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ABSTRACT

Professional archaeologists firmly control the prehistory of British Columbia (more commonly referred to today as "pre-contact" history). This has been the case since Dr. Charles E. Borden, a German professor at the University of British Columbia, professionalized the archaeological discipline between 1945 and 1960. The purpose of this paper is to critically examine and explain the process by which this monopolization occurred, and to suggest the massive ramifications that have followed.

Relevant approaches to the history of archaeology are reviewed, and a "contextual" strategy is adopted as the best way to unravel, but preserve, the richness of the local history of archaeology in B.C. A mixture of narrative and analytical style is employed in explaining the rise Borden and professional archaeology in the 1950s. It is argued that Borden produced knowledge by drawing on an existing network of North American archaeology to create, and substantiate, his authoritative position. In the context of archaeological site destruction, during the 1950s, Borden was able to pull unrelated members of the B.C. populous to his cause, including provincial officials, through the passing of the "Archaeological and Historic Sites Protection Act," in 1960. Amateur archaeologists and Aboriginal people lacked the means to amass the powerful alliances that Borden did, and therefore amateurs and Natives were unable to offer a persuasive alternative to Borden's authority.

It is concluded that because of the professional encapsulation of B.C. archaeology, we, as non-specialists, have to put our faith in archaeologists, and assume that the knowledge they produce is truthful and valid. It is suggested that professional archaeologists have joined other human scientists in a rapidly spiralling scientification of humanity. This is significant because specialists inform the State about who we are as citizens, and impose identities on us which partly dictate how the State regulates our access to resources. The example of Natives in B.C., who have recently appropriated
professional archaeology to their own cause of settling land-claim disputes, is offered to show how alienated components of our identities can be returned to us through political action.
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That archaeologists control what we know of the prehistory of Canada is evident in government and privately-financed museum collections, university curricula, and protected heritage sites. In British Columbia, this has been true since archaeology became professionalized beginning in 1945. In that year a University of British Columbia (UBC) German professor, Charles E. Borden, began excavating Aboriginal refuse piles, known as middens, on Point Grey in Vancouver. Before Borden B.C. prehistory was a relatively wide-open field. Aboriginal people knew their past and orally recorded and passed on ancient family histories, myths, and totem pole stories to succeeding generations. Local amateur archaeologists, such as Charles Hill-Tout, excavated the ubiquitous middens that dotted the coastal shores and river estuaries of the province, and developed their theories about B.C. prehistory. But in the 1950s, Charles Borden professionalized B.C. archaeology, drove amateurs from the public sphere, and concurrently silenced Native claims about the past, a process first begun on the B.C. coast when professional anthropologists arrived in the late 19th century. The legacy of Borden's professionalization of archaeology is that the prehistory of this extremely rich and ancient culture-area of North America is monopolized by archaeologists. This monopoly is guaranteed by protective legislation passed in 1960, which limits access to prehistoric materials to archaeologists, who use the materials to build their careers and advance the discipline. This situation has traditionally been to the disadvantage of contemporary Aboriginal people, who have had their material culture and history apprehended, examined, and displayed, without much input. The level of control that archaeologists exercise over the origins and history of Natives, and the rapidly increasing importance of archaeology in current Native land claims, demands a critical inquiry into the formation of B.C. archaeology. My purpose then is to expose the process by which Borden's archaeology came to control B.C. prehistory, and to suggest the massive consequences this has had, and will continue to have, on the lives of all
Approaches to the history of archaeology do not include examinations of how the science became established in particular places and times. A division in the history of science exists between "positivistic internalist" studies, ones that depict the development of the discipline as self contained and insulated from influence by social change, and "social externalist" histories which locate archaeology within a larger social context. Traditionally, archaeologists themselves write the history of North American archaeology as internalists. Gordon R. Willey and Jeremy A. Sabloff's, *A History of American Archaeology*, has since the early 1970s been the most significant proponent of this type of historical study, although Glyn Daniel pioneered the approach in England in the 1950s. Internalists argue that the historical development of professional archaeology has been driven entirely from within by ever increasing scientificity in a unilinear and inevitable fashion. The "rational objective knowledge" produced by archaeology is all that is needed to explain its success, or so the argument goes, while social factors are offered to account for those instances in the past when the rational path appears to have been lost.

Locally, the internalist approach dominates the histories of B.C. archaeology, which include Knut R. Fladmark's "British Columbia Archaeology in the 1970s," Roy L. Carlson's "History of Research in Archaeology," and "Archaeology in British Columbia," Roderick Sprague's "The Pacific Northwest," William Noble's "One Hundred and Twenty-Five Years in the Canadian Provinces," and, most recently, a chapter in R.G. Matson and Gary Coupland, *The Prehistory of the Northwest Coast*. These B.C. accounts, which include several graduate theses in anthropology, are very disciplinary in their approach, and the authors display no interest in questioning the assumptions of what archaeologists do. There is a distinct tendency to rely on the published works of significant individuals, such as Charles Hill-Tout and Charles Borden, and
a powerful propensity to chronicle excavation projects. This strategy suggests that these works are designed to establish a historical pedigree for ongoing research in the province, rather than explain why past excavations were conducted. The authors no doubt consider the later point self evident.

Some archaeologists, epitomized by Bruce G. Trigger, *A History of Archaeological Thought*, have located archaeology within a larger historical social context. Thomas C. Patterson and other "externalists," including Jim Wright for Canada, explain archaeology as an outgrowth of the socio-economic milieu in which it is practised. However, these scholars stop short of the more relativist assertion that archaeological knowledge is nothing but a reflection of contemporary social concerns. Instead, they argue that despite the impingement of external factors, such class ideology or nationalism, over time archaeology has still managed to progress and accumulate an objective core of factual data. The problem with externalist works is the predominantly one-way causal arrow pointing from the social milieu to changes in archaeology, and also the lack of a clear explanation of how objectivity is maintained under the circumstances of massive social influence.

Ultimately, both approaches create an illusionary division between internal and external influences to account for disciplinary developments. Recently, some self-styled "critical" scholars, following the "post-processual" archaeology of Ian Hodder and the sociology of knowledge approaches, have suggested that there is an unceasing flow of influences in and out of the discipline. They reject internalists as Whig historians, and they criticize externalists for smothering local disciplinary change under the cover of class ideology or other broad social forces. Best described as "contextualists," scholars such as C.M. Hinsley, Alice Kehoe, Sergio Chavez, Donald McVicker, and Valerie Pinsky opt to study particular historical cases, in order to understand the interplay of internal and external pressures, in a multiplicity of micro-contexts of time and space.
Because of the relative isolation in which archaeology has developed in the province, the contextual approach is well-suited to B.C. Proceeding contextually, I hope to explain Charles Borden's monopolization of B.C. prehistory as an interplay of internal and external forces in numerous specific contexts. For this purpose, in addition to the traditional published sources, I have consulted contemporary newspaper accounts to gauge public reaction to archaeology, and government documents for the official view. Most important, however, were the rich archival collections - correspondence, lecture notes, and unpublished essays - from the well-ordered personal papers of Borden and other relevant archaeologists. Borden in particular seems to have saved and cross-referenced every scrap of paper he came into contact with, and the post-mortem deposition of his papers at UBC suggests he did not want his central role in the formation of B.C. archaeology to be misunderstood or trivialized. Among other uses, this collection has proven invaluable for understanding how Borden produced knowledge, a process that is invisible if only his published works are studied.

By emphasizing the constructivist nature of knowledge, I run the risk of being unfairly accused of relativism. A contextual approach does not imply that truth is relative even though truth it is certainly influenced by personal and social location. I believe that in every society there is an economy of truth in which some knowledge is considered more truthful than other knowledge. It was the case in B.C., between 1945-1960, that Borden's scientific knowledge of prehistory came to be accepted, publicly and politically, as more truthful than knowledge generated by either "amateurs" or Aboriginal people. To understand this process, which is absolutely central to how archaeologists control prehistory, I prefer to think of professional archaeology and other knowledge producing systems, as networks within which there are resources that are manipulated to construct knowledge. Archaeologists use universities, research funding agencies, professional associations, and specific methods and
theories to form heavily fortified strongholds from which to produce facts and knowledge. The success of professional archaeology in B.C., as I will demonstrate, can be attributed to a very real set of historical circumstances in which Charles Borden gained access to the prevailing network of professional archaeology, in North America in the late 1940s, and fashioned himself into the authority on B.C. prehistory. The professional and public acceptance in the 1950s, of Borden's interpretations and standards, was dependent upon his ability to draw as many people, groups, and governmental allies as possible into this network. This occurred in many ways on different levels, and in the process both amateurs and Natives were marginalized. They were, I argue, unable to formulate competitive networks. As a result, it will be shown, only one seemingly objective and truthful discourse on B.C. prehistory emerged after 1960, and it persists today with monumental consequences.

The novelty of professional archaeology in Canada immediately after WWII cannot be overstated. Despite a brief fluorescence in eastern Canada in the nineteenth century, by 1950, only three professional archaeologists worked in the country, including Charles Borden at UBC. Borden himself reflected incredulously, if not immodestly, on this early period: "In 1955 there were only six people professionally employed in Canada as specialists in Can. prehistory. A career in Can. archaeology seemed scarcely more profitable than a career in poetry. Until the late 1950's I was the only archaeologist west of Ontario!" Borden grew up as a German national, but was an American by birth, and like most archaeologists in Canada he was educated in the United States. After he returned to the U.S. from Germany in 1927, at the age of 22, Borden completed his A.B. in German at UCLA and finished his studies in 1937, after receiving an M.A. and Ph.D. at Berkeley in the same subject. He arrived at UBC in 1939 to take a faculty post in the German department, where he remained until retirement in the 1970s.

As unlikely as it seems, Borden choose to make his academic career in
archaeology. Former colleague Roy L. Carlson explains:

I once asked him why he took up local archaeological research, and he replied that he had become so frustrated with the U.B.C. library in attempting to obtain copies of original material with which to pursue Germanic studies, that he turned to archaeology, in which he had been interested since his school days in Germany when he assisted his teacher in excavating Hamburgian sites.18

Borden's passion for archaeology appears to have lingered throughout his years at Berkeley, where he apparently sat in on anthropology lectures.19 It was here that Borden surely encountered the ubiquitous Boasian disciple, Alfred Kroeber, who was one of the pioneers of the culture-area classification scheme which continues to be central to how Aboriginal cultures are studied.20

While Borden received no formal training in anthropology or archaeology, his amateur interest enticed him to devour a substantial number of works on the subject during the 1940s. This probably alerted him to the dearth of even remotely academic works on the archaeology of the Northwest Coast (NWC).21 Preeminent among the slender choices was the 1943 monograph by Californian anthropologist Philip Drucker, on B.C., entitled Archeological Survey on the Northern Northwest Coast.22 As an ethnographer interested primarily in living Nootkan peoples of Vancouver Island, Drucker's archaeological field work of 1938 was limited to site surveys, minor excavations, and an artifact typology. Especially significant for Borden was the passionate cry that Drucker issued for systematic archaeological work on the origins of prehistoric coastal peoples:

The truth of the matter can be determined only by careful and extensive investigations. My aim here, however, is not to soar off into the realms of speculation, but to point out a series of problems, and specifically at this point, the vital need for more rigidly controlled excavations in the Fraser-Columbia region as well as on the adjacent coast.23

In the mid 1960s Borden would reflect in the essay, "Review of Archaeological Research Carried Out in British Columbia," that Drucker's words instigated his
early amateur involvement in B.C. archaeology: "Drucker's report . . . had a profound influence on the present writer. It was the direct impact of his publication which in 1945 prompted me to initiate a series of salvage projects at potentially important but rapidly vanishing sites within the city limits of Vancouver." Early salvage excavations from 1945 to 1947 were conducted by Borden and his friend, Dr. A.V.P. Akrigg, at numerous locales on Point Grey (Figure 1, p. 71). Although an unsanctioned hobby, Borden's 1947 unpublished "Preliminary Report on the Archeology of Point Grey," indicates the seriousness with which they worked: "Though archaeology is not our major field, but an avocation, we are trying to follow accepted procedures and to avoid, as much as possible, the errors and sins of omission commonly committed by amateurs." By looking to professionals for guidance, Borden was already distancing himself from other local amateurs and preparing himself to command professional field archaeology in B.C.

The local amateur tradition that Borden rejected was deeply entrenched. It dated from the first excavations by English immigrant Charles Hill-Tout, who moved from Ontario to Vancouver in 1890. He was principal of his own private school, and a fellow of both the Royal Society of Canada and the Royal Archaeological Institute of Great Britain, and considered himself eminently qualified to excavate local sites. In particular, he worked on the massive midden discovered in Marpole (then Eburne) during road construction from Vancouver to Sea Island in 1888 (Figure 1, p. 71). The results of his work on what he dubbed "The Great Fraser Midden," were published as a professional article in 1895, entitled "Late Prehistoric Man in British Columbia," in the Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada, under George M. Dawson, Director of the Geological Survey of Canada. Hill-Tout met Dawson in the 1880s through Daniel Wilson, the President of the University of Toronto. Wilson, along with George Dawson's father, John William Dawson, and Horatio Hale, initiated institutionalized archaeology in Canada when they formed the Committee on the
North-Western Tribes of Canada, as a branch of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, in 1884. This Committee sponsored Franz Boas' first ethnographic field trips to B.C. (1888-1894), and, Douglas Cole argues, established Boas' early dominance in Canada. In 1897, George Dawson chaired the newly-formed Committee on an Ethnographic Survey of Canada of the British Association. Hill-Tout was chosen by Dawson as the B.C. anthropologist and contributed to the Committees' 1902 report.

The decisive moments for Canadian archaeology began with the 1901 death of George Dawson, following shortly after the deaths of Dawson's father, Hale, and Wilson, in the 1890s. The death of these giants of Canadian archaeology left no professionally-trained heirs, and with the liquidation of the Ethnographic Survey in 1903, Hill-Tout and other amateurs across Canada were essentially abandoned to their local pursuits. During the same time, from 1897-1902, Boas, as Professor of Anthropology at Columbia University and Curator of the American Museum of Natural History in New York, led the Jesup North Pacific Expedition to B.C. The major goal of the Jesup Expedition was to salvage Native material culture and oral traditions, which were perceived by anthropologists to be in grave danger of extinction in the face of capitalist Western culture. The focus of the Jesup Expedition on collecting for museum purposes, was consonant with other expeditions to the NWC, from the mid-1870s to the 1920s, which depleted the area of virtually all material culture, in a massive exodus to major American and European cities such as New York, Washington, Chicago, London, and Berlin.

The Jesup Expedition conducted ethnographic surveys and the first professional archaeological surveys under the direction of Harlan Smith. Methodologically Smith was very similar to Hill-Tout, excavating rapidly, with little measuring, and focusing on the procurement of artifacts and skeletons according to the standards of the day. Literally thousands of skeletons, skulls, and material artifacts were acquired through excavation, purchase, or
theft and shipped back to the American Museum of Natural History in New York.\textsuperscript{36} Aside from contributing to the cultural exhaustion of B.C., the impact of the Jesup Expedition on Hill-Tout and the future of B.C. archaeology was monumental.

It is evident that Boas had a strong personal dislike for Hill-Tout from early on. In 1897, despite Hill-Tout's devotion, experience, and generosity (he gave five Native skulls to Boas),\textsuperscript{37} Boas flatly denied Hill-Tout a position in the Jesup Expedition, while hiring other locals such as James Teit, who had absolutely no prior experience or training. Teit was married to a Native woman and provided Boas with vital contacts, while his lack of education gave Boas the opportunity to mould Teit to his brand of anthropology, something he could not have done with Hill-Tout.\textsuperscript{38} Boas also trivialized Hill-Tout's central argument, arising from his excavations at Marpole and based on a few skull examinations, that an earlier "long-headed" people were replaced by a later "broad-headed" race related to the contemporary Native populations.\textsuperscript{39} Boas dismissed Hill-Tout's assessment, arguing that the long-headed skull was merely an unremarkable example of ritual deformation.\textsuperscript{40} When consulted by R.W. Brock of the Geological Survey, in 1910, about candidates for the job of chief ethnologist at the new Victoria Museum in Ottawa, Boas advised: "It seems to my mind that the few Canadians who are interested in anthropological work have not sufficient scientific training for the position that you intend to fill." He continued, "I mention particularly Mr. Hill-Tout, who besides, has a most remarkable ability of exasperating everyone with whom he comes into contact, who is a good collector, but thoroughly unscientific in his conclusions."\textsuperscript{41} The job went to a Boas student, the American Edward Sapir, who had also worked on the B.C. coast. Sapir in turn appointed Harlan Smith, the Jesup Expedition archaeologist, as Canada's national archaeologist, thereby completing the Boasian encapsulation of professional anthropology and archaeology in Canada.\textsuperscript{42}
In the succeeding decades, Sapir demonstrated a distinct preference for professionals from the Americanist school of Boas, and the work of amateurs in Canada was neglected. In a letter from 1912, Hill-Tout chastised Sapir for ignoring the work of Canadian anthropologists. Sapir reciprocated in 1916 when President Wesbrook, of the newly-formed UBC, inquired as to Sapir's opinion of Hill-Tout for the Chair of the University Anthropology Department. Sapir replied "To be perfectly frank, I do not think Mr. Hill-Tout would altogether answer the needs of a university." Ultimately, West Coast amateurs, like Hill-Tout, were barred by Sapir from access to the Geological Survey's ethnology journal, and had to publish either locally or outside of the country.

After 1910, owing to the Boasian control of Canadian anthropology under Sapir, B.C. archaeology limped along in a particularly local and insulated manner from the rest of North America, until Borden started digging in 1945. The Art, Historical, and Scientific Association of which Hill-Tout was a charter member from 1894, operated the Vancouver City Museum and continued to sponsor local excavations, particularly those of Hermann Leisk at Marpole, 1927-1932. Hill-Tout and other museum members were tremendously popular in Vancouver during the first half of the 20th century, issuing their own Arts Notes publication, holding public lectures, and using the Vancouver newspapers as their professional forum. Hill-Tout also had a substantial following in England, where the London Illustrated News provided extensive coverage of the results of his Marpole work. Despite Boas' rejection of him, and his further marginalization by Sapir, Hill-Tout's two-race replacement model remained the working thesis of local amateurs well into the 1940s. Hill-Tout died in 1944 just as Borden began his own digs into B.C. prehistory.

It is of paramount significance that Borden chose to reject the local amateur archaeological lineage, and pursue the professional Boasian Americanist tradition, when he began his 1945 Point Grey excavations. It would have been
easy for him to have assumed the role of chief local amateur after Hill-Tout died in 1944. However, most likely Borden's exposure to Kroeber and the Boasian school in California, and his desire to build a recognized professional career had taught him to maintain his distance from the local tradition, which at this point had no influence on professional North American archaeology. In spite of the methodological similarity of Harlan Smith's "professional" and Hill-Tout's "amateur" turn-of-the-century work at Marpole, Borden consciously established himself at the terminus of Smith and Drucker's tiny lineage of professional field archaeology. While Borden acknowledged Hill-Tout in his writing, he carefully avoided any direct association with Hill-Tout's amateur pedigree.

The fusion of Borden, professional British Columbian field archaeology, UBC, and the existing network of scientific North American archaeology occurred officially in 1948, and was described by Borden in a 1977 lecture to the Archaeological Society of B.C.:

When Dr. Harry Hawthorn was appointed to a teaching post at UBC in 1947 (the first anthrop. at a university in western Can!) he looked with favor on our salvage archaeology at Point Grey and, in the fall of 1948 Dr. H asked me to undertake a trial teaching field project as part of his course on Brit. Col. Indians. This was carried out successfully at the Marpole site in late 1948 [and] early 1949. Its success led to the introduction of a course in the Archaeol. of Brit. Col. at UBC. The course has been taught there since. 

The significance of this sequence of events is paramount. As a Yale educated member of the American anthropological establishment, Harry Hawthorn was able to formally connect Borden to his network of institutions and colleagues in the U.S., and allowed Borden to derive his authority from them, rather than the ranks of local amateurs.

By taking the title "Lecturer in Archaeology" in 1949 at a major provincial university, Borden adopted the academic status of his new colleagues in American universities. The American Anthropological Association quickly
made Borden a member, and his short article on field methods, "A Translucent Shelter for Field Work in Regions with High Precipitation," appeared in the January 1950 edition of the premier journal in the field, *American Antiquity*. His recognition as an expert in NWC archaeology led to publication of Borden's short report, "Fraser River Delta Archaeological Findings," and invitations to write two reviews in 1951, including one for a book by University of Washington archaeologist, Arden King. Thus, in spite of his lack of formal training in archaeology, Borden was by the early 1950s, a fully recognized member of the academic community of professional archaeologists, with full access to their societies, conferences, and publications. He had, in effect, become the conduit through which the network of Americanist archaeology with its collection of approved methods, theories, and goals built up by professionals over decades, intersected with the largely unearthed prehistory of B.C.

For the first half of the 20th century, professional archaeologists in the U.S. had followed the Boasian historical school of anthropology, which achieved its fullest expression in Sapir's seminal 1916 work, *Time Perspective in Aboriginal American Culture: A Study in Method*. By Borden's day, in the 1940s, professional archaeologists, armed with new field methods, continued to agree, for the most part, that the reconstruction of cultural history and "area syntheses" of prehistoric American cultures was their purpose. The essential task of "area synthesis" was the development of regional charts and chronologies, that defined and located "cultures" temporally and spatially according to "artifact" distributions. Spatial distribution was controlled by typologies that grouped artifacts according to how they were manufactured, material type, and their original function. The relative similarity and difference of artifact types across space, it was assumed, could define the limits of cultures. These "cultures" were mapped spatially and correlated with the geographic areas derived by Kroeber. For temporal control, archaeologists in the U.S., in the 1930s and 1940s, employed stratigraphic techniques
developed in the 1910s and 1920s. Stratigraphy involved the assumption that artifacts found in lower layers in sites during excavations were deposited first, and therefore are necessarily older than objects found closer to the surface. The objective of excavating and artifact classification was to establish these vertically temporal, and horizontally spatial, maps or latticeworks of Aboriginal cultures.

In the late 1930s and 1940s Clyde Kluckhohn, W.D. Strong, F.M. Setzler, and Julian Steward among others, fervently criticized culture history. They argued that archaeology needed to pursue scientific generalizations about culture processes, rather than focus too closely on specific instances of culture history. Kluckhohn, in particular, issued a damning indictment of culture history as devoid of theory, and posed a decisive question: "Is the 'structure of the modern world' to be revealed by flashes of intuition catalyzed by historical insight or by the inductive generalizations of science?" Many North American archaeologists chose the latter path and issued a stringent call to tighten controls on excavations in the name of scientific objectivity.

The pinnacle of scientificity was achieved in the 1940s by the landmark work of Walter W. Taylor entitled *A Study of Archeology*. Taylor's scheme, called the "conjunctive approach," advocated a convergence of all possible forms of evidence to answer specific archaeological questions. Central was scientifically systematic data collection:

The gathering of data from archeological sites, in nearly every instance, involves the destruction of the original record. Only to the extent to which that record is transposed to the archeologist's notes is it preserved for study either by the collector himself or by other students. A good axiom for archeologists is that "it is not what you find, but how you find it," and it is superfluous to point out that "how you find it" can be told only from notes and not specimens. An archeological find is only as good as the notes upon it. Therefore only one objective can be sanctioned with regard to the actual excavation of archeological sites: that of securing the most complete record as possible, not only of those details which are of interest to the
The goal of archaeology was to be able to reproduce the original association of artifacts and cultural and environmental detritus in the lab, in order to discover the function of artifacts in their original cultural and environmental contexts. Taylor's interest in functionalism was drawn from the British social anthropology of Bronislaw Malinowski and A.R. Radcliffe-Brown who both taught in the U.S. in the 1930s.

The timing of Taylor's 1948 work is critical for understanding the development of professional archaeology in B.C. and Borden's ascendancy within it. The empiricism of the conjunctive approach dovetailed perfectly with Borden's proclivity for field rigour evidenced at Point Grey. Taylor's work actually became the core around which Borden's own archaeological ideas coalesced, and were expressed in the classroom. Borden's commitment to scientific archaeology was articulated in his first lectures to archaeology students at UBC in 1949: "Among the disciplines which comprise the wide range of the field of anthropology the science of archaeology occupies an important place." He went on to make a case for scientific archaeology, citing the turn-of-the-century Jesup Expedition work of Harlan Smith as an example of how permanent value was lost, because of a lack of "scientific control and precision." In his standard class lecture, "Objectives + Methodology of Modern Archaeology," Borden made statements that closely paralleled those of Taylor: "The modern archaeologist seeks to construct as complete a picture as possible of past human life in terms of its human and geographic environment both on a single time plane and in successive periods." In a class lecture from September 1954, Borden actually read pages 154-156 of Taylor's book, containing the section reproduced above. The importance of scientificity was not lost on the students. Borden's prize disciple, Wilson Duff, explicitly
stated in his Anthropology 401 report for Borden, on excavations at Marpole in 1949, that "the method of presentation of this report is a modification of that suggested by Walter Taylor in *A Study of Archeology.*" The constant emphasis that only standardized excavation and lab techniques could reveal knowledge of the past was the central theme in Borden's teachings.

Despite Taylor's focus on scientificity, he, unlike Kluckhohn, did not readily divorce culture history and anthropological generalization: "The conjunctive approach is not concerned as to whether the particular archeologist has for his objective historiography or anthropology. But it does believe that, to justify itself as a social science as opposed to antiquarianism, archaeology must at least write history, must at least construct the fullest possible cultural contexts." Borden, in agreement, suggested in class that the scientific archaeologist's "chief goal is to write culture history," and for him this task took priority, in the late 1940s and 1950s, because not even basic chronologies or area syntheses had been formulated for B.C.

Indeed, the ultimate legacy of the encapsulation of NWC archaeology within a context of Boasian anthropology, by Sapir and Smith from Ottawa, and from the western U.S. by Kroeber, Drucker, Frederica de Laguna, and Borden the self-taught Boasian, is that culture history is still the main thrust of archaeological research in B.C. This situation is different from other areas of North America in which the scientific anthropology of Kluckhohn, Steward, Setzler, Taylor, and others led to the rejection of culture history, in the late 1950s and 1960s, as particularist, non-explanatory, and thus unscientific. The resulting "processual" or "new archaeology" of Gordon Willey, Philip Phillips, and Lewis Binford, which dominated American archaeology from the early 1960s until the 1980s, is oriented toward discovering general scientific laws of culture change. Processualists draw heavily on neo-evolutionary ideas and anti-historical British social anthropology to argue that archaeology is anthropology (meaning a generalizing science) or it is nothing. To the
contrary, Borden remained within the Boasian historical school through the 1960s and 1970s, and yet drew on the scientific rigour and functionalism of Taylor, without irreconcilably splitting history and science as Kluckhohn and others did.\textsuperscript{76} So the scientific culture history that was universal in the late 1940s and 1950s in North America, continued in B.C. through Borden's tutelage, while in the 1960s it was rejected in other parts of North America by a positivist urge to identify general laws of cultural development.

During the 1950s, in this early period of chronology building and area synthesis, Borden began to monopolize B.C. prehistory. How he was able to do this stems from the differences between how he produced knowledge about prehistory as a professional, compared to how locals continued to produce knowledge as amateurs. The significant difference is not an issue of the "truth" of Borden's knowledge versus the "falsity" of amateur knowledge, but rather an economy of truth. When Borden dug into the prehistory of B.C. he did so not only as an individual, but as a representative of the massive network of North American professional archaeology, with its universities, museums, laboratories, special technology, standard language, known methods, and approved theories. His knowledge-production enterprise involved drawing on this network to build alliances of authority that would support and promote his work. Borden spoke for professional archaeology in B.C., and professional archaeology confirmed Borden's authority. In contrast, most amateur archaeologists in B.C. were individuals working alone, unconnected, and without communication lines, publications, collective language, theories or methods, and deriving their authority solely from personality and common sense. When it came to making claims about prehistory in the public forum, the weight of alliances became decisive.

Excavations in the summer 1949, at a large midden on the Whalen family farm at Point Roberts Washington (Figure 1, p. 71), are typical of how Borden conducted scientific culture history and mustered resources and alliances to
construct knowledge. The Point Roberts excavations were conducted as a field school for UBC and University of Washington (UW) archaeology students. Although it was financed by UW, Borden directed the excavations, and published most of the results in *Anthropology in B.C.* and *British Columbia Historical Quarterly* in 1950, which were among his first publications as a professional archaeologist. In these articles, Borden makes it clear to the reader that he is personally responsible for producing what limited knowledge existed on the culturally rich Fraser Delta area:

> Among the sites that have been investigated in the Vancouver area are the following: Point Grey, one mile northeast of Point Grey proper; Locarno Beach, a mile and a half nearer to the business centre of Vancouver; and Marpole (Eburne), the well-known and much abused site on the North Arm of the Fraser River. A surface collection has also been made at the two village sites on the Musqueam Reserve at the mouth of the North Arm.

He conveniently, and understandably, did not mention that most of these excavations were carried out by him as amateur activities. Indeed, he likened them to the professional 1946 San Juan Islands excavations of Arden King from UW. Borden also took this opportunity to cite Drucker's call for "rigidly controlled excavations" as the impetus behind the Whalen farm project.

The elaborate ritual of excavation at the Whalen site, as in all of Borden's subsequent excavations, proceeded methodically using recognized field methods borrowed from *A Manual of Archaeological Field Methods*, edited by Robert F. Heizer from the University of California at Berkeley. The process outlined in Borden's published reports on the project began with the physical location of the site: "Before the excavation proper began, the students were busy with alidade, plane-table, and stadia rod, surveying, fixing datum points and benchmarks, and preparing contour maps of the site." As the actual digging progressed, "every find, upon discovery, immediately received an identification number and its location was measured three-dimensionally with reference to datum point and bench mark."
excavation were treated carefully: "One artifact record-sheet, the size of standard typewriter-paper, was devoted to each find for the recording of these and other data." The record-sheets that were used at the Whalen site were directly adapted from UW forms and Heizer's manual. In addition to the artifacts themselves, the physical context or matrix was also "scientifically" apprehended: "Associated material, such as food remains, detritus of manufacture, charcoal, samples of ash and other midden material from the various strata, was collected in special bags and its origin recorded." As a final measure, stratigraphic profiles were copied onto graph paper and hundreds of photographs taken. "In this fashion a trench 80 feet long, 5 feet wide, and 12 feet deep was excavated during the nine weeks of the field-trip." (Figure 3, p. 73) Because it was generally understood, from Taylor's writings, that archaeological sites are destroyed during excavation, exacting field methods ensured that the spatial and temporal relationships of all recovered items were "frozen," so to speak, for transport to the archaeology laboratory where their meaning could be derived. The artifact sheets and extensive field notes recorded literally tons of data, meticulously encoded in the standardized three dimensional language of professional archaeologists, and deposited at UBC in massive booklets.

After completion of the excavations at Point Roberts, the UBC archaeology lab received crates of raw data and boxes of notes for analysis. Borden attempted to rationalize the massive efforts of meticulous record-keeping as necessary to reveal the true story about the past:

The reward for all this care in the field came later in the laboratory when, after the original position of each find had been precisely plotted on the profile drawings, the artifacts were laid out on a large table in their proper association and sequence. Although not one of the artifacts was very spectacular by itself, as the finds lay spread out in this fashion they began to tell the story of two interesting chapters in the pre-history of this area.

For Borden, following Taylor's functionalism, lab analysis was the crucial
process whereby the relationships between artifacts and other materials, encoded on paper, were "revealed." Taylor had noted the primacy of the relationships in the raw data: "I refer to what may be called the affinities existing between the material remains: between individual cultural objects, between groups of objects, between groups of objects and the natural environment. These affinities are as much facts and as much integral parts of the archaeological data as are the material objects themselves." The first step in revealing the meaning of relationships between material objects, was to group them into artifact types. For this task Borden turned to the classification scheme developed by Philip Drucker for his 1943 survey of NWC archaeology.

As the pioneer in NWC artifact classification, Drucker provided the most expedient and applicable typology. He was really the only one to whom Borden could turn for the analysis of the Whalen artifacts. Drucker described the rationale behind his classification scheme:

A heterogeneous lot of material objects may be classified in various ways. Theoretically, it should be advantageous to group them primarily according to a single one of the several possible criteria -- form, material, or function. To follow this procedure consistently would mean that it would be possible to compare components widely separated in time and/or space. In practise, any single criterion is insufficient for specific and detailed classification. The present body of material has been classified according to whichever of the three aspects -- material, form, or function -- seemed to meet immediate demands. In some cases, material seemed the primary factor of classification; in others, function or form played this role. This procedure has the advantage of flexibility, which outweighs its theoretically objectionable inconsistency.

By employing Drucker's typology to formulate hypotheses about the relationships of artifacts, Borden incorporated into his alliance system both Drucker, and Drucker's colleagues and predecessors in classification from M.C. McKern back to Linnaeus.

Artifact classification allowed Borden to hypothesize that two cultures
with distinct origins were present at different times at the Whalen midden.\textsuperscript{94}\n
He concluded that the artifact collection contained two distinct assemblages of artifacts; that is, it represented a sequence of two different Indian cultures. Although there are certain similarities, the differences between the two are more numerous, and some of these are very striking. The transition from one to the other is quite abrupt, with a distinct dividing line between the two groups.\textsuperscript{95}\n
Differences in the artifact assemblages including the size, material type, and method of manufacture of projectile points, adzes, antler wedges, and of other important wood-working implements, substantiated his claims for the two distinct cultures, which he designated Whalen I and Whalen II.\textsuperscript{96} Assigning artifacts to types and attributing cultural significance to them required inference from the ethnographic known to the archaeological unknown.\textsuperscript{97}\n
Viewed as most reliable for both the classification of artifacts and the interpretation of their cultural meaning was the "direct historical approach." This method had been widely employed in North America since the early 20th century, and counted Kroeber and prominent archaeologists W.D. Strong and Julian Steward among its developers.\textsuperscript{98} This method relied on ascertaining the known function of tools, from direct descendants of original occupants of prehistoric sites, as a basis for inferring the function of tools and a corresponding subsistence pattern and social behaviour in the unknown past.\textsuperscript{99}\n
Drucker used this approach in his survey to formulate his artifact typology, and Borden himself employed the direct historical approach during his analysis of materials excavated from middens on the Musqueam Indian Reserve along the North Arm of the Fraser in 1950 and 1951 (Figure 1, p. 71).\textsuperscript{100} Since it was not applicable to the Whalen site, which was not contemporaneously occupied at the time of excavation, ethnographic knowledge from other locales was applied to classified artifacts to infer cultural significance. For comparative ethnographic information on NWC cultures, Borden relied on the extensive data
With artifacts satisfactorily nominated, but before applying ethnographic analogy, Borden sought to reconstruct the geographical context within which tools had been used. He did this by analyzing floral and faunal material found in association with the artifacts. For the Whalen site, students were assigned the task of compiling data on specific aspects of the prehistoric physical environment and analyzing the data in the lab. Wilson Duff, for example, contributed the botanical report. His approach was that of UW Boasian anthropologist, Erna Gunther, and drew on the rationale offered by Taylor, that the cultural meaning in artifacts was only ascertainable in their physical context. Interpreting the Whalen artifacts, which Borden classified as "adzes," "wedges," and "pounding-hammers," in light of ethnographic data and contextual material, Borden made powerful conclusions about the social behaviour of the prehistoric occupants:

From ethnographic sources we know that such tools were used for splitting off planks from large cedar logs. The presence of this configuration of wood-working tools in the upper horizon suggests, therefore that the later occupants of the Whalen site had a well-developed wood-working industry, and that they probably lived in large plank houses of the historic Coast Salish type. Conversely, the absence in the lower horizon of all three of these heavy-duty tools may indicate that wood-working was not highly developed among the earlier occupants, and that they lived in houses of a different type.

Borden went even further to infer a differential subsistence pattern for the two cultures based on sea animal remains found in association with key artifacts. These inferences of artifact function and the meaning of contextual detritus were presented by Borden, in the professional literature, as fundamental "facts" from which a broader interpretation could, and would be made.

To order the "facts" and account for the apparent culture change in the Whalen midden, Borden took from his professional repertoire, the classic
Boasian explanatory mechanism of cultural transference. Diffusion and migration, explained culture change as either the transfer of ideas/technology or of entire populations, rather than as the product of indigenous innovation. Arranged this way, the archaeological "facts," from the Whalen excavations, suggested to Borden "that an early group of Indians who had lived at this site for a considerable time, and whose entire orientation was evidently coastal by long tradition, was eventually overwhelmed by intrusive Indians whose culture exhibits strong ties with the Interior." Adding comparative linguistics to the archaeological evidence, Borden went further out on a limb to conclude that

At an early period extensive dislocations among the Indian groups of the North-west were caused by repeated waves of migration of Athabaskan-speaking peoples sweeping from northern regions southward along the Coast in through the Interior. Great unrest was caused among the Salish. It appears that Salish-speaking groups were jostled out of positions in the Interior of Washington and migrated towards the Coast, where they adapted themselves to a new life.

While admitting a lack of evidence to explain who had been displaced by the Salish, Borden indicated in a diffusionist manner, that based on tool types, the culture of the Whalen I people may have "derived its main stimulus from the Far North rather than from the East." This hypothesis left open the possibility of introducing new "facts" to the interpretation as they became available. It might appear at this stage of the analysis, several levels removed from the data, that Borden was in danger of falling into the amateurish trap of speculating beyond what the data could support. This, however, was not the case to Borden's professional colleagues, who recognized that he stayed safely within the range of acceptable interpretation allowed by the methods and authorities he employed in his support.

Publication was the culmination of the knowledge-production enterprise because acceptance or rejection by peers determined whether excavation results
became truthful factual knowledge, to be used authoritatively, or academic artifacts to be discarded. Borden published articles in a number of leading journals, including *American Antiquity*. Most important for Borden locally, was the introduction of the journal *Anthropology in British Columbia*, which appeared in 1950 as a publication of the Provincial Museum, under the editorial helm of Borden's former student and protegee, Wilson Duff. Borden's success in having his interpretations graciously received into the academic community stemmed from his effectiveness in mustering allies in the field. By using established professional techniques, methods, and theories, Borden demonstrated to his peers, mostly in the U.S., that he was prepared to conform to the inner logic of the archaeological discipline. This logic was dictated by a devotion to the sanctity of empiricism in excavation, classification in analysis, and inference from analogy during interpretation. These current cornerstones in the discipline were vital to the ability of archaeologists to transform raw data, such as salmon bones, crushed shells, and smooth stones, into subsistence patterns, modes of labour, and patterns of social organization. The disciplinary logic of professional archaeology, in the 1950s, was constantly reproduced through the production and spread of archaeological knowledge that endorsed the work of predecessors. Additionally, the prevailing inner logic severely circumscribed the range of interpretation available to professional archaeologists, thereby guiding research along a narrow band of plausible explanations, and ultimately guaranteeing the accumulation of uniform knowledge over time and the "progress" of the discipline.

Clearly, professional archaeology had changed substantially, in terms of field methods and interpretive rigour, from the time of Smith's work at Marpole in the 1890s, to Borden's at Point Roberts in the 1950s. To the contrary, local amateur work, had remained in virtual stasis from the days of Hill-Tout's 1890s excavations, to those by members of the Vancouver museum at Marpole in the 1940s. One amateur, Hermann Leisk, described his excavation methods in
1944 as sinking a pit into a midden and then cutting away at a face with a steel rod "in some methodical fashion, or whenever the leads seem most promising. You can zig-zag to and fro under big trees, filling the dirt in behind you. . . ."\textsuperscript{113} Leisk earlier, in 1937, indicated in a letter to The Vancouver Sun, that in two years work he had recovered about 1000 skeletons from Marpole, most of which were thrown away because of insufficient storage space at the City Museum.\textsuperscript{114} These excavations were conducted entirely to retrieve artifacts for display with little being done to establish their spatial or temporal locations, and note keeping was minimal.\textsuperscript{115} Leisk claimed to T.P.O. Menzies, the museum curator, that despite his less than rigorous methods, given sufficient time he could go through his notes, match them up with the unmarked museums collections by memory, and offer and interpretation of the artifacts, although this was apparently never done.\textsuperscript{116}

The amateur analysis of artifacts sometimes proceeded from a basic knowledge of Native ethnology, but usually from simple "common-sense," which allowed a massive range in the form and reliability of interpretations. The more fantastical of these received local publicity. A local amateur named R.A. Brooks, who owned a Vancouver antique shop, excavated a site on the Fraser in 1944, and concluded from the stone heads he discovered that the site was a Maya outpost.\textsuperscript{117} During the 1930s and into the 1950s, provincial newspapers often ran stories about amateur discoveries that concluded Aztecs lived in B.C., likened Marpole to King Tut's tomb, or described it as the site of a major prehistoric battle evidenced by stone swords and skull-crushing clubs.\textsuperscript{118}

While considered fantastic and foolish by Borden and his professional associates, these amateur interpretations reflect the highly individual, informal, and personal nature of B.C. amateur archaeology. Amateurs were solitary experts. They had no labs, no agreed upon vocabulary, no systematic "coded language" that all could read, no authorities behind them, and no confining and confirming logic. Publication outlets for amateur ideas were
limited in number and quality, and consequently there was no feed-back mechanisms to insure the formation of knowledge. In short, amateurs were "unconnected" beyond the association of a few with local museums and newspapers. They appear on the B.C. archaeological landscape as independent dots rather than a tightly woven network. In a contest for discovering the truth about B.C. prehistory, no amateur could compete with the authority that Borden exercised from the archaeology lab at UBC, and displayed for the approval of his allies from North American archaeology. Additionally, unlike Borden, most amateurs had absolutely no desire to be connected to anything nor to produce knowledge; many of them desired only to amass personal collections for fun or profit.

If the professional acceptance of Borden as the voice of authority about B.C. prehistory was guaranteed by the indelible link of disciplinary logic and scientific journals, how can his equally broad acceptance be explained among the vast majority of non-scientific British Columbians who were outside of the network? The answer lay in Borden's ability to make archaeology seem both relevant, and in some cases, indispensable, to the lives of British Columbians.

During the 1950s, Borden's success in establishing popular credibility and a monopoly over B.C prehistory was his ability, and need, to involve ordinary people in his archaeological projects as allies in the knowledge-production process. This need was generated by the nature of archaeological excavations in the 1950s, which were largely conducted in a climate of crisis in the face of post WWII urban expansion and industrial development. In his April 1947 report on the Point Grey excavations, Borden grimly acknowledged that "at the time of writing, the thickets of salmonberry are being removed and the stands of maple and alder thinned. A tractor is churning the surface [of the midden] as it pushes around the felled trees." He ends the report by stating that "in the immediate future the camp on the upland northwest of the ancient canoe runways will be excavated if at all possible, for the land is
being cleared and slated to be plowed within a few weeks."\textsuperscript{120} It was at such threatened sites that diverse members of the B.C. populous were drawn into close proximity with Borden's archaeological network, and linked to it in subtle and overt ways, making them important allies in preserving archaeological sites, which was obviously central to the production of knowledge.

Borden began enlisting the public to the cause of knowledge-production early in his career as a scientific archaeologist. His public discourses took a variety of forms, including lectures, radio broadcasts, and newspaper interviews. On 8 March 1948, for example, Borden's CBR radio talk to Vancouverites, "The Middens of British Columbia," introduced the notion that the scientific study of garbage piles, like "Indian middens," could reveal a wealth of knowledge, and also contained an abridged version of his Point Grey results.\textsuperscript{121} He ended the broadcast with a brief explanation of the purpose of professional archaeology in B.C.: "Modern Archaeology is not content with the mere collecting of museum pieces for exhibition purposes. One of the chief aims is the reconstruction of the prehistory of the different regions. This task is far from complete on this continent, indeed, in Canada it has hardly begun."\textsuperscript{122} In other popular publications Borden suggested that scientists could read middens like books, and in the newspapers he criticized amateurs for doing "science a dis-service."\textsuperscript{123} In his radio broadcasts and newspaper articles, Borden's careful aligning of resources and the massive number of contingent factors in the production of knowledge, such as assigning artifacts to arbitrary typologies, drawing inferences and so forth, were invisible to the audience. What the public received were synthesized results cloaked in the catch phrase of "scientists say."\textsuperscript{124} To most people this meant the results were unambiguous, true, and lent popular credibility to Borden's efforts.

Concurrent with Borden's public education campaign, and facilitating media access and public interest, were the intense political struggles over the
preservation of particularly high-profile archaeological sites. These involved even broader social linkages to the preservation of archaeological sites and the process of knowledge-production. Borden's former student, Wilson Duff, instigated the initial crusade to preserve archaeological sites, in the fall of 1950, from his new position as Assistant in Anthropology at the Provincial Museum of Natural History and Anthropology, in Victoria.\textsuperscript{125} Duff sent Borden and his UBC colleague, Harry Hawthorn, a series of recommendations based on the assessment that provincial archaeological sites were in danger of destruction, by both urban expansion and proposed hydro-electric dam projects.\textsuperscript{126} Duff recommended restricting access to sites to professionals only, designating some sites as permanent monuments, regulating excavations by researchers from outside of B.C., and controlling the exportation of antiquities.\textsuperscript{127} Borden strongly advised that legislation go even further by urging that developers pay for salvage excavations: "We cannot prevent urban expansion and industrial development, but by intelligent legislation they could be turned from a bane to a boon to archaeology. I can get all excited about the possibilities."\textsuperscript{128} Duff and Borden together reviewed the existing provincial antiquities legislation, the "Historic Objects Preservation Act," dating from 1948. This legislation barred the desecration of any object or site designated by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council as valuable, although the lack of researchers to assess value realistically prevented its application.\textsuperscript{129} Through consultation with a lawyer, Duff had determined that the proper channel for developing fresh and more comprehensive legislation was the Provincial Minister of Education, W.T. Straith, who oversaw the Provincial Museum.\textsuperscript{130}

The assault on Straith by Duff and Borden for legislation began in December of 1950 with a letter and memoranda entitled, "Preservation and Salvage of Threatened Archaeological Sites."\textsuperscript{131} Duff briefly explained the scientific significance of provincial archaeological sites and lamented that middens ranging from Marpole and Locarno beach, to Prince Rupert, had already
been destroyed by urban developers, commercial sea-shell mining, souvenir hunters, and cultivators and now faced the onslaught of massive river-dam projects. Duff dismissed existing legislation as inadequate and urged immediate government action for greater site protection. The January 1951 announcement, of the Aluminum Company of Canada, Ltd (Al-Can) Kenney dam project on the Nechako river in central B.C., prompted Duff and Borden to temporarily abandon efforts for legislation, and pursue immediate funding for emergency site surveys and excavations in the threatened area.

In a barrage of letters from early 1951, to Straith and the Minister of Lands and Forests, E.T. Kenney, Borden and Duff offered their services and requested $2000 in special grants for archaeological work in the summer of 1951. Duff met personally with Straith in April to plead for the grant, which was advanced through a special act of cabinet in late April of 1951. July and August were spent by Borden and Duff and a small team in the Nechako river drainage in Tweedsmuir Park (Figure 2, p. 72), mapping sites and identifying those that promised rich rewards if excavated.

At the urging of Wilson Duff, Borden sent Straith a detailed report of the summer of 1951 surveys, as a follow-up exercise designed to maintain the momentum and secure additional funding for more fieldwork in the summer of 1952. Duff advised Borden to "shuck off some of your scientific hyper-caution and make it good - you have the exciting material to do it with. Press releases should be journalized (I won't say sensationalized) as well. You should begin your campaign for more money soon, and this would be a way to start." It worked. Claiming that the eyes of the world were on B.C., Borden spent the winter of 1951-1952 securing promises from Straith for additional funding. A grant was approved by special act in March of 1952 for the amount of $8650, supplemented by contributions of $5000 from Al-Can and $900 from the UBC Research Committee. This unprecedented financial backing facilitated extensive surveys and excavations in the summer of 1952. The results were
published in the same year in *Anthropology in B.C.* Colour films of this first-ever government backed salvage operation were made by the Provincial Museum and used in its educational series. Additional concerns over major power developments such as the 1954 Kootenay-Libby project, the Quesnal river dams, and the 1954 Frobisher project among others dominated B.C. archaeology in the 1950s.

Perhaps the most significant methodological ramification of the Al-Can project was Borden's invention, and publication, of a uniform site designation scheme for Canada. Known as the Borden System, and still in official use across Canada, this scheme assigns all archaeological sites a four letter coordinate corresponding to a precise latitudinal and longitudinal location, on maps from the National Topographic Series.

The issue of legislation, dormant during the Al-Can project, resurfaced again in 1955 over the continued destruction of the Great Fraser Midden at Marpole, in the face of the construction of the Fraser Arms Hotel. Borden initiated salvage excavations in May of 1955 but was stymied when funding from UBC ran out and students left the project for other summer employment. After an outpouring of media coverage, and negotiations by Borden, the Vancouver City Museum granted Borden $350 to facilitate excavations in exchange for all artifacts that were recovered. A crew of volunteers turned out to do the labour. While orchestrating untrained workers, Borden also encountered amateurs whom he chastised in newspaper interviews: "One of the hazards of research work is Sunday afternoon archaeologists who come down to [Marpole] to 'pot hunt'." In August of 1955, members of the Marpole Chamber of Commerce joined the crusade to save the midden and formed the Great Fraser Midden Foundation in the autumn with Borden as honourary president. Months later came a media frenzy over Borden's radio-carbon dates of 1950 years +/- 125 years for organic debris from the Marpole site. This, combined with Borden's public lectures, favourably influenced some local business people with
government connections. As a result, the Marpole issue had already reached legislative circles by the time Wilson Duff resumed his pressure on the government for new legislation.149

Duff wrote to the new Minister of Education, Ray Williston, in October 1955: "For several years Dr. Borden and I have been working in close cooperation toward the protection and salvage of threatened archaeological remains. We regard the problem as one of great cultural importance to this Province."150 Duff emphasized the wide-ranging support for preservation of the Marpole site both locally and nationally. Duff also offered professional advice in formulating legislation that would ensure the protection of sites, facilitate funding for salvage excavations from developers and government, and control the actions of excavators through an advisory board.151

Despite renewed media interest and the continuing hotel project, because of insufficient funding, no excavations were undertaken at Marpole in the summer of 1956.152 Borden resumed excavations the next summer using a grant from an anonymous Vancouver industrialist, apparently prompted by an editorial in The Vancouver Sun.153 This dig, and the completion of the Fraser Arms Hotel project, chewed-up the remaining undisturbed sections of the midden, which once spanned a remarkable 4.5 acres in area154 and had been under constant seige for seven decades. Despite the failure to preserve any portion of the midden for later research, efforts to build a park and display case housing artifacts on a tiny portion of the exhausted midden, still owned by the City of Vancouver, continued in vain into the early 1960s.155

Borden's well-documented professional career demonstrates that it is the seemingly insignificant and disparate letters of suggestion, minor but well-placed newspaper articles, public lectures, radio interviews, receptions for volunteers, and tedious grant applications156 that explain the success of professional archaeology in the public sphere in the 1950s. These were the minute political actions that spun almost invisible threads, linking the
complex internal network of alliances within professional archaeology to the larger public forum. Within the network of specialists, Borden aligned a particular group of methods, theories, individuals, technologies, and institutions from across North America to construct a strongpoint from which to produce knowledge. So, too, did he and Wilson Duff over more than a decade link this disciplinary network with the lives and objectives of often unrelated individuals and institutions across British Columbia. A letter to the provincial minister of education, a phone call to Al-Can, a press release to *The Vancouver Sun*, discussions with the Whalens about access to their farm, and a radio talk about middens were subtle, often unconsciously formed, but cumulative bonds. The commonality to these threads and links, too numerous and diffuse to count, is that they spliced the lives of ordinary and unrelated people to the successful production of scientific knowledge. Each tiny act of preservation, whether through volunteering, writing an article, or donating money, helped stymie the destruction of archaeological sites, facilitated the production of scientific knowledge, made archaeology a public issue, and thus gave it power in the public sphere. This currency simply did not exist in 1946-1947, when Borden watched helplessly as bulldozers razed the Point Grey middens. A decade later, as Marpole was under-seige, Borden's science spoke in defense of the midden and there were many people who stood with him, listened, and understood the significance of what was being said; because they had been implicated, however tenuously or temporarily, in Borden's network. I do not want to exaggerate the numbers of people involved or the level of public concern over site destruction. The numbers were very small, but highly concentrated at the critical junctures where conflict occurred, and included influential citizens.

At Marpole, Borden, with his alliance of volunteers, newspaper columnists, and Chamber of Commerce members, could not be ignored as he was a decade earlier at Point Grey. For the hotel developer to continue towards a
completion of his project required him to take issue with prehistory as interpreted by Borden, not to mention the whole network his knowledge rested upon: UBC, Harry Hawthorn and his Yale education, Walter Taylor, Robert Heizer, Philip Drucker, M.C. McKern, Julian Steward, Erna Gunther, Alfred Kroeber, Harlan Smith, Edward Sapir, James Teit, and even Franz Boas. A dissenter would have had to meta-physically engage the validity of empiricism, classification, and inference from analogy, concepts most people would have been ill-equipped to tackle, had they even wanted to. If necessary, this alliance system could have been extended to include other parts of science including geology, comparative anatomy and physical anthropology, botany, zoology, and even chemistry and physics, which were linked to archaeology through radiocarbon dating. For the developer to dismiss the Marpole midden as nothing more than a worthless garbage pile required refuting the combined weight of all of these people and institutions.

Of course, we know that the Fraser Arms Hotel was completed and the Marpole midden virtually destroyed in the summer of 1957. Even though the developer may have recognized the value of the midden to archaeologists and the public, his own objectives were in no way impeded by calls from Borden, the media, or the Chamber of Commerce to protect the site. In other words, the developer was not formally required to address the concerns of professional archaeologists and he did not, so to speak, have to detour through the UBC archaeology lab on the way to fulfilling his objectives of building a hotel. The whole potential confrontation between the developer and Borden's powerful allies failed to materialize. The archaeological network was simply too frail and too incomplete to entrap everyone whose own goals involved the destruction of archaeological sites, developer and souvenir-hunter alike. So despite Borden's efforts, it could not be ensured that in times of conflict, when financial and other stakes were high, people would value the preservation of sites and artifacts over development and economic growth. This guarantee
required yet stronger allies to be enlisted in the knowledge-production enterprise.

With a resounding majority, bill 67 passed three readings without debate and was committed to law as the "Archaeological and Historic Sites Protection Act," on 18 March 1960 by the Legislative Assembly of British Columbia. The culmination of a decade of political agitation by Borden and Duff, this legislation fused the network of professional archaeology to the penal code of British Columbia, making provincial power the ultimate ally in the professional production of knowledge. Sections 2 and 3 of the Act defined and qualified the make-up of archaeological sites and materials in the professional vocabulary:

2. In this Act, unless the context otherwise requires, "archaeological site" means an archaeological site designated as such under section 3; "archaeological object" means any object in or from an archaeological site;

3. (1) The Minister may designate any
   (i) Indian kitchen-midden;
   (ii) Indian shell-heap;
   (iii) Indian house-pit;
   (iv) Indian cave;
   (v) other Indian habitation;
   (vi) cairn;
   (vii) mound;
   (viii) fortification;
   (ix) structure;
   (x) painting or carving on rock;
   (xi) grave or other burial-place; or
   (xii) other prehistoric or historic remain as an archaeological site.

Though many of these terms pre-dated professional archaeology, the meaning they took in the Act was that of their formal usage in professional archaeology. A "kitchen-midden" which may have been formerly known as a place to collect "Indian relics" on a Sunday afternoon, became a legally-defined and restricted entity in 1960.

The new Act also ensured that the goals of developers would necessitate a trip through the archaeology lab, not to mention the bank. Provisions in the
legislation insured that all necessary salvage work would be financed by prospective developers, and dictated stringent professional standards for site assessment:

10. Whenever, in the opinion of the Minister, any prehistoric or historic remain, whether or not designated as a part of an archaeological or historic site under this Act, is threatened with destruction by reason of commercial, industrial, or other activity, the Minister may require the persons undertaking the activity to provide for adequate investigation, recording, and salvage of archaeological or historic objects threatened with destruction as the Minister may direct.\textsuperscript{160}

This section entangled all major perpetrators of archaeological resource destruction in the knowledge-production process, by requiring a guarantee of financial support, and ample time for professional excavations.

Restricted access to archaeological sites was insured by a series of prohibitions, backed by penalties of imprisonment and fines,\textsuperscript{161} designed to prevent all but valid permit holders from manipulating prehistoric materials:

(4)No person shall knowingly destroy, deface, or otherwise alter, excavate, or dig in any Indian kitchen-midden, shell-heap, pit-house, cave, or other habitation site, or and cairn, mound, fortification, or other structure, or any other archaeological remain on Crown lands, whether designated as an archaeological site or not, under the provisions of this Act, except to the extent that he is authorized to do so by a valid and subsisting permit issued under this Act.\textsuperscript{162}

The issuing of permits was at the discretion of the Minister, whose powers were exercised through an administrative Advisory Board composed of "the Director of the Provincial Museum of Natural History and Anthropology or his representative, the Provincial Archivist or his representative, and a representative from the appropriate department of the University of British Columbia, or any two of them."\textsuperscript{163} This Board was granted the centralized power to develop provincial policy, manage all archaeological sites and resources, and hence control knowledge-production about B.C. prehistory.\textsuperscript{164}

Wilson Duff chaired the Advisory Board, which had its inaugural meeting
on 15 August of 1960, and included Charles Borden, W.E. Irekland, and L.J. Wallace. Measures for assessing and controlling provincial archaeological resources were swiftly adopted. Duff assumed the responsibility of drawing up the stipulations of permits and application forms for access to archaeological sites, and the Board adopted Borden's national site designation system to catalogue B.C. sites. Immediate plans were made to survey and assess the threatened archaeological resources on the Peace River, Columbia River, and along the proposed route of the Pacific Northern Railway.

The burning issue of the future role for amateur archaeologists was a central concern of the Board at the first meeting. The Act effectively split amateurs into two groups. Those who insisted on continuing the indiscriminate collection of artifacts from sites on public land - the "irresponsibles" - were barred from access under the threat of prosecution. Amateurs who wished to continue to investigate B.C. prehistory - the "responsibles" - were brought under the wing of professionalism. Augustin Milliken was elected to the Advisory Board as the representative of responsible amateurs. Their role, it was agreed, "should be limited to site surveys and small-scale test pits, followed by corresponding reports on the results obtained. It was further agreed that beyond this point, a certain amount of danger existed that amateurs could do serious harm and even contribute to the destruction of an archaeological site." To explain the legislation, instill a "sense of moral responsibility," and delineate between the actions of professionals and amateurs, Wilson Duff published the pamphlet, "Preserving British Columbia's Prehistory: A guide for Amateur Archaeologists." This brochure provided an extensive summary of the goals and objectives of modern scientific archaeology with a heavy emphasis given to rigorous record keeping and the importance of context. Amateurs were encouraged to carry out surface surveys using special forms and send their results to UBC or the Provincial Museum, where the sites would be assigned coordinates, and the forms kept on file pending future
planning. It was suggested that "responsible amateurs, especially those affiliated with a museum or similar public institution," could obtain permits. But it was repeatedly emphasized that excavation was the job of professionals, and amateurs should dig only in cases of emergency, and then should follow the accepted procedures outlined in books by Robert Heizer and R.E.M Wheeler. All of this was to insure that amateurs who did continue to enjoy their hobby would be tethered to professionals at UBC and the Provincial Museum.

While amateurs were either eliminated or co-opted by the legislation, the deliberate dismissal of what Aboriginal people had to say about prehistory was a tragic bi-product of professionalization that had begun decades before. Early 19th century ethnographers were the first to study the family histories and origin myths of coastal Natives through the objectifying lens of science. From Franz Boas to James Teit, Charles Hill-Tout, Philip Drucker, Wilson Duff, and Charles Borden, Native knowledge systems were treated as things about which knowledge was produced. Indeed, Americanist anthropology, archaeology included, has always been constructed around the Western scientific objectification of the indigenous "other." There is a clear juxtaposition in the literature between Native "beliefs" about history and scientific "knowledge" gathered from comparative ethnography and archaeology. In 1902, Boas noted the difficulty in figuring out NWC Native history: "Naturally it is impossible to utilize historical traditions of the tribes for the construction of their history, because all of them are more or less of a mythical character. It is possible to reconstruct the history only by comparative study of all the elements of their culture." In particular, he advocated archaeology as a means to objectively check the subjective historical beliefs of Natives. Drucker in this 1943 work argued that "archaeology may thus be the means of determining the actual historical worth of these [family historical] traditions; should they prove reasonably sound they could become an aid to research in the regional prehistory." While few anthropologists denied the
value of Indigenous histories, they saw them as having limited merit outside of Native circles, and no independent or objective truth-value in the anthropological sense.

There is some evidence to suggest that non-Natives viewed the idea of Natives taking a scientific interest in their history with stunned disbelief. A newspaper headline from 1955 marvelled at the sight of an "Indian" amongst Borden's Marpole teams: "FIRST IN B.C. YOUNG INDIAN PROVES KEEN AS ARCHAEOLOGIST." The author continued: "Andy 'Smitty' Charles, a handsome 22-year old Indian of the Musqueam Reserve, is unique among his people. To all known records he is the first B.C. Indian to scientifically explore [sic] and excavate into the pre-history remains of his ancestors." There are other examples in which Aboriginal people are portrayed as ignorant and disinterested in their own history, especially with regard to the protection of prehistoric materials, such as the 1960 Chase burial mound "affair." A headline in The Vancouver Sun, 10 June 1960, exclaimed: "BURIAL MOUND A MYSTERY SHUSWAP INDIANS UNEARTH RELICS OF FORGOTTEN PAST." Natives discovered the burial mound during road construction on a Shuswap reserve. The columnist describes what happened next: "Whatever it was they had found, the Indians were soon taking it home, giving it away or -- in some cases -- selling it to souvenir hunters who flocked to the diggings." The alleged rampage was only stopped by a police officer who interceded, warned the Natives that the materials belonged to the province, and then called the Kamloops Museum Association, which contacted Borden at UBC. The overall impression given is that until the level-headed Whites intervened to determine what was really going on, the Natives were bent on destroying the valuable site.

I think it is likely that the erroneous popular idea that Natives were unconcerned with history stemmed from dichotomous views of what composed "real" history. Traditional Aboriginal history was orally constituted and transmitted through the generations in complex interaction with culturally specific
material objects and geographic features. The truth of oral traditions to Natives was based on vastly different premises concerning the relationship of time, space, material objects, and concepts of causation, than those of Western scientists. The past was not found in the archaeological record but in the words of elders. On the other hand, for anthropologists and archaeologists, as culture historians traditionally obsessed with artifacts, the "universal" truth of history was located in the physical relationships of objects of study, and could be extracted through scientific grids of analysis and made to verify or deny the validity of Aboriginal histories and myths. This belief escalated in the 1950s and 1960s as Native studies in B.C. became increasingly empirical, and thousands of people visited museum exhibits filled with material culture and heard Borden and Duff advocate preservation of the archaeological record in the name of science. In such an environment there is little wonder that the culturally specific and highly ideational views of history that Natives had, were considered merely "beliefs," while the apparent disrespect by Natives, for archaeological remains, allegedly proved ignorance or disinterest in "real" history as discovered by scientists.

With the suppression of other voices and the fusion of provincial legal power to the network of professional archaeology, after 1960 the objectives of professionals became the policy of the province, and vice versa. The ultimate goal of Borden and those who followed him was to protect the raw materials of prehistory for archaeological research (and control), and dispel misconception and speculation about prehistory by speaking its "scientific truth." The purity of this objective was transmitted to British Columbians, by Borden, over CBU Pacific Network in March of 1960:

It is from the evidence which lies buried in the deposits of ancient occupation sites that archaeologists all over the world reconstruct the prehistory of man. Indications are that an important portion of this story transpired in British Columbia. The ethnic and cultural diversity of her aboriginal population as well as the limited, archaeological evidence now at our disposal
point to the fact that for many thousands of years this province played a significant part in the peopling and cultural development of the New World. The data to document these happenings can be obtained only through systematic archaeological excavations at ancient sites. Obviously, if great numbers of such sites are destroyed [by collectors or development] before they can be properly investigated, the archaeologist is deprived of his indispensable source materials, and large and permanent gaps in the prehistoric record are the inevitable result. It is fortunate that the provision for adequate salvage archaeology in this act will prevent such a calamity from occurring in this province. The citizens of British Columbia can be proud of, and the civilized world will be grateful.\textsuperscript{186}

While it is clear that Borden, Duff, and their contemporaries saw their goal, and that of the province, as the pursuit of pure scientific knowledge for its own sake and the benefit of civilization, they unfortunately failed to indicate exactly what these benefits were. My study suggests that the production of truthful knowledge simply served to justify the continuance of inquiry, hence generating ever more knowledge and justifying more research, in a self-sustaining cycle of accumulation. At base, Borden, too, was a collector.

Without inquiring too deeply into the function of archaeological knowledge in B.C. since the 1960s, I would like to suggest some of the important effects of Borden's professional monopolization of prehistoric knowledge production. Presently the record of B.C. prehistory, both material culture and field notes, is literally concentrated in a small number of repositories such as UBC\textsuperscript{187} and the Provincial Museum, and controlled by a limited number of acknowledged archaeologists. In this circumstance, any serious student of archaeology could easily master the prehistory of the province. They could do this without even going into the field simply by looking at a map, identifying a site from its Borden coordinates, locating the appropriate site surveys at the designated repository, reviewing the field notes, and possibly handling the artifacts in the museum. Extensive notes, maps, stratigraphic profiles, and photos would allow them in an instant to know
what had taken other archaeologists months or years to compile. They could locate any artifact in the province to within millimetres of its original location without ever leaving their chair, and even this hassle could be avoided by simply reading the scholarly literature which introduces the professional mode of thinking, and also synthesizes the complex empirical data into clear prose. In an instant, archaeologists can dominate the actions of thousands of people of numerous languages and customs, through the millennia, and across the entire province. In effect, wherever there are site coordinates, maps, known datum points, and stratigraphic profiles i.e. the empirical grids of archaeology, so, too, is there the power of the archaeologist to control prehistory physically, and dictate its interpretation in contemporary society.

As non-specialists, unaware of what goes on in the archaeology lab and how knowledge is manufactured, we must rely on the assumption that the knowledge that archaeologists produce and disseminate to us through museums, films and classrooms, is the truth. On this point, archaeology joins the other sciences that study humans, in providing us with coveted "truthful knowledge," which has great power in our society. Michel Foucault has argued that "there can be no possible exercise of power without a certain economy of discourses of truth which operates through and on the basis of this association. We are subjected to the production of truth through power and we cannot exercise power except through the production of truth."188 The power of these discourses of truth is that they provide many of the crucial descriptors we use as individuals to construct our identities, and more importantly that the state uses to describe us as citizens.

Human sciences such as archaeology, social geography, sociology, psychology, criminology, and pathological sciences give us the analytical categories and labels to describe ourselves ever more precisely and enhance our individual and group identities. At the same time, however, these human
sciences also circumscribe our lives. At every turn there is a human scientist quantifying, labelling, and diagnosing our behaviour—telling us who we are, why we do things, and what our problems are. This would be relatively unimportant except that the state is dependent on human scientists to describe, quantify, and categorize citizens and inform policies, which regulate our access to many resources from health-care and education, to social welfare payments, taxes, hunting licences, and archaeological permits. Reciprocally, the human sciences have become dependent on the state through regulations that control educational requirements, funding, and quality standards for practitioners. In B.C. since the 1960s, this linkage of the state and archaeology has insured the constant reproduction of "truthful knowledge" through tightly controlled access to all resources such as the raw archaeological materials, entrance to educational facilities, financial support, capital intensive laboratories, publication outlets, conferences and so forth. The net result is that the regulatory power of the state over our lives is growing in direct relation to the production of "truthful knowledge" by the human sciences, in a self-sustaining cycle.\textsuperscript{189}

The proof of this spiral in B.C. archaeology is clear. At numerous times in his career Borden commented that the science of archaeology has just begun to investigate prehistory. In 1994 Matson and Coupland commented: "The future of Northwest Coast archaeology holds great promise because there is so much work yet to be done."\textsuperscript{190} I am quite confident that in another fifty years some future archaeologist will again repeat this sentiment. I see no end in sight to this spiralling empiricism and regulation of humanity that threatens us with entrapment in almost limitless grids of analysis and state power. Ultimately this causes me to regard Borden's archaeology with great ambivalence. On the one hand, the vastness of his personal papers and sometimes overt displays of ego indicate that he was ambitious, and his magnificent career largely vindicates this generous view of him. As a student of history and archaeology,
I applaud his dismissal of amateurism and dedication to empiricism, and strongly approve of the protective legislation for which he was largely responsible. On the other hand, I recognize that the impalatable legacy of Borden's career is the continued scientification of B.C. prehistory and apprehension of other peoples' cultural heritage, which began a century ago in the name of preservation, and thus archaeologist's unenviable role in the much larger trend of the empiricism of all aspects of humanity, and increasing state control over our lives.

As foreboding as the ongoing empiricism of humanity may be, recent events in B.C. suggest that while we may not be able to stop this process, we can control how "truthful knowledge" affects our lives on a local level. With Natives, archaeologists and anthropologists define the reality of their past from the outside as demonstrated in museum displays around the province. Historically, this has often been to the disadvantage of Natives and their own voices about who they are have been publicly and politically ignored, such as during the outlawing of the potlatch from 1885 to 1951, and the massive loss of material culture to museums. Recently, however, Natives in the province have begun to seize control of the network of professional archaeology that Borden created. The "truthful knowledge" of archaeology is being made to work for them in substantiating current land claims, which in 1995 engulf all of British Columbia, including coveted sections of Vancouver, such as Stanley Park and Point Grey which includes UBC and the archaeology lab. Such instances, in which the power of "truthful knowledge" has been apprehended by local groups and is being brought to bear against the state, are certainly suggestive for all people who have been alienated from parts of their identity by specialists.

Underlying the professionalization of B.C. archaeology from 1945-1960 is the elimination of many voices and the construction of a single: that of professional archaeology. In B.C. since the 1960s there have been ever increasing scientificity and more professional practitioners, excavations,
funding, applications of technology, and elaborate theories producing ever more knowledge. So, too, has there been a more finely-woven net to draw people into the process whether they realize it or not. While the professionalization of archaeology may be only a peripheral component of a much larger trend toward a scientific and quantified world, we can no longer afford the luxury of pretending, as Borden would have us do, that scientific research is value-free and serves the public interest. There is a definite need for a critical commentary on what function the powerful "truth knowledge" that professional archaeologists produce and disseminate will serve in the future of British Columbia and the rest of Canada. The recent seizure of prehistory by B.C. Natives for their own use in land-claim negotiations suggests that political action can control how such knowledge is applied to human lives. However, the outcome of the struggle for control of prehistory, and its meaning in the future of B.C., is not yet before the courts and remains undecided. Looking to the future, I guarantee that a knowledge of prehistory will continue to have vastly longer-reaching repercussions, for all British Columbians, than Charles Borden had in mind when he raised his glass in his favourite toast: "To the future of the past."
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116 VCML, Hill-Tout Collection, file DIX, letter to T.P.O. Menzies from Hermann Leisk, 14 February 1937. In this letter Leisk claims that he could match his field notes up with the City Museum collections. In a personal communication from Lynn Maranda at the VCML, I learned that this never happened, and that Leisk's field notes were only translated from the original Dutch in the early 1970s.
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UBC Archives, Borden Papers, box 47, file 42, summary of Borden's work at the Marpole midden in the summer of 1955, describing media hype and providing the radiocarbon dates for the site, 1. Box 31, file 19, "Editorial Page of The Vancouver Sun." VCML, Hill-Tout Collection, file DVII, "Great Fraser Midden is source of hidden Indian treasures," 26 November 1955, article, in The Vancouver Province B.C. Magazine, referring to Borden's summer 1955 excavations.

UBC Archives, Borden Papers, box 11, file 15, letter to Jean Lesage, Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources, Ottawa, from Arthur Laing, B.C. Provincial MLA, 23 August 1955. Laing wrote: "Last week I met three businessmen who had attended a service club meeting to hear a university professor who has this year conducted, with a number of volunteer workers, further excavations [at the Marpole midden]. The professor so impressed these businessmen that they told me that if the historical value was half as great as the professor impressed upon them then this property should be set aside as an historical site for the enjoyment and investigation by all people. Would you be good enough to make some inquiries among your officers to assess the value of this site as of permanent historical value? I might add that a number of bodies, including the Marpole Chamber of Commerce, are already on record as advocating definite action." Laing also mentioned that Dr. Walter Sage, the B.C. historical sites representative, was in full agreement with the three businessmen. Box 11, file 15, letter to A.J.H. Richardson, Superintendent Historic Parks and Sites, Ottawa, from Walter N. Sage B.C., historical sites representative, 25 August 1955, mentioning Borden's work at the Marpole midden and urging immediate action to save the remains of the midden from destruction. Box, 11, file 15, letter to A.J.H. Richardson from Walter N. Sage, 25 August 1955, discussing the imminent danger to the Marpole midden, from the hotel project, and including a copy of Laing's letter to Lesage, from 23 August 1955. Box 11, file 15, letter to W.N. Sage from A.J.H. Richardson, 6 September 1955, noting: "Mr. Laing's letter has been received and his comments will be placed
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151 Ibid.

152 VCML, Hill-Tout Collection, file DVII, "For Lack of $1000," 21 June 1956, newspaper article in The Vancouver Sun, lamenting the lack of money for Borden to excavate and chastizing the provincial government for not providing funding for a UBC project. However, Borden did excavate in 1956 at sites in the Fraser Canyon with funding from the Koerner Foundation and the UBC Committee on Research: Charles E. Borden, "DjRI 3, An Early Site in the Fraser Canyon, British Columbia," National Museum of Canada, Contributions to Anthropology, Bulletin 162 (1957, 1960): 101.

153 UBC Archives, Borden Papers, box 31, file 17, "inspired by Sun editorial private gift finances dig on marpole midden," 19 August 1957, newspaper article in The Vancouver Sun. Box 11, file 15, letter to P.B. Stroyan, Superintendent and Engineer Vancouver City Parks Board, from Charles Borden, 25 August 1957, noting that "thanks to the generous financial support of a well-known B.C. industrialist we were able to resume investigations at the site in June 1957."


155 The failed attempt to build a park and interpretive centre on city owned property is detailed in the following: VCML, Hill-Tout Collection, file DII, letter to T.A. Wylie, Director of the Maritime Museum, from Thomas H. Ainsworth, Curator of the City Museum, 11 August 1960; letter to T.A. Wylie from Elisabeth Bouscholte, Secretary to Dr. C.E. Borden, 29 August 1960; letter to J.C. Oliver, Commissioner at City Hall, from T.A. Wylie, 26 October 1960; letter to T.A. Wylie from the City Clerk, 4 June 1962; letter to Mr. Lefeaux, Park Superintendent of the Vancouver Parks Board, from T.A. Wylie, 20 June 1962; letter to Mrs. C. Pacey, Secretary of the Marpole Chamber of Commerce, from T.A. Wylie, 22 June 1962; letter to Mr. McGillivary, President of the Marpole Rotary Club, from T.A. Wylie, 22 June 1962; letter to T.A. Wylie from the Deputy City Clerk, 28 August 1962; and letter to T.A. Wylie and Mrs. C. Pacey, from Stuart S. Lefeaux, Parks Superintendent, 2 October 1962. These letters represent two years of attempts by T.A. Wylie and members of the Marpole Chamber of Commerce to have the City of Vancouver convert its lots on the Marpole midden into a park. Ultimately City Council members considered the park proposal redundant to the existing Marpole Park (not actually located on the midden) and no further action was taken.

156 UBC Archives, Borden Papers, box 11, file 15, letter to the 1955 Marpole volunteer diggers from Charles Borden, 30 March 1956, regarding a public lecture he was going to give to the Vancouver Institute, 7 April 1956, entitled, "The Marpole Midden, 56 B.C. to 1956 A.D.: Results of Recent Archaeological Excavations," and inviting the volunteers to a reception at his home following the talk. Box 10, file 11, letter to The Committee to Consider Uses of Leon and Thea Koerner Foundation Funds from Charles Borden, 9 December 1955, regarding an application by Borden for $3000 per annum over five years to conduct archaeological surveys of B.C., to determine the extent of provincial sites in danger of destruction from industrial development; letter to Harlow, Secretary Projects Committee of the Leon and Thea Koerner
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187 For example, the Archaeology Reading Room, in the Museum of Anthropology, is a designated repository for fieldnotes compiled during archaeological projects conducted under the auspices of UBC.


191 The outlawing of the potlatch is comprehensively examined in Douglas Cole and Ira Chaikin, An Iron Hand Upon the People (Vancouver, Toronto: Douglas & McIntyre Ltd.; Seattle: The University of Washington Press, 1990). Cole indicates that despite letters of protest, legal action, and calls for a federal investigation, by the Kwakilul, to explain what occurred during the potlatch, the federal government relied on hearsay and the testimony of its own "experts" to formulate policy. Cole indicates, (page 21) that the giant of Canadian anthropology, George M. Dawson, himself judged the potlatch to be
"pernicious." Another more recent example of how Natives are studied by anthropologists for the purpose of informing government action was the massive "Indian Research Project" commissioned by the Department of Citizenship and Immigration, in 1954, under the direction of Harry Hawthorn, from UBC: H.B. Hawthorn, C.S. Belshaw, and S.M. Jamieson, *The Indians of British Columbia* (Toronto: The University of Toronto Press, 1958, 1960).

192 Coupland and Matson, *The Prehistory of the Northwest Coast*, 315.
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Figure 1: FRASER DELTA SITES EXCAVATED BY CHARLES BORDEN, 1945-1960

Adapted from: Matson and Coupland, The Prehistory of the Northwest Coast, 155.
Figure 2: MAJOR B.C. SITES SURVEYED AND EXCAVATED BY CHARLES BORDEN, 1945-1960

1 Fraser Delta Sites, 1945-1957
2 Nechako River Survey Sites, 1951-1952
3 Kootenay Survey Sites, 1954
4 Fraser Canyon Sites, 1956

APPENDIX 2

Photo: Whalen Farm Excavations, 1949

Figure 3: WHALEN FARM MIDDEN EXCAVATION TRENCH, POINT ROBERTS, WASHINGTON, 1949

Copied From: Borden, "Field Notes + Photo Record I & II Whalen Farm (DfRs 3) Boundary Bay 1949," Archaeology Reading Room, Museum of Anthropology, University of British Columbia.