

## I. Editorial

Since the first issue of the *Bulletin of the History of Archaeology* appeared in May of 1991 (volume 1, number 1), the Editor has received correspondence from subscribers and other interested readers concerning the amount of space available in each issue for papers as well as for other contributions. Some have argued that paper submissions should be peer reviewed and that authors of books or journal articles reviewed in an issue should be contacted in order to afford the opportunity "reply" to the review. Many have suggested that the *Bulletin* "evolve" into a journal. Correspondents write of their perception of the need to have a formal outlet for the ever burgeoning interest in the history of archaeology. The *Bulletin of the History of Archaeology* is an informal forum for those doing research or having an interest in the origins and development of archaeology around the world. The purpose of each issue is to excite interest in the history of archaeology, to provide a forum for the exchange of information on research that is ongoing, new sources documentary materials, and to provide a space for the short papers and articles that would not be able to find a home in other publications. Knowing that the interest in creating a formal journal devoted solely to the history of archaeology is growing, work is now proceeding in the design of such a journal from many quarters. Readers of the *Bulletin* who have suggestions as to the nature of such a new journal should correspond with me at the Editor's address. I would welcome any suggestion as well as volunteered help. However, the *Bulletin of the History of Archaeology* has its own niche within the growing interest in the history of archaeology. That niche is to informally encourage continuing work in the history of archaeology by the free exchange of ideas, interests, source materials, and other items clearly related to the history of archaeology.

Douglas R. Givens, Editor

(Editor's Note: Ms. Pamela Smith, the *Bulletin's* Associate Editor for Canada is now in temporary residence at Lucy Cavendish College, Cambridge, England. For contributions to the *Bulletin of the History of Archaeology* relating to the history of Canadian archaeology, please contact her at: Lucy Cavendish College, Cambridge CB3 0BU, England.

## II. Discourse on the History of Archaeology

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5334/bha.03202>

(The Editor wishes to acknowledge an omission of text in Dr. Richard Forbis' paper which appeared in the May 1993 issue of the *Bulletin of the History of Archaeology*. The Editor expresses his apologies for the omission and publishes again Dr. Forbis' entire paper so that the reader might have the benefit of the corrections made.)

### **A Brief History of the Department of Archaeology, University of Calgary**

by

**Richard G. Forbis**  
**Professor Emeritus**  
**Department of Archaeology**

During the early 1960s, largely as a result of the "baby boom" of the 1940s, large numbers of students of college age surfaced. They demanded a wider scope for higher education in Canada. The period saw not only the expansion of facilities in already established universities, but also the creation of many new institutions, among them the University of Calgary.

During the early 1960s, the number of full-time professionals practicing and teaching anthropological archaeology in Canada could be counted on the fingers of two hands. The centre of gravity was the National Museum of Canada in Ottawa; of the three to four research archaeologists there, Dr. James V. Wright and Dr. George MacDonald offered occasional instruction at nearby universities. As for other universities, Dr. J. Norman held a full-time position at the University of Toronto, as did Dr. William J. Mayer-Oakes at the University of Manitoba; Dr. Charles E. Borden, Professor of German at the University of British Columbia was able to devote part of his valuable time to archaeology while Dr. Richard G. Forbis of the Glenbow Foundation served as sessional lecturer at the University of Alberta, Calgary Branch.

Canadian students seeking advanced degrees in archaeology were compelled to enroll in foreign universities (the University of Toronto had the authorization, unexercised, to grant the degree of Ph.D.). Most students - nearly all of them from the University of Toronto - went to the United States (Chicago, Yale, Michigan, Wisconsin) where they found an intellectual climate suited to their special interests in Canadian studies. Upon graduation, they normally returned home, often to pursue illustrious careers. It was apparent that Canadian students of high calibre and great promise were being forced to secure their academic credentials elsewhere, and that Canada was derelict in that it failed to provide the educational facilities that would qualify them to follow their chosen profession in their native land.

In retrospect, it appears inevitable that one university or another in Canada would develop a programme for the advanced training of Canadian archaeologists. Indeed, it was to happen at the fledgling University of Alberta at Calgary. Perhaps newness (and Brashness) was catalytic. In its formative years, guided by Principal Malcolm Taylor, the University was searching for "innovated programmes" in an attempt to fill academic gaps left unclaimed by old established schools. Archaeology was one discipline with no secure home. The future of the field looked bright in view of strong currents of world opinion, enunciated by UNESCO, urging member nations to husband and treasure their archaeological resources. It was clear to some, even at that time, that Canada was ill-prepared to live up to its global commitment. An Federal legislation, long in place, was soon to be supplemented by provincial laws that required governments, industry and other developers to carry out impact assessments and to take measures to assure that archaeological resources were protected or salvaged before they were disturbed or obliterated. Alberta was in the midst of an oil boom and Canadian archaeologists trained to cope with the demands brought about the enormous developments of the day were in short supply.

1963, Dr. R.S. "Scotty" MacNeish, then Chief Archaeologist of the National Museum of Canada, embarked on a lecture tour to bring western Canadians up-to-date on recent activities in Calgary and Edmonton, the core being members of the vigorous, newly-formed archaeological Society of Alberta. The enthusiastic response to his talks demonstrated the breadth of general public appreciation for studies in prehistoric archaeology.

This interest extended to the faculty of the University of Alberta at Calgary, which was coincidentally searching for a celebrated scholar to take the headship of the Department of Sociology and Anthropology. When approached, MacNeish expressed no interest in that position, which he thought would someday turn into an administrative chore in still another department where archaeologists were outnumbered and swept under the rug.

Later, he fantasized with Forbis over a unique Department of Archaeology, divorced from Sociology and Anthropology. MacNeish railed over the indifferent training that American universities had given to the archaeologists employed on his current project in Mexico. Traditional training was obsolete. A new programme was envisaged: A truly interdisciplinary department designed primarily for graduate students. It would no longer see archaeology as a handmaiden to anthropology but as a discipline unto itself and a profession with specific requirements of its own. In an academic turnabout, anthropology would serve archaeology. Thus the prime importance of a sound undergraduate education in the fundamentals of anthropology was acknowledged. Instruction in physical anthropology and much of ethnography would be generated from within the department. By and large, students would depend on sister departments in the Faculty of Arts and Sciences for adequate instruction in social and cultural anthropology as well as in linguistics. Graduate students were to be encouraged to take advanced courses in pertinent anthropological topics.

Contemporary archaeological training throughout North America included instruction in several anthropological sub-fields of little or no practical value to a professional archaeologist. More critically, it neglected instruction in prime fields of direct relevance, particularly in the natural sciences. Students needed formal encouragement to take courses in geology, botany, zoology, history, geography and other fields. The new programme envisioned a true merger of disciplines, not mere lip-service, and it would tailor instruction to meet individual needs of each aspiring scholar. While the University, at the time, did not have the variety of teachers needed to staff such a wide-ranging programme, the department could draw sessional instructors from the many talented specialists flourishing in the downtown oil industry as well as from the local offices of the Geological Survey of Canada. The dream was to provide students the best possible archaeological training available anywhere in North America, and to reverse the flow of Canadian students going to American universities.

It was a bold departure from tradition, but, as noted above, universities of the day were willing to indulge qualified social scientists, and Calgary looked favourably on bold new initiatives. Thus, when MacNeish brought the concept forward to Malcolm Taylor, he was taken seriously and given high hope. Eric L. Harvie of the Glenbow Foundation generously offered his support for the new programme, and promised fellowships, books, and journals, laboratory facilities and funds for field work, as well as a consultancy so that Forbis could serve as a bridge with the University in the transition. The programme was on its way.

Shortly after, in 1964, the Department of Archaeology became operational, with equal but separate status in the Faculty of Arts and Science, and with the tacit understanding that it could grant graduate degrees almost immediately. Six courageous graduate students, all classified as M.A. candidates, arrived that year, most transferred directly into the Ph.D. programme when it was approved by the University in 1966. The same year the university gained full autonomy. Four Ph.D. candidates (William Noble, Robert McGhee, Ronald Nash and James Millar) were granted their degrees in 1968, while the number of successful M.A.s increased.

During the past twenty-seven years, the objective of providing first-class training to students in archaeology has remained unchanged. The department, at least within its own perception, has remained oriented toward graduate work, and largely gauges its undergraduate success by its ability to turn out students prepared to carry on graduate studies elsewhere.

The graduate programme has not been changeless. The early emphasis on instruction in the natural sciences (especially in geology, vertebrate palaeontology and palynology) has gradually declined, and with it the environmental approach. Sessional instructors who were specially suited to offer courses, not only ancillary fields, but also in specialized archaeological subjects, have by and large disappeared from the scene as a result of budgetary cuts. Course offerings by other departments have offset these losses to a certain extent.

At the same time, the field of archaeology itself has developed greater sophistication and requires more in-depth instruction at both graduate and undergraduate levels. If anything, the department has taken a swing back in the direction of the Social Sciences, particularly in its theoretical stance. But probably not one of the archaeology faculty would go so far as to subscribe to the notion that "archaeology is anthropology or it is nothing," an aphorism widely accepted by North American archaeologists 25 or so years ago.

Method and theory courses are given more prominence in recent years. While the concern is primarily archaeological, the issues lately have moved toward broader concern with contemporary society. Method and theory are emphasized in all courses. On a more particularistic level, advanced undergraduate instruction includes such courses as muscology, ceramic analysis and computers. Seminars are given largely to discussions of current issues in archaeology, and include a wide range of topics.

Area coverage has expanded appreciably in response to the special interests of new faculty members. Until 1974 the Faculty of Graduate Studies insisted that the department limit its scope to New World archaeology, but when this stricture was laid to rest, African studies rose into prominence. Aside from Europe and Oceania, staff members have not personally specialized in regions outside the Americas and Africa. The department does, however, offer courses in general Old World archaeology as well as topical courses which are not confined geographically.

The subtle shifts that can be detected in the archaeology program can be seen as moves away from the natural sciences, environmental studies and descriptive reconstructions of the past to great concern with contemporary archaeological problems; contemporary not only in the sense of keeping up-to-date in relation to modern trends in world archaeology, but also in the sense of addressing modern social issues from the archaeological perspective.

### III. Bibliographic/Archival Material Relating to the History of Archaeology

#### A. Recent Work by Subscribers

##### *Archaeology of the Pueblo Grande Platform Mound and Surrounding Features*

1993 edited by Christian E. Downum and Todd W. Bostwick, Pueblo Grande Museum Anthropological Papers, Number 1, Phoenix. (Contains historical sketches of Adolph Bandelier, Frank Hamilton Cushing, Jesse Walter Fewkes, Omar Turney, Odd Halseth, Julian Hayden, Albert Schroeder, Richard Woodbury, and others)

Kchoe, Alice B.

1991 "The Invention of Prehistory", *Current Anthropology*, 32.

Meyers, Thomas B. and Michael K. Trimble

1993 *Archaeological Curation-Needs Assessments, Technical Report No. 1*, Technical Center of Expertise in Archaeological Curation and Collections Management, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Saint Louis District, Saint Louis.

#### B. Doctoral Dissertations/Masters Theses

Klimko, Olga

1993 "Where are the Indians? Fur Trade Archaeology in Western Canada", Ph.D. dissertation, Simon Fraser University.

Robinson, Ellen

1969 "Charles E. Borden: His Formulation and Testing of Archaeological Hypotheses", Master of Arts, University of British Columbia.

Williams, Anne M.

1980 "Carl Borden and Archaeology in British Columbia: An Interactive History", Master of Arts, University of British Columbia.