Editorial

Maryon McDonald

This is a new journal but it also follows in some grand footsteps. *Cambridge Anthropology* existed for nearly four decades, from the early 1970s until 2011, as an in-house forum in Cambridge encouraging innovation and debate, in pages littered with now famous names. That forum ceased publication last year, although some of those names will be reappearing in the current journal. This issue re-launches *Cambridge Anthropology* as an international peer-reviewed journal, with a geographically broad input. These pages will continue to offer space to try out new ideas and material, to publish new ethnography, and to set new agendas. It is still a space therefore in which to inspire and to praise, to engage in serious debate, to get angry if necessary, to fly kites, to urge new directions, or to take colleagues' contributions to task.

Why would we want another journal in anthropology? The simple answer is that there is a lot of very good material out there requiring publication, and a good deal of debate to be had. Anthropology is an area of scholarly inquiry wherein practitioners feel they should be able to spin the globe, pick an issue and know from first principles how to go about understanding it. As this journal goes to press, the self-confidence of some of the world's once dominant economies has been seriously shaken and the Eurozone feels to some like a reckless dream. It is perhaps fitting therefore that we launch with a piece by Arjun Appadurai on the world of finance, with a response by Keith Hart. Jasarevic's article then reminds us of some of the different entanglements construed as 'debt'. In a tense combination of grand theory and close empirical observation, these pieces point between them to some of the original contributions that anthropology can make.

For better or for worse, the days of grand theory have seriously paled in recent decades, accompanied in some quarters by an increasing willingness to throw well-tried theories and theorists out of the analytical tool kit and treat them ethnographically instead. This has been especially welcome perhaps to anthropologists of Europe and North America. More generally, a lightness of touch might seem to prevail – not allowing the theory informing analysis to fall on the material from too great a height, with priority still accorded in one way or another to the experiential realities of those whom we are studying. But where we come to rest analytically is still of great import, too – for we do have to come to rest, if only momentarily, in the sense that we have to have our own languages of analysis. It may be that we are relying on some notion of phenomenological realities, or on a particular historiography, or on social relations, or

discourse, or culture, or relationalities, or networks, or agency, or ontology – to name but a few of the languages available – or that we are relying on particular combinations of some or all of these. What we see in the Special Section on ‘Sociality’ in this issue, a section guest-edited by Nicholas Long and Henrietta Moore, is a bold attempt to take hold of one analytical place-to-rest metaphor – ‘sociality’ – and to see what mileage there might be in running with it in a new mode. One of the results is a new agenda for the study of human inherence in an envioning world.

This journal welcomes articles showing what anthropology can do or perhaps telling us what it should or should not do. We are very open to suggestions and we have no party line other than sound scholarship and courtesy. The journal also welcomes responses to any articles it publishes and welcomes reflections and commentaries on any matter, topical or analytical, of anthropological interest or concern. In this first issue, Heywood’s brief reflections on ‘ontology’ take to task some of those who have been looking to that particular language to ‘take seriously’ the world or worlds they study. The distribution of reality has long been an anthropological problem and, as Heywood indicates, there are clearly still some people and realities that we have more willingly taken seriously than others.

It seems especially important at this time to take seriously not only the problems in our envioning world but also our capacity to intervene, however small, piecemeal or humble that intervention might be, with sound scholarship. The journal is planning special sections and issues on inter-species ethnography and on climate change, and we will have more on financial and economic matters. Where there is debate to be had, we would be happy to publish attendant disciplines with which anthropology has engaged and we very much want to publish anthropology. We know that publication – whether criticised or admired, used or scoffed at – is a matter of winning allies. Anthropology is not a bad ally to have but it needs reciprocal attention. In that sense, this journal is inevitably an attention-seeking endeavour. Good submissions, reflections, replies, reviews and commentaries are welcomed that can make this worthwhile. We look forward to hearing from you.