

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

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5334/bha.03102>

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

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. A 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 swepted 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 McGhoo, 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 museology, ceramic analysis and computers. Seminars are given largely to discussions of current issues in archaeology, and include a wide range of topics.

Areal 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.

Archaeology and Cultural Nationalism in the American Southwest, 1895-1920

by

James E. Snead
Department of Anthropology
University of California-Los Angeles

Introduction

Traditional histories of archaeology have been described by a recent commentator as resembling travel journals, providing "...an account of the slow journey out of the darkness of subjectivity and speculation towards objectivity, rationality, and science" (Murray 1989:56). In recent years new approaches to this subject have taken a more critical look at the tangled social and intellectual currents surrounding the development of archaeology. One of the least contestable points to arise from the current theoretical debates within the discipline is that of the fundamental relationship between the observer/scientist and the production of knowledge (for example, Leone 1986). This topic is central to modern sociocultural anthropology (Stocking 1983) and is particularly pertinent to the history of the field.

In North America research on the history of prehistoric archaeology has been dominated by considerations of administrative and intellectual contexts (for example, Meltzer 1983; Dunnell 1986; Hinsley 1987; Fowler 1989; Trigger 1989). Few scholars, by comparison, have dealt with the role of social history in this process (but see Patterson 1986; Hinsley 1989).

The present study adopts the perspective of social history in examining archaeology as it developed in the southwestern United