analyzing the conditions of power that reproduce inequality and suspending that inequality in search of different presuppositions and forms of reasoning than those to which we have grown all too accustomed.

For all the optimism of this collection, virtually every author offers a challenge to action. The structures of power do not operate in anthropology's favour; funding for the kind of research we want to do is hard to justify in an audit economy focused on those who hold power rather than those whose exclusion from it is deemed to be their own fault. We indeed know how to listen to others and find them little different from ourselves in final analysis, but we are less practiced at making our case in the corridors of power. The internationalism foreshadowed by the mutually reinforcing conclusions of these anthropologists promises to break down parochial and isolationist versions of nationalism and national traditions. The future is in the hands of readers who imagine and go forward to create a revitalized anthropology.

References

Harrison, Julia, and Regna Darnell, eds.
2006 Historicizing Canadian Anthropology. Vancouver: UBC Press.

Jebens, Holger, and Kohl, Karl-Heinz
2011 The End of Anthropology? Wantage: Sean Kingston Publishing.

The End of Anthropology—Not!

Gavin Smith
University of Toronto

Todd Sanders has done a wonderful job of capturing not just the major issues addressed in this edited book, but also the flavour of the collection as a whole. As he notes, and as many of the contributors also point out, there have been many pieces over the past years addressing this issue. Peter Worsley handed me a dog-eared mimeographed copy of his piece "The end of anthropology" once, when I thought of doing my doctorate at Manchester (in an attempt I think either to persuade me to choose a discipline that didn't include fieldwork, or to get me to go back to Canada, a place he identified with radicalism, having taught in Quebec during the height of the FLQ). But I haven't read any of the others, though I expect they all make the obvious (and less obvious) play on words.[1] So sure was eye—sorry I meant "I"—that the book would be loaded with these word-plays as I opened it that the old conundrum "How long is a piece of string?" kept popping into my head for some reason— reminding me of course that a piece of string has two ends and when you bring them together you can tie the ends into nots, no sorry knots. As Mike Myers would say: "The end of anthropology—Not!"

John Comaroff notes that anthropology is not the only discipline worrying about its own end and possible ends (he mentions economics and sociology) but in doing so he made me think about a short, rather fatuous article, that had caused way more ripples than all the writing about the end of anthropology could possibly do. This was Fukuyama's "The end of history" of course. And once there, I realized that when one speaks of the end of history it is unlikely that one is speaking of the end of the profession. Just as anthropologists tend be as possessive of "their own" fieldsite as a child holding on to a toy in a playground, so historians are a bit touchy about "history" and this is because there's lots of it all about, and all kinds of people seem to think they can do it, have access to it, even make it. So you sometimes hear them speaking of "guild history" which I think means the stuff the professionals do.

And this is of course what our authors here are talking about. They are not talking about the end of anthropology as in "the end of history"; they are talking about the end (double meaning) of the profession (double meaning) of anthropology (any meaning). Perhaps rather like the guild historians they are nervous that, should all the departments close, "other people" might get in on the act. And in fact a number of the contributors do speak of this—usually in quite complementary terms: good journalism for example, and economists who seek to embrace culture in their analyses.

But surely this *is* what makes these kinds of books—despite the astuteness and sensitivity of the authors—well, *embarrassing*. And especially so for a discipline that makes something of a thing about looking outwards and being critical of various "centricisms." A number of authors say what "anthropology" means *to them*—and I must say that some of this did sound rather like the kid in the playground insisting on why the toy he was clinging to was so especially and idiosyncratically his or hers. But they were reluctant to say what "anthropology" actually is. In fact many of them celebrated the impossibility of doing so.

And yet I think this was a bit of a blind. There was in fact something they were all talking about in unison. It was the profession of people like themselves. It had various ends in the sense of goals and its end could take various threatening forms, but there is no doubt that in both cases what was being spoken of was a profession, mostly in the guild sense of the word, but also in the professing sense too. In fact the essays tend to disguise anxieties about the former by seeming to speak of what it is to do the latter.[2]

Todd shrewdly notes that some saw threats of a possible ending (or at least diminishing) arising from factors internal to the discipline, while others stressed the need to make the discipline attractive to those outside the discipline. Citizens? Consumers? The objects of study? Like him I am dismayed by the easy slide a couple of the authors make into the language of market consumption: how could anthropology be better sold, or branded? And I think he makes a very incisive point when he notes that shaping a body of intellectual enquiry around the likes and dislikes of consumers is unlikely to enhance the value of the discipline, either as a humanity or as a science. He identifies the real worm in the bud—mostly missed by

the contributors—which is the way in which anthropological research will be funded (or not). I applaud those he names who are resisting the pressures involved here. None the less, whether we like it or not, it is likely that the pressures and principles that shape funding—of students and faculty and of teaching and research alike—will have a much greater determination of what the profession of anthropology looks like in ten years time.

Seen from this perspective it may be that the centricism of the authors here is misplaced. Instead we may be better off with an exercise in what Bourdieu called "participant objectivation." And so let me give the last word to this figure who never really settled on whether or not he wished to profess anthropology or something else. What needs to be objectivized he told his audience at the Royal Anthropological Institute in London in 2000 is:

> The social world that has made both the anthropologist and the conscious or unconscious anthropology that she (or he) engages in her anthropological practice—not only her social origins.... But also, and most importantly, her particular position within the microcosm of anthropologists... [The anthropological field and] its constraints in matters of publication of findings, its specific censorships... and the biases embedded in the organizational structure... [2003:283]

Notes

1 Crapanzano in this volume, for example, speaks of *the end* as in "the end of town," a rather shady and possibly dubious area.

2 The sense that what was being spoken of was the anthropological profession was reinforced by what took up a vast amount of the information about the contributors, viz their memberships and honours in various professional associations.