

I. Editorial

In February-March of 1992 the Wenner-Gren Foundation engineered a conference on the **Preservation of the Anthropological Record** in Rancho Santa, California. I represented the Society for American Archaeology's Committee on the History of Archaeology at the gathering. At that conference, representatives of many of the anthropological societies gave their assessment of the condition of the anthropological record in private, public, and institutional hands. The assessment by the participants was almost universally gloomy. The conference accepted the reality of the condition and preservation of the anthropological record as being peril and embraced a sense of urgency of getting about the business of rectifying the situation. To that end, the Wenner-Gren Foundation published a collection of the conference participant's assessments of the anthropological record under the title *Preserving the Anthropological Record*. This publication is available free of charge while supply lasts by writing to: Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research, 220 Fifth Avenue, New York, New York 10001-7708.

Part of the archaeological documentary record are the obituaries of colleagues who have dedicated their lives to Americanist archaeology and who have contributed to its growth both methodologically as well as practically. Obituaries of colleagues not only represent the recognition of a life's work but also part of the history of the development of Americanist archaeology. Obituaries are part of the documentary record of Americanist archaeology and should be actively published in a timely manner. It is through the publication of obituaries that many archaeologists add to their knowledge of history their own discipline and where historians of archaeological science find some of their most important clues to the intellectual history of Americanist archaeology.

The publication of obituaries is an important part of the life of any anthropological society and should not be supplanted by "more pressing issues." Obituaries are evidence of the milestones that anthropological societies have passed, both in research and in the interpretation of results. They are not only a celebration of the contributions that have been made but also an irreplaceable historical account of why archaeology is a valued enterprise to be embraced. It is my hope that obituaries of colleagues will continue to receive prompt publication treatment in now and into the future. One cannot fully understand the history of Americanist archaeology without one of its major ingredients, a recounting of the life and the intellectual climate in which it was lived.

Douglas R. Givens
Department of Behavioral Sciences
Saint Louis Community College-Meramec

II. Discourse on the History of Archaeology

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

by

Richard G. Forbis
Professor Emeritus
Department of Archaeology
University of Calgary

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 Emerson held a full-time position at the University of Toronto, as did Dr. William J. Mayer-Oakes at the University of British Columbia. Mayer-Oakes was then 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