Queen's Press.
1956 *The Fur Trade in Canada*, rev. ed., Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Jenson, Jane
1989 "Different" but not "Exceptional": Canada's Permeable Fordism, *The Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology*, 26: 69-94.

Kennedy, John C.

1997 At the Crossroads: Newfoundland and Labrador Communities in a Changing International Context, *The Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 34(3): 297-318.

Laclau, Ernesto and Chantal Mouffe

1985 *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy*, London: Verso.

Lambek, Michael

1981 *Human Spirits: A Cultural Account of Trance in Mayotte*, New York: Cambridge University Press.

Lamont, Michèle

1987 How to Become a Dominant French Philosopher: The Case of Jacques Derrida, *American Journal of Sociology* 93(3): 584-622.

Leach, Belinda.

1998 Citizenship and the Politics of Exclusion in a "Post"-Fordist Industrial City, *Critique of Anthropology*, 18(2): 181-204.

1997 The New Right and the Politics of Work and Family in Hamilton, *Atlantis*, 21(2): 35-46.

Lipset, Seymour Martin

1990 *Continental Divide: The Values and Institutions of the United States and Canada*, New York: Routledge.

Maranda, Pierre

1983 International Posture and Tradition of Canadian Ethnology, *Consciousness and Inquiry: Ethnology and Canadian Realities*, Frank Manning (ed.), Ottawa: National Museums of Canada, Canadian Ethnology Service Paper No. 89E, 114-129.

Martin, Michèle

1997 *Communication and Mass Media: Culture, Domination, and Opposition*, Scarborough: Prentice Hall.

McBride, Stephen

1992 *Not Working: State, Unemployment, and Neo-Conservatism in Canada*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Mitchell, Katharyne

1993 Multiculturalism, or the United Colors of Capitalism? *Antipode*, 25(4): 263-294.

Moodley, Kogila

1983 Canadian Multiculturalism as Ideology, *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 6(3): 320-331.

Panitch, Leo

1981 Dependency and Class in Canadian Political Economy, *Studies in Political Economy*, 6: 7-33.

Patten, Steve

1996 Preston Manning's Populism: Constructing the Common Sense of the Common People, *Studies in Political Economy*, 50: 95-132.

Preston, R. J. and Marc Adelard-Tremblay.

1988 Anthropology, *The Canadian Encyclopedia*, Edmonton: Hurtig: 80-83.

Reitz, Jeffrey and Raymond Breton

1994 *The Illusion of Difference: Realities of Ethnicity in Canada and the United States*, Toronto: C.D. Howe Institute.

Silverman, Marilyn

1991 Amongst "Our Selves": A Colonial Encounter in Canadian Academia, *Critique of Anthropology*, 11(4): 381-400.

Smith, Dorothy

1990 *The Conceptual Practices of Power: A Feminist Sociology of Knowledge*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Stasiulus, Daiva and Radha Jhappan

1995 The Fractious Politics of a Settler Society: Canada, *Unsettling Settler Societies: Articulations of Gender, Race, Ethnicity, and Class*, Daiva Stasiulus and Nira Yuval-Davis (eds.), Thousand Oaks: Sage: 95-131.

Stymeist, David

1976 *Ethnics and Indians: Social Relations in a Northwestern Ontario Town*, Toronto: Peter Martin and Associates.

Swift, Jamie

1995 *Wheel of Fortune: Work and Life in the Age of Falling Expectations*, Toronto: Between the Lines Press.

Trigger, Bruce

1985 *Natives and Newcomers: Canada's Heroic Age Reconsidered*, Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Turner, David

1985 *Life Before Genesis*, New York: Peter Lang.

Valverde, Mariana

1991 *The Age of Light, Soap, and Water: Moral Reform in English Canada, 1885-1925*, Toronto: McLelland and Stewart.

Ward, Peter W.

1978 *White Canada Forever: Popular Attitudes and Public Policy Towards Orientals in British Columbia*, Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Wernick, Andrew

1993 American Popular Culture in Canada: Trends and Reflections, *The Beaver Bites Back?: American Popular Culture in Canada*, David H. Flaherty and Frank E. Manning (eds.), Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press:

Willis, Paul

1981 *Learning to Labour: How Working Class Kids Get Working Class Jobs*, New York: Columbia University Press.

Zizek, Slavoj

1997 Multiculturalism, Or, the Cultural Logic of Multinational Capitalism, *New Left Review*, 225: 28-51.