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ABSTRACT

Carl Borden has been designated "Grandfather of B.C. archaeology" (Carlson 1979: 233). I present an aspect of his claim to this title by focusing on his important contribution to the efforts made in the 1950's, 60's and early 70's to provide a forum amenable to the pursuit of archaeological research in British Columbia. My thesis is, therefore, primarily a contribution to the literature which addresses itself to understanding Borden's place in the history of archaeology in British Columbia. As such, it will not only interest those archaeologists and anthropologists who knew and worked with Borden, but also a wider audience of Canadian anthropologists and archaeologists who are concerned with understanding the significance of the persons and institutions discussed in "local histories" within the broader framework of the history of Canadian anthropology.

In presenting history, I also engage in its creation. My thesis reflects my self-consciousness in producing an account where Borden's point of view (as expressed in the literature and a series of interviews) and my interpretation of his point of view are negotiated. I call this process of negotiation an interactive history. It is through this process that I discover an important aspect of the significance of Borden to archaeology in British Columbia. Therefore, it is a process which will be of relevance to those anthropologists interested in the social construction of knowledge.

Presenting history and being self-conscious about how we discover history are part of a reflexive approach to furthering an understanding of ourselves and our Western Culture. My thesis advances this approach in two ways. First, by applying the anthropological method of fieldwork,
traditionally applied to other cultures, to make a statement about an institution - archaeology in British Columbia - which emerges from my own culture. Second, by confronting this statement and making its formulation explicit.
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INTRODUCTION
FIELDWORK IN HISTORY

Part One: Framing the Questions

The questions with which we approach the literature reporting on archaeological research in British Columbia will direct our understanding of this research. For example, if our questions are concerned with antiquity, papers on culture history, prehistoric lifeways, and culture process inform us of the cultural development of the early inland and coastal dwellers. This is because archaeologists, interested in a knowledge of the prehistory and history of this area, have discovered and recorded data which are evidence of the actions of these people. If, however, our questions are concerned with how this knowledge has been constructed, this literature gives us insights into the process by which archaeology is accomplished, because it also contains evidence of the actions of the archaeologists. It reveals a series of historic events which constitute the emergence of systematic archaeological research in British Columbia. Bibliographies and references point to ideas which have shaped research, and prefaces, introductions, acknowledgements, and footnotes provide us with a glimpse of the concerns, beliefs, and problems which surround and give meaning to events of archaeological significance.

I am interested in asking questions which will advance an understanding of the process by which archaeology is accomplished. The literature approached in this way suggests that some thirty years ago the coastal stretch between Northern California and Southwestern Alaska was archaeologically one of the least known areas of the North American
continent. This was Philip Drucker's view of the situation when he reported on his survey of the Northern Northwest Coast which took place in the fall of 1938 (Drucker 1943). This survey has since been acknowledged as the first systematic work in the region (Sprague 1973). Archaeological research accomplished prior to this by Charles Hill-Tout in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century and later by Harlan I. Smith, who was affiliated with the Jesup North Pacific Expedition, is considered to be useful (Borden 1955; Carlson 1970; Maude 1978; Noble 1972; Sprague 1973; Winram 1975) although unspectacular (Sprague 1973). However, Roy Carlson, writing in 1975, refers to "an archaeological explosion" which he suggests took place between the years 1965 and 1975. He states, "the amount of archaeology accomplished within the last ten years is more than ten times that of all previous years combined" (Carlson 1975: 14). The question I ask of the literature at this point is this: How and why did this explosion come about?

Carlson, himself, provides an important clue. He states that "Charles Borden has done as much as any one man can do by undertaking extensive excavations and surveys in different parts of the province." In Carlson's opinion, "until the mid-60's he was the only archaeologist in B.C." (Carlson 1975: 14).

Charles E. (Carl) Borden was born on May 15, 1905, in New York. He received his B.A. degree in 1932 at the University of California at Los Angeles and his M.A. and Ph.D. degrees in 1933 and 1937 respectively at the University of California at Berkeley. After teaching at the University of California and at Reed College in Portland, Oregon, he joined the UBC faculty in 1939 as an Assistant Professor of German. In 1949, his involvement in archaeology in British Columbia led to a cross appointment
in anthropology as Lecturer in archaeology. One year before his retire-
ment, in 1969, he was appointed full time as Professor of archaeology.
Even after his retirement, Borden continued to engage in archaeological
activities. He died on Christmas Day, 1978, at the Vancouver General
Hospital. He was 73.

Recognition of Borden's career in archaeology in British Columbia
is such that it has already received considerable attention. He has been
 accorded the following honours: Fellow of the American Association for
the Advancement of Science; The Centennial Medal for Valuable Service to
Canada; Literarum Doctor (U.B.C.); Queen's Silver Jubilee Medal, 1977; and
the Smith Wintenburg Award of the Canadian Archaeological Association, 1978.

To date, those who have furthered an understanding of the signifi-
cance of his career have done so by commenting on his intellectual
contribution (Bunyan 1978; Carlson 1979a, 1979b; Noble 1972; Robinson
1969; Sprague 1973) to systematic archaeology in British Columbia. They
neglect, however, another important aspect of his career which is better
explained from a perspective which makes its point of reference the social
context of ideas. This aspect centres on his involvement in establishing
legislation to protect archaeological sites.

In the late forties and fifties, industrial development in British
Columbia threatened to obliterate archaeological sites. Then, in 1960,
the Archaeological and Historic Sites Protection Act was passed (Chapter
15, The Revised Statutes of British Columbia (Victoria: Queen's Printer,
1960). Among the main points of the act (see copy in appendix 2) was
that it provided for the appointment of an Archaeological Sites Advisory
Board to advise the Minister in charge of the act. The act was a landmark
in that it placed British Columbia in the vanguard of a nationwide move
to expand the forum within which problems of archaeological significance
might be explored to include archaeology as a matter of government business. It marked the beginning of a new orientation among Canadian archaeologists which W.J. Byrne (1976: 140) describes as:

A gradual shift from a kind of passive acceptance of the inevitability of the destruction of archaeological resources as a result of ever increasing industrial and urban development, to an almost militant insistence upon the rights of archaeology in recognition of the inherent irreplaceable character and value of archaeological sites.

It marked the beginning of a new challenge for archaeologists that G.R. Willey and J.A. Sabloff (1980: 261) describe as the challenge of the tension between archaeological goals and public policy.

Borden contributed towards achieving this legislation (Carlson 1979a). My question now is this: What was the nature of this aspect of his involvement in establishing archaeological research in British Columbia?

Part Two: Constructing an Interactive History

The purpose of my thesis is to further an understanding of Borden's contribution towards establishing legislation for the protection of archaeological sites through the conscious construction of an interactive history where knowledge of this contribution is negotiated between Borden and myself. All histories are interactive because as, for example, Carl Becker (1935) and E.H. Carr (1965) explain, histories emerge as a consequence of historians interpreting their data in the light of their own experience. Each history is therefore a unique interpretation of the past. My commonsense knowledge of histories tells me, however, that many traditional historians have not articulated an acknowledgement of this interaction. Subsequently their histories tend to emerge as authoritative statements. Becker's comments (1935: 249-50) on "the scientific historian" are apt. He says, "the scientific historian, it seems, was one who set forth the facts without injecting any extraneous meaning into them."
Becker continues to suggest that this "objective" historian believed that it was not he, the historian, who spoke, but history which spoke through him.

To say that I am doing an interactive history means that, unlike the "scientific historian" I am aware that the history I present is only one of many possible histories about Borden and archaeology in British Columbia. It does not pretend to be the definitive history of his contribution. There will be persons whose experience of Borden will not be satisfied by my thesis. Further, to say that I am doing an interactive history means that I am conscious of the tension between presenting Borden's point of view and my interpretation of his point of view. This tension commences with my engagement with the literature and proceeds through the series of interviews that I conduct with Borden. It is made apparent in the following chapters where, in order to balance my analysis or interpretation, I rely heavily on Borden's comments as data. Yet, at the same time, the pattern into which I place his comments reveals, of course, my interpretation. What emerges is a history that is very much a product of this process of interaction. A history in which I try to avoid the disappearance of Borden's point of view into my generalizations by refusing to treat Borden as an object to be researched and analyzed. His point of view, the way he perceives his contribution to archaeology in British Columbia is important to me. While I realize there may be more to be said about this contribution I wish to make myself accountable for presenting his feelings and perceptions about his place in the history of archaeology in British Columbia. In a climate where people's experiences of Borden are varied, I see this as my moral responsibility.

The process of interaction starts, as I point out, with a survey of the literature (Borden's publications, published commentary by others, government and university documents). I have found it particularly helpful
to read the introductions, prefaces, acknowledgements, and footnotes to his publications. In these statements, I sense something of Borden's feelings about the archaeological endeavour. I catch glimpses of his concern with the importance of preserving the past evoked by words such as "rescue operations" and "threatened" areas: for example, in "An Ancient Coast Village," Borden (1955: 12) refers to "surveys to assess the archaeological resources and the need for salvage operations." Now I begin to understand the significance of the 1960 Act from the point of view of a person for whom the principles it stood for meant a great deal. I begin to understand an event from a perspective concerned with the relationship between an event and the values, attitudes and concerns surrounding that event.

The literature reviewed from this perspective highlights data which indicate that Borden contributed towards establishing legislation in three very important ways. First, he recognized the archaeological potential in British Columbia. Second, he presented a scholarly definition of this potential. Third, because his documented concern did not exist in a vacuum, he embarked upon a course of action to raise public awareness to the idea of regarding archaeology as a non-renewable resource and to accepting the necessity of preserving that resource. He appealed to what Colin Turnbull (1976: 122) describes as "our society's increasing concern with conservationism." Borden writes:

Archaeologists do not want to stand in the way of economic growth, but we must call attention to the urgent need in British Columbia of legislation to protect archaeological remains from wanton destruction and to provide the means for adequate scientific investigations wherever ancient sites are threatened by industrial development and urban expansion (Borden 1955: 19).

Yet the literature is cryptic and raises questions. It only partly explains the nature of Borden's contribution. I was, however, in a
position to further the development of an interactive history through fieldwork. In May 1978, I contacted Borden and expressed my interest in interviewing him. I told him that I wanted the interviews to focus on his contribution towards providing the setting in which archaeological research had developed in British Columbia. I explained that the interviews were to be sponsored by a B.C. Provincial Government Youth Employment Program Grant. They would be taped and transcribed and would eventually reside in the UBC Museum of Anthropology archives where they would be available to interested scholars. I also told Borden that the interviews might provide the basis for my M.A. thesis.

To focus on interviewing interests me. As a means of answering questions of historic events, it is compatible with one of the purposes of anthropology: to move towards an understanding of events from the interpretations placed upon them by the persons who live them. An interview situation would provide Borden with the opportunity to reflect and comment on his career at length and in great depth, and it would produce an account constructed by anecdotes and reminiscences which would supply a broader understanding of his involvement in archaeology in British Columbia.

When I use the word account, I mean explanation. Borden's account is one explanation of an aspect of his contribution towards the establishment of systematic archaeological research in British Columbia. In their paper "Accounts" (1968), Marvin B. Scott and Stanford Lyman make a distinction between explanation and accounts with the former referring to "statements about events where untoward action is not an issue and does not have critical implications for a relationship." Their concern is for linguistic forms that are offered for untoward action and which they designate "accounts." However, common and important to both their use
and my use of the word is the implication that people's 'accounts' - the words they use - carry a recognition of a cultural commitment. Words are associated to some degree with the values, attitudes, and expectations of culture. People account for events within a framework of a commonly shared set of assumptions. For example, earlier I expressed an interest in Borden's use of the words "salvage" and "rescue." These words often appear in the literature and are appropriate - make sense - within the context of the ideology - background assumptions, values, attitudes, and expectations - of a group of people (anthropologists and archaeologists) whose task it often is to discover and record cultures which have disappeared or are fast disappearing.

In principle, therefore, interviewing can accomplish an interpretive understanding of events where, as Maurice Natanson (1963) suggests, "the emphasis is on trying to comprehend the way in which social life is lived by actors on the social scene." This is not to assume, to use an expression of Clifford Geertz (1976), that an interviewer can get under the narrator's skin to produce the point of view of the latter person. Rather, interviewing is like Geertz's description (1973) of ethnography: thick description. The interviewer, like the ethnographer, pulls together the bits and pieces to create his construction of the narrator's own constructions.

This aspect of interviewing has relevance for most anthropologists and some other social scientists engaged in fieldwork and interested in the social construction of knowledge (e.g. Geertz 1973, 1976; Lee 1950; Malinowski 1935; Olsen and Whittaker 1967; Smith 1974). And it is becoming increasingly debated by a group of social anthropologists who rely exclusively on interviewing for their data and who contribute to the literature dealing with life histories. Gordon W. Allport (1942), John
Dollard (1935), Clyde Kluckhorn (1945), and L.L. Langness (1965) acknowledge the problem. Recently, however, Geyla Frank (1979) and James M. Freeman and David J. Krantz (1980) have specifically focused on the problem. As Frank points out, "the story of a life history is not a fait accompli of unconsciousness but is a form which emerges in discourse" (Frank, 1979: 86). Freeman and Krantz elaborate:

Given the problems of editing, translating, and directing of narratives, most narrated life histories are the result of the combined efforts of the narrator and the translator-editor, who directs the life history and thus is involved in the creation of the very data he analyzes (Freeman and Krantz 1980: 4).

Frank, Freeman, and Krantz recognize the importance of the idea that knowledge or information presented by the narrator will not remain steadfastly the same regardless of who the interviewer may be. Similarly, they recognize what Erving Goffman (1959) assumes: When an individual appears before others, he will have many motives for trying to control the impression they receive of the situation. The narrator to some extent purposefully shapes his public face. Both these factors are basic to the production of an account and are therefore relevant to my work. I would like to indicate how they affect the account that emerges from the interviews I conducted with Borden.

First, I am like the novice anthropologist who Dennison Nash (1963) suggests "is recruited into and trained by a group with a particular formal and informal ideology which, to a greater or lesser extent, he absorbs." As a graduate student, I have been influenced by the culture of social anthropology through my professors and fellow graduate students. Gradually my special theoretical interest in the anthropology of everyday knowledge has taken shape and has stimulated the approach I take to develop an understanding of the contribution of Borden to the establishment of
systematic archaeology in British Columbia. I approached the interviews, interested not so much in Borden's ideas about the prehistory of British Columbia, but rather some of the everyday events which had helped to shape the social climate within which these ideas had developed. More specifically, as the questions listed in appendix 2 reflect, I was concerned with the following: the events in Borden's early life which affected his decision to come to British Columbia; how the teaching program he initiated in archaeology at UBC developed; and how he expanded this academic forum to include a general public awareness of the archaeological potential in British Columbia.

Second, the account is also affected by the roles played by Borden and myself in the interview situation. Borden was a Professor Emeritus of archaeology and I was a student. As I have explained, Borden understood that the interviews might provide me with material for an M.A. thesis and that in any event they would provide research material for interested scholars. He knew that what he said would constitute official knowledge. The feelings he expressed would have to stand public scrutiny. He also knew that he was dying of cancer and that the interviews would possibly be the last opportunity to officially articulate his feelings about his work. Borden was therefore, active in shaping this public account. He was not a passive narrator. I approached the interviews with planned questions (see listed in appendix 2), but as the interviews progressed, almost imperceptibly, Borden took command of the situation. If I put a question to him which he thought inappropriate, he would suggest that we discuss something else. Although my question plan had directed the general focus of the interviews, it became less predominant. Gradually, the interview situation became not the formal occasion I had anticipated, but rather an
informal conversation extending over twice weekly meetings, Mondays and Fridays between 4 p.m. and 6 p.m., during the course of the two months.

The account that emerged was anecdotal and its contents diverse. The topics each interview ranged over are indicated in the Interview Index (appendix 1). Overall, it reflects what he considered to be the important aspects of his contribution to providing a forum amenable to archaeological research in British Columbia. That he considered the shaping of this forum important is revealed in his following words which follow comments he made on the relative importance of producing full accounts of various site reports, which as he suggested usually ended up being mere preliminary reports, and his teaching responsibilities and political commitment to archaeology in British Columbia.

Well, perhaps I shouldn't have done all these things. But they did give me a comprehensive background knowledge that I never would have gained if I hadn't participated in this manner. But one could weigh it on the scale. What is more important? Do this, or to say "no" to all this and write site reports on the different sites we had investigated? (Borden Interviews 1919: 85).

It would be interesting to speculate how the account would have differed if, say, for example, I had been one of Borden's colleagues or a graduate student interested in his intellectual achievement. In his account, Borden briefly mentions how his wishes for expanded teaching responsibilities in archaeology were frustrated by the Department. If I had been a colleague, I might have questioned him more closely about this revealing further information. As a student, I felt reluctant to do so. And knowing the account would be made public knowledge made me hesitant to enter the area of personal feelings about department policies and decisions. If I had been a graduate student interested in his intellectual contribution, my questions would have been very different (cf. Robinson 1969),
eliciting another aspect of his contribution to the development of archaeology in British Columbia. Often Borden did comment on the archaeological significance of his finds to me, but I purposely evaded asking questions which would elicit further comments of this sort because of my estrangement from archaeology. I was uncertain about addressing an area about which I knew almost nothing.

The account that emerged from my interaction with Borden in the interview situation provides the basis for my thesis, but I did not want to present it simply as it stood. At the same time, as I have already stressed, I did not want to lose its content by paraphrasing Borden's comments and making some authoritative statement about his contribution. Rather, I wanted to negotiate his account as it stood and the way in which I made sense of it. I saw Borden's contribution to providing a forum for archaeological research as having a definite shape. He recognized, defined and took action to raise public awareness to the archaeological potential in British Columbia. But to state this understanding in my own words gave it a hollow ring. Therefore, using primarily his account (in view of questions left unanswered because of his death, I also consulted persons who knew him well), my thesis brings into focus: Borden's view of how he developed his recognition of the archaeological potential in British Columbia through an academic forum. How he used the opportunities offered him to define that potential. And how he took advantage of his position as an academic to appeal for public support of an Archaeological and Historic Sites Protection Act. The process of interaction does not, however, end here. The account that emerges from the interviews, in juxtaposition with other accounts of his contribution to the establishment of B.C. archaeology, will stimulate questions and be productive of further
knowledge in the continuing process of the development of an interactive history of Carl Borden and archaeology in British Columbia.
CHAPTER ONE
RECOGNIZING THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL
POTENTIAL IN BRITISH COLUMBIA

Charles E. (Carl) Borden's early field reports (1950a, 1950b, 1951a, 1951b, 1952a, 1952b, 1953-4a, and 1956) are a clear statement of his recognition of the archaeological potential in British Columbia. They also express the concern which gave this recognition meaning. This finds stronger expression in other publications and associated documents (Borden 1955, 1977), where he stresses his fear for the safety of archaeological sites in the face of agricultural, industrial and urban expansion, and his distress at the indifference shown towards this process. In 1955, he urges:

The cultural remains that lie buried in the ancient sites of this province are part of the cultural heritage of all mankind and ... it is our duty not to let these archaeological resources go to waste through apathy and negligence (Borden 1955: 19).

The literature is informative, but at the same time it raises questions. First, why and how did Borden, engaged to teach German at The University of British Columbia (UBC), come to be concerned in the archaeological potential in British Columbia; and second, in what social context did this concern develop?

I believe that the account, that emerges from my interviews with Borden (Borden Interviews 1979), adds substantially to our understanding of the nature of his recognition by giving us some background information and by providing further insights into the values which influenced his work.

1. How Borden came to be concerned in the archaeological potential in British Columbia

Borden's interest in British Columbia archaeology precedes his arrival in Vancouver to join the German section of the Department of Modern
Languages at UBC at the invitation of Isabel MacInnes. He explains:

Before I came, something else played an important part in my decision to transfer to Vancouver. I had a map of Vancouver, and on this map were Indian reserves outlined within the city limits, and this was an additional attraction to come here... I noticed that two were located right within the city limits. One was Kitsilano at the south-west end of the Burrard Street bridge on the spot where the Centennial Museum is now located. Earlier, it was the location of an Indian site named Snaug (Borden Interviews 1979: 3-6).

In his account, Borden reviews the influence which shaped the interest in archaeology which contributed in no small measure to his decision to come to British Columbia and to eventually pursue a career in archaeology:

My first interest in archaeology was aroused by two high school teachers whom I had in Germany. This was after the First World War. I actually spent the First World War in Germany as a boy. I was caught there as an American citizen - stranded there you might say. During my school years I met, as I mentioned, two high school teachers. And incidentally they both had PhD's and both had studied, among other subjects, archaeology and pre-history. One, particularly, was quite active in archaeology. Together we went on surveys, recorded sites, and made small test excavations. This was over a period of two or three years; in other words from about 1920 onward. ... As you can see, I had an early introduction to archaeology (Borden Interviews 1979: 1).

It was a productive introduction:

The artifacts which I found, and which are now in our museum, include some blades of flint which very likely date to the late Upper Paleolithic. I think Alfred Rust later called this culture the Hamburgian which is a contemporary of the Magdalenian culture in France. These blades were found in a locality not very far from Bergeoradf where there are dunes. The wind often drifted the sand away and exposed pre-historic material. In addition to the finds which may date to the late Upper Paleolithic I found some bladelets, quite a number of bladelets actually, so-called microblades, which are now in our collection. These almost certainly date to the Mesolithic. Occasionally, the wind exposed some shards and calcined bone fragments. These were part of a burial ground dating to the Bronze Age. I do recall that I found a few Bronze-Age artifacts. I think at least one of them is in our collection. It was probably part of the head of a pin. ... There are several other pieces that antedate the Bronze Age and which belong to the Neolithic. There is one fragmentary dagger, the tip of which is missing. This was found on the outskirts of Bergeoradf. There is also an axe-head, a
polished axe-head, which was found in a field in Wendorf which is just across the border from Bergedorf. Bergedorf is a part of the free city of Hamburg District going back to the Hanseatic times. Wendorf belongs to the State. Yes, these artifacts I have retained through the years and now they are here in the Museum (Borden Interviews 1979: 11).

After this early introduction to archaeology, Borden's interest lay dormant for many years (please see Borden Interviews 1979: 12-19 for an account of his experiences during these intervening years). But as he reflects:

I never lost my interest in archaeology, and I always hoped that I might some day be able to return to it (Borden Interviews 1979: 2).

He was able to do so. In 1935, while still a graduate student working towards a Ph.D. degree at the University of California at Berkeley, he won a Scholarship to Germany:

In 1935, there was a competition for a scholarship to one of the Scandinavian countries; I think one had a choice. I participated in that, but somebody else got that particular scholarship. But after a short while I received a call from the Dean of Graduate Studies asking me whether I would be interested in accepting a scholarship to Germany. Now, this was a rather difficult decision that I had to make. My wife was Jewish and in Hitler's Germany Jews were not welcome, to say the least. So I wired my wife, and it was entirely up to her whether we would go or not. She wired back immediately in the affirmative. So in 1935, we drove our old car across the continent from Los Angeles to New York and boarded a freighter, the Black Condor. There were altogether about 12 passengers which was rather pleasant, and it was cheap. We had to stretch our funds. This scholarship was the Walter Lowie Travelling Scholarship. It specified that the recipient study at the University of Heidelberg (Borden Interviews 1979: 19).

The situation in Germany at that time was tense:

It was in some respects a very interesting year and in other respects a very difficult year also. Heidelberg was at that time a rather small and still romantic town, and the adverse manifestations of National Socialism were quite strong by contrast with some of the larger cities where Jews could move easily and conceal themselves. We had plenty of evidence that Jews were beginning to have a very bad time. This was in 1935. I don't want to get too much into that. I think I still have a few posters which I ripped off, and one in particular I recall said
"War, Revolt, Unrest in all the rest of the world. Only Germany is an island of peace. Vote for Adolf Hitler in the election."
The election was in April 1936. I believe I still have that poster somewhere. It was absolutely useless to read newspapers; they were printing all the bad things that were happening in the rest of the world. There were constant attacks against Jews. Newspapers all printed the same thing no matter where you were. They were all gleich gerchaltet; that is, they were all on the same circuit. There was no discussion, nothing, no real editorials with differences of opinion and so forth. So whenever we could, we made it across the border and it was like getting a breath of fresh air. Whenever you got out of Germany, you were free to select any newspaper or any journal and see what was really happening in the world (Borden Interviews 1979: 20-21).

But, it was in Heidelberg that his interest in archaeology was re-awakened:

One of the courses I took at the University of Heidelberg was given by a nobleman: Professor Von Salis was a specialist in Roman and Greek Archaeology and I attended his excellent lectures with much interest. Of course, this was, again, close to some of my early interests, and this was an opportunity to expand on them. Then also I was interested in photography, and there was a very good course in photography which I attended, and I became somewhat of a specialist in photography. This came in very handy later on in my archaeological work in taking progress shots of field work and taking photographs of artifacts, etc. Various things, which seemed to be discrete, later on combined to prepare me for what I eventually was going to do. During the Spring intersession, between semesters, we took a trip to Italy which was really wonderful. We entered Italy from Switzerland and travelled as far south as Naples and then back over the Brenner Pass into Austria and then Germany. We visited many museums and art galleries and of course also Pompeii. That, again, was a tremendous experience for me (Borden Interviews 1979: 21-22).

It was also during Borden's years at Berkeley (1932-1937) that he encountered Lowie and Kroeber. He recalls (Borden Interviews 1979: 22), "It was impossible to be at that university without coming under their influence," and "they did have an impact on me." The impact was indirect since Borden did not attend their courses, although he did read some of their publications (Borden Interviews 1979: 25). In later years, he was able to meet Kroeber personally:

It was not until 1950 or '51 that I met Professor Kroeber himself. We discussed archaeology at length, and he enjoined me, whenever conducting excavations, not to stop when the cultural
deposits seem to come to an end, but to continue digging and to make sure that there were no earlier deposits underlying what appeared to be sterile soil. This was very good advice. Later on, this advice became very pertinent particularly during our Fraser Canyon project about which I will talk later on. I sent Professor Kroeber a copy of one of my first publications on the work that we had done in the Fraser Delta up to 1950. It was as a result of this communication that I received Professor Kroeber's letter with very encouraging comments. I very much cherished that because it reinforced and encouraged me in the work I was doing. (This letter is now on file in C.E. Borden Papers, UBC Archives) (Borden Interviews 1979: 21-22).

When Borden arrived in Vancouver, circumstances were such that he was able to spend time surveying the archaeological potential of the area:

In 1939 the war had started and it was a difficult time all round. Interest in German, of course, had slackened, and UBC's research library in German was still extremely poor for various reasons, and I couldn't really carry on any research in Germanistics. So it happened that I had leisure time to wander around Burrard Peninsula, and one day I discovered a small Indian camp site which was revealed by the presence of decaying mussel and clam shells, etc. It was in 1945, then, that I persuaded one of my colleagues in the English Department, Dr. Philip Akrigg, who shared an office with me, to make some test excavations at this Indian camp site which was being badly eroded away by waves and by people walking over it to go to the beach. At that time - this was on the southern shore of the Burrard Peninsula - the beach used to extend all around the point and also quite a way along the southern shore. If you go down there now you will find it completely changed and overgrown with verdule and it would be very difficult to see any sites unless you knew where they were. And so it was that we made our first excavations (Borden Interviews 1979: 4).

Philip Akrigg recalls that at that time he and Borden shared an office with two others. It was room Z in the old Arts Building. One day Borden noticed a book on Northwest Coast Indians on Akrigg's desk. Borden asked Akrigg if he was interested in Indian culture, and would he be interested in doing some excavating (personal communication, P. Akrigg, April 14, 1980). Akrigg was persuaded to do so. He remembers that on this occasion they took shovels down to the area of beach now known as Wreck Beach. It took some time to get rid of the overlay and the results were meagre. As they were climbing back up the cliff, they were stopped
by a Vancouver policeman who had been warned that two suspicious characters
were possibly burying loot on the beach.

Akrigg continued to accompany Borden on other excavations. In

Borden's words:

A little later we also excavated another small site which was
a short distance further east and covered by a succession of mud
slides. All along, it was my idea to salvage and to prevent sites
from being destroyed without any record, and many of the things we
observed and excavated at that time might have been completely lost.
We also recorded some interesting features that nobody had recog­
nized: for instance, Indian canoe runways. The beach along the
south shore was not only sandy but it was also lined with rocks.
And Indians, in some places, had removed the rocks so that they
could beach their canoes without damaging them. There are
negatives of two of these canoe runways in the archives at UBC.
Thus, my interest in archaeology having been reawakened, I made
some rather intensive surveys of the peninsula. I discovered
several sites that were quite large. Most of them were partly or
almost totally destroyed. One is right within a stone's throw of
the University (the area called Point Grey) ... Another was the
Locarno Beach site (Borden Interviews 1979: 4-5).

(Akrigg points out that they both knew of plans to build on this latter
site).

Borden continues,

With some considerable difficulty I also relocated the Marpole
site where Harlan I. Smith had excavated in the late 1800's.
Smith was the Archaeologist who had been appointed to the Jesup
North Pacific Expedition and he had conducted excavations there.
Of course, at that time it was almost untouched. Now, the site
is largely built over and destroyed. But the old Vancouver City
Museum had engaged a man, by the name of Herman Leisk, in the
early 1930's, and he conducted excavations at the Marpole site.
Some of the recovered artifacts were on exhibit in the City Museum
which was located on the top floor of the old Carnegie Library.
After the new Vancouver main library was built, the old library
building stood vacant and the museum expanded into the entire
building ...

It was also in 1946 that Dr. Akrigg and I excavated two trenches
and a series of test pits at the Point Grey site. Most of the site
had been erased by a children's health camp. However, there were a
few areas that were still undisturbed and we selected three for our
main excavations. In addition we conducted tests to determine the
extent of the site. One interesting thing about the site is that
it has not only a prehistoric horizon but also a historic horizon.
It was one of the first areas in this region in which logging had
been carried out in the mid 80's of the last century. Right on the remaining part of the midden were two large stumps, Douglas fir stumps. These huge trees seemed to have been growing right out of the midden. One of our purposes was to investigate whether the trees had actually been growing out of the midden as it seemed. We were able to borrow an increment borer from the Department of Forestry to bore into the trees and to count the annual rings. We found that one of the trees was over 250 years old. And at another part of the site, we determined that one of the huge stumps was over 400 years old. Incidentally it is still there. The Parks Department of Vancouver, some years ago, was going to blow up all the stumps but I persuaded them not to do so. The logging had been going on in the mid 80's of the last century. So if you combine the time that had elapsed and add to that the time that we determined, we had a minimum age for the site of 500 years. And if I might anticipate. Later, when I was actually teaching archaeology at the university, we conducted, in connection with our courses, field work during which the students learned excavating techniques, recording, mapping, and so forth. During one of these courses, we collected some charcoal samples, and we now know that the actual age of that particular site at Point Grey goes back to the last century B.C. (Borden Interviews 1979: 5-8).

During this period of time Akrigg suggests that Borden developed "an archeologist's eye." He remembers one occasion when he and Borden were driving through the Musqueam reserve. Borden would know intuitively when to stop the car and get out to pick up a point (personal communication, P. Akrigg, April 14, 1980). Although Akrigg himself decided to commit his time to teaching English, he saw that Borden was becoming increasingly more absorbed in archaeology and in an awareness of the "desperate race" to rescue objects from significant sites. Borden's own words convey this concern:

Economic activities were threatening the archaeology of the province. For example the building of roads, the construction of dams and reservoirs, urban expansion, even agriculture. All these would destroy sites before they were investigated. From the beginning, my emphasis had been on salvaging archaeological remains while they were still accessible (Borden Interviews 1979: 30).

It was a concern that, as Akrigg suggests, was rooted in commitment. Here was an area which, unlike German literature, had not been worked over. As Borden points out (Borden Interviews 1979: 27), "there was no
professional archaeologist active in the west." Borden committed himself to the task of mastering what he did not know about archaeology. Books on archaeology arrived in the office from various parts of the world (personal communication, P. Akrigg, April 14, 1980). In addition, Borden communicated with archaeologists elsewhere, particularly at this point with those at the University of California at Berkeley (personal communication, B. Simonsen, April 10, 1980).

There, Drucker was a source of inspiration for Borden, particularly because of his refutation of Diamond Jenness' view of the potential in British Columbia. Borden reflects:

Well I was speaking about Diamond Jenness. His *Indians of Canada* is still a classic, even now, although it was written many years ago. I believe the first edition was in 1932 or '33. There is the statement in that volume which is really rather devastating for the archaeology of the Northwest Coast ... It runs to this effect -- that one could dig for about two weeks with a six-man crew and come up with nothing more than around six artifacts which would be worthwhile taking home. Now this was not exactly an encouragement to come to the West Coast of British Columbia to conduct archaeological fieldwork. And it was at least in part, Philip Drucker's intention to refute this notion and to demonstrate through his work that really a good deal could be learned by conducting archaeological fieldwork in this area. So here was another incentive for me to continue the work I had started (Borden Interviews 1979: 27).

Borden (1974) refers to Drucker's publication (1943) as a bible. The following remarks echo this sentiment:

I learned a great deal from that publication (Borden Interviews 1979: 26) ... this was a clarion call (Borden Interviews 1979: 7).

Both Borden and Akrigg visited Berkeley in 1946. They met Mr. Beardsley who had accompanied Drucker in his survey of the northern Northwest Coast in 1937. He was a graduate student at that time. He and others at Berkeley were extremely helpful to Borden, showing him their collections and the forms they were using. Borden comments:
So we had excellent cooperation there which made our task a good deal easier, and made it possible for us to follow what then were current systematic procedures (Borden Interviews 1979: 7).

Borden also received help and encouragement at this early stage of his career from Erna Gunther who was head of the Department of Anthropology at the University of Washington. She had initiated an Archaeological program:

I was very cordially received and obtained helpful information regarding procedures, field record forms and so forth (Borden Interviews 1979: 7).

Bjorn Simonsen comments interestingly that Borden never made a point of emphasizing that he was not trained in archaeology. And, indeed, as time progressed, it never seemed to be a disadvantage. He became a senior person in the field (personal communication, B. Simonsen, April 10, 1980). Nevertheless, Borden himself was "keenly aware" that he did not have any formal instruction in archaeology. But he reminds us:

... the sort of doctorate that I had - particularly, the professor under whom I was working, was very insistent on extremely thorough work. He absolutely would not pass, for instance, any quotation that had been lifted from some other work that had quoted an original. He always insisted that one go to the original and see actually what the man had said and what the total context was. So this was important in my own work and the same thoroughness I try to apply to the collecting and assembling of the raw data as well as to the analysis of the data themselves (Borden Interviews 1979: 81-82).

And it was, therefore, not simply the concern with which Borden approached the archaeological potential in British Columbia that impressed Harry Hawthorn when he arrived to take up his appointment as Professor of Anthropology at UBC in 1947, but his scholarly thoroughness. Hawthorn (personal communication, H. Hawthorn, October 2, 1979) regarded Borden as "a scholar" with "a feel for evidence," "orderly and systematic."

Hawthorn suggests that "sensible contemporaries would respect Carl for the
care with which he gathered the evidence." Therefore, they would "respect his conclusions even if later people arrive at different ones." His regard for Borden's work led him to invite Borden to teach archaeology on a voluntary basis. Borden recollects:

In 1947, Professor Harry Hawthorn was appointed to the faculty at UBC in the Department of Economics, Political Science and Sociology. And then Anthropology was added. I believe I mentioned before that Dr. Hawthorn visited some of my excavations, and he examined some of what I had written, and so it came that in 1948 he asked me if I would be willing to teach, on a voluntary basis, part of his course on the Indians of British Columbia. This part of the course was to involve some field work in archaeology. As part of their work, students had to participate in an excavation, learn field techniques and then later prepare a meaningful report on the basis of this field work and, on the analysis of the recovered artifacts (Borden Interviews 1979: 24).

He was meanwhile teaching German:

... even though I was teaching one and later two courses in archaeology on alternate years, I was still teaching a full load in German Studies. That means four courses - four courses in German. Some introductory courses, a Scientific German course, and a fourth-year course in the History of German Civilization. I always started with pre-history because I thought it was utterly wrong to begin with Medieval times. Particularly in Germany, you have a very, very long pre-history going back to Neanderthal man. I thought it important for the students to have a knowledge of that (Borden Interviews 1979: 33-34).

Akrigg points out that Borden was essentially carrying two full time careers. He remembers that it was at this point Borden developed asthma (personal communication, P. Akrigg, April 14, 1980).

The archaeology project in conjunction with Hawthorn's course on the Indians of British Columbia was successful, and so the following year (1949-50), Borden was persuaded to teach a full course in the Archaeology of British Columbia which would involve "fieldwork, lab work, theory, method, and practice" (Borden Interviews 1979: 29). Problems involving the structure and content of the course were left to Borden:
Dr. Hawthorn's charge, and his task, was to establish a separate department of Anthropology and Sociology. He was a cultural anthropologist and his primary interest was in that. And he built up one of the best Departments of Anthropology in Canada - as a matter of fact on the North American Continent. Archaeology was of peripheral interest to Harry Hawthorn and he left me pretty well to my own devices (Borden Interviews 1979: 30).

2. The Social Context within which Borden's concern developed

Borden's concern with the archaeological potential in British Columbia was now to find expression and develop within an academic forum. But before archaeology classes could start, facilities had to be found "where archaeology could be taught and ... where the artifacts could be stored and analyzed ... where reports could be written" (Borden Interviews 1979: 31). Borden reminisces:

Well one day, I believe it was in 1949, the President, and the Dean, and Harry Hawthorn, and myself searched the campus for a location where we could establish sort of a bridge-head for archaeological facilities. And we found this bridge-head in the west basement wing of the old Arts Building on campus. There was one room for which we couldn't even get a key, and we had to climb through the window in order to get in. The room smelled of vinegar and rotten vegetables and other groceries because it was the room which had been used by the cafeteria in the old Auditorium building. So it was there that I established some tables. That is to say, some 4 x 8 plywood supported by saw-horses. We even had a sink with running water which was absolutely necessary, but there was no ventilation, and the steam pipes which ran behind the room in the basement were not tight and sent out steam to overheat the area. It was not an ideal situation. It was not until sometime later that I was able to persuade Physical Plant to install a fan, which they did. And they installed a window and a door with an iron grid. A similar grid was installed in the front door. So, when you put on the fan, there was some draft coming through. But the fan was an old one and it clattered. We worked to the tune of this clattering fan. There were a good many other rooms in that basement, but they were occupied by various interests on campus. For instance, by the bookstore which had a large area for the storage of books, and invoices, and other papers. Then, there was another small, narrow room which was used by the campus constabulary. They had a little cooking facility and the room smelled of fried bacon and other things - for instance, onions. And these smells wafted through into the lab. But, eventually, I was able to out-live these people and to elbow my way into the storage room of the bookstore. They had occupied
a relatively small space in one of the army huts which had been brought to the campus at the end of the War. But, when they built the bookstore building, they eventually evacuated the basement and, because I had through the years made quite a pest of myself and pressured that we wanted and needed this space, we were eventually able to obtain this area. One of the most difficult rooms to get was the one immediately adjoining the first room which we had, and this former room was occupied by the head of the campus janitors. He was quite a character. He chewed tobacco and spat over his desk at the heating facility. And once in a while he would call on the carpet some janitor or janitress and give them a good calling down because of what they had or had not done. He used rather strong and profane language while doing so. I was competing with this while trying to lecture nearby. So these were some of the early difficulties we had, and this head janitor was determined to eventually expand to all the areas which we occupied. But I managed to outlive him. He retired before he was able to realize his ambition, and we fell heir to his former room (Borden Interviews 1979: 31-35).

In these early days Borden states that he was teaching archaeology six days a week (Borden Interviews 1979: 35).

At the beginning, there was only a handful of students who would participate, but later on I had between 12 and 15 and sometimes even more. Often, at the beginning, the classes would be 20 or so, but not everyone was willing to go out in all weathers and submit themselves to the agonies that it entailed because, often, it was very cold and wet and soggy and not too pleasant. And some people who had some romantic ideas about archaeology very quickly learned that it entailed a great deal of really unpleasant work (Borden Interviews 1979: 42).

Saturday afternoon field sessions played an important part in course work:

First of all, as far as the course Anthropology 420 was concerned, that is the Archaeology in British Columbia, we did have field sessions. And, in the early days, they were held every Saturday afternoon, and of course the students participated in them. We were fortunate in a way that we did have sites in the immediate vicinity of Vancouver and some actually in Vancouver where the students could engage in practical field work (Borden Interviews 1979: 36).

Borden was, however, eager to find sites where field work could be engaged in over a much longer period:
In order to do that, I surveyed the Musqueam Indian Reserve, which is located just to the southeast of the Endowment Lands of the University, right within a few miles of the campus. That was a task which was not so readily done because in those days the Indians were rather suspicious of strangers and hostile to people coming on their reserve. Now, I thought I went through the proper steps. For example, I went to the Indian Agent in Vancouver, and he was quite cooperative, and he wrote a letter to the Secretary of the band stating quite categorically that this authorizes Dr. Charles E. Borden to carry out archaeological investigations on the Musqueam Indian Reserve. When I showed that letter to Mr. Sparrow, who was the Secretary of the band at that time, he almost hit the roof, you know, because the Indian Agent had no right to do that. So that was a very bad beginning, you know, to establish good relations with the Indian Band there. But in time, I did manage to convince Mr. James Point, who was the chief of the band at that time, that it was desirable to rescue these remains before they were destroyed. In order to persuade and pacify Mr. Sparrow, I invited him to come to our lab and to view what we had excavated already in sites such as the Point Grey site and the Locarno Beach site. So one day I packed them all into my car and drove them out to the lab. Mr. Sparrow came, and his wife, his children, and grandchildren. We all landed in the lab, and I explained in detail the various items that we had. They obviously did not know what they were and how they functioned, and they were very, very much interested, in particular Mr. Sparrow. And after a while when one of the children tried to handle some of these rather fragile objects, he told him, "Don't touch, don't touch, be careful." And so this established a good basis for further cooperation. Mr. Sparrow, himself, permitted me then to conduct excavations on land which belonged to his family on the reserve. And we did that for several seasons (Borden Interviews 1979: 37-38).

Then, in later seasons, we were able to excavate on land that belonged to Chief James Point, and we made some interesting discoveries there. Now, these excavations were on a site which had been visited in 1808 by Simon Fraser upon his arrival at the mouth of the river. This, of course, is detailed in his journals about his perilous trip down the Fraser. He did receive a rather hostile reception from the Indians. I think it was on the 2nd of July, 1808. He arrived with his band at high tide. He went up a small stream and there seemed to be a small lake in association with the village, and they pulled up their canoe there. Most of the Indians had retreated into the nearby forest and so he and his group went through the entire village, and only a few elderly people were there. Now when they had completed their investigations - and it is really tantalizing how much he could have told about what he saw, but he only gave us some idea about the size of the village and he didn't describe it in detail - and returned to their canoes they found that the tide had gone out, and their canoes were beached high and dry, and they had great difficulty moving a canoe at all. Incidentally, a canoe which had been confiscated against the wishes of the chief of a village in the vicinity of present day New Westminster. And it was possible
that the news of that had travelled to the reserve. At any rate, when the Indians saw that he did have difficulty, they came running and shouting out of the woods brandishing their clubs and spears and so forth and, according to him, howling like so many wolves. I suppose the adrenalin began to flow, and eventually they were able to budge the canoe and launch it into the small stream and to come out to the safety of the river. At that time he noticed that there was another small village further down. That is a little further west. And I am quite sure that this couldn't have been any other village than the recent village of Male. Now, I mention this because there has been some confusion about the name Musqueam and how much the name Musqueam encompasses. I talked to another Indian informant on the reserve who, upon my question "What is the name of this village?" stated that it was Stslax, and that, apparently, was a misunderstanding. He actually was thinking mainly of the area on which we were standing. And to my second question, "What does Musqueam then mean?" he said that it was the entire area of the reserve. So there was, really, a misunderstanding there which later became precipitated in the literature because I referred to the Musqueam village under the name of Stslax village, and it really should have remained Musqueam. And instead of the Stslax phase it should be the Musqueam phase. So that confusion I was not able to clear up until much later. So actually we were able to excavate at Musqueam (Borden Interviews 1979: 38-40).

Borden continues with his reminiscences:

Later on, I met Mr. Frank Charles who was a very old Indian gentleman who remembered even the fire of Vancouver. You remember there was a huge blaze shortly after the settlement had been established at Gastown, and it burned down. He remembered the fire. You have to remember that he was very old and he spoke very little English, but somehow we did manage to engage in conversation, and I learned a few very interesting items from him. But to make a long story short, it was through him and his family that we received permission to excavate in one of the two Indian houses that were still standing. In other words, we were given permission to excavate the house floor of these houses. Of course they had no plank floor. It was a dirt floor, and over the centuries the occupational debris accumulated, and you had a long history of the occupation of that house. So that was work for a number of seasons or academic years of Saturday afternoons. And those were the three, well the two, main sites. No, there was a third one on the reserve which we were able to work. The last one was up on top of the bluff. Both Male and Musqueam village itself were recent villages with a historic horizon. Male had been virtually destroyed by the Chinese truck farmers when they had ploughed the entire area and had scattered all the deposits over a wide area. But there was another village, another shell midden, on top of the bluff which overlooked the village of Male and looked out over the Gulf of Georgia. I was interested because out of the deposits, apparently, had been growing very large cedar trees and Douglas fir trees the stumps
of which were still standing, and so there was a likelihood that this site was much older than the other ones. I learned from the Chinese truck farmers that the cultivation of these, that is the truck farming, had begun around 1910. An elderly Chinese also told me how they had to eliminate the stumps which they had on their fields. That was one of the last sites which we excavated on the reserve. Then the other site, another old site I have already mentioned in connection with the trial venture which we had in 1949, was the Marpole site. We excavated there again in 1955 and again in 1957, and that was our last fling at the Marpole site. So, Point Grey, Musqueam, and Musqueam north as we called it, sometimes old Musqueam, and Marpole, those were the sites right within Vancouver that we were able to excavate (Borden Interviews 1979: 40-41).

An important aspect of fieldwork was the emphasis of the need for salvaging sites. Borden instilled this into his students. Borden reminds us that it was this emphasis on salvage which he instilled in Wilson Duff" (Duff, 1925 - 1976, B.A. UBC M.A. University of Washington, eventually became a leading authority on the art and anthropology of Northwest Coast Indians). At this point Duff was studying archaeology with Borden who points out that "In subsequent years, we closely collaborated on many ventures" (Borden Interviews, 1979: 30). Borden remarks that he later learned that this fieldwork was "the first urban salvage archaeology in all of Canada" (Borden Interviews 1979: 30).

I have already referred to Borden's early communication with the University of California at Berkeley and with the University of Washington. His appointment to teach archaeology at UBC was an important and significant event in that it afforded him further opportunities to exchange ideas. During the course of the interviews, I asked Borden how he felt about this:

Well, they actually didn't go too far beyond the actual visits to these institutions for the purpose of seeing what forms they were using in their fieldwork. And they were very generous in giving us all these forms for our use. For instance, to fill out in connection with burials and general description of the sites and artifact forms and so forth. Come to think of it, I did actually visit some of their excavations, particularly the University of Washington, their excavation on San Juan Island and one of the
important sites on which Arden King made an unpublished ...
(Cattle Point manuscript, later published, see King 1951).

Yes, I reviewed that for him. I attended one of the conferences at the University of California at Berkeley and his work there, and also his publication about the work, was thoroughly panned by some of his associates at the University of California, whereas, by contrast, my review was rather favourable. Yes, you mentioned there were important points in it. I considered it a very important contribution to pioneer work, and I contrasted it favourably with another work that was published at the same time, Marian Smith's work. Her work had a very ambitious title: "Archaeology of the Columbia Fraser Region." It was mostly fiction and contained very little truth, and it also included some crass errors. For instance, she didn't realize apparently that Eburne and Marpole were one and the same site. That was the confusion that she introduced into the literature, but actually her work was hardly ever quoted as Arden King's work was. Now, on the basis of the work that I had carried out myself and with Dr. Akrigg and then later with my students, even as early as 1950, I published a summary of that work, and I evolved at least the rudiments of a cultural sequence. Something which had not really appeared before. Although Arden King, whose work I think was published in the same year, 1950, had tried the same thing at Cattle Point, at his Cattle Point site. But there was much that was uncertain about this sort of sequence that he proposed there. And in the ensuing years people actually referred more to my work than to his.

Another site that I visited was one that was being conducted by Dr. R.D. Daugherty. At that time, he was a graduate student at the University of Washington, and he was conducting some salvage excavations at Moses Lake at some sites there. Well, we were at the Moses Lake site, and it was of considerable interest to me how they were proceeding with that excavation and I learned a good deal from that. Dr. Daugherty, Richard Daugherty ... later on became quite famous in connection with this work at the LindCoulee site, which was one of the older sites, over 9,000 years old, on the Columbia plateau, and then later with many of the sites on the Snake River. And, of course, one of his chief contributions has been his continuing work at the Ozette site on the Olympic Peninsula, on the west coast of that peninsula. This was an abandoned Makah village with fabulously preserved perishables like basketry, wood carvings, and so forth. They excavated one entire house and had about 30,000 recorded items from that one site. So he made quite a name for himself later on.

So there was a good deal of exchange. Some students from the University of Washington came up to visit my work, ... Some of the graduate students came up to inspect our work and were impressed by it ... and Mr. Robert Lane, who is now Professor Lane, Professor of Anthropology at the University of Victoria,
came to my excavation in 1948 at Locarno Beach ... (Borden Interviews 1979: 43-45).

Borden continues:

Soon after I received an invitation to teach the summer field school in archaeology which the University of Washington had initiated as a Summer Session course. In 1949 the field school was to be held at the large midden site on Whalen farm, Boundary Bay (Borden Interviews 1979: 9) ... And, while I was working at the Whalen farm site, it was Mr. Wayne Suttles, now Professor of Anthropology at Portland State University, who brought us much of the gear that we used in our field work at the Whalen farm site (Borden Interviews 1979: 45-46).

Later, after Wayne Suttles' appointment at UBC in 1951, Borden and Suttles became good friends. In Suttles' own words:

I got acquainted with Carl after going to Vancouver and we were good friends until his death. I saw a lot of him at UBC and we saw each other from time to time after I returned to the U.S. (At one point he was stuck here in Portland in hospital for a time after a heart attack and I visited him nearly every day.) We argued over the years about the meaning of archeological discoveries and the prehistory of the region. I seem to remember nearly every year talking to the archaeology student group (I think there was always one -- sometimes well organized, sometimes less so) and making as strong a case as I could for the relevance of ethnography and the evidence for people doing different things at different times at different places with different tools. Carl, it always seemed to me, was too inclined to construct types. We also disagreed about the evidence for the emergence of the Salish out of the interior ... But the disagreement was always the basis for long pleasant talk. I liked Carl very much and I know the feeling was returned (personal communication, Wayne Suttles, March 4, 1980).

Borden continues:

So there was a good deal of contact and exchange. I also went down to the University of Washington and reported on some of my work here and gave a lecture there in connection with some of their sessions. I met Walter Taylor there you know who had quite an impact on me, the one who wrote "A Study of Archaeology" (Borden Interviews 1979: 46).

He discusses the impact of Taylor's study.

He questioned many of the current techniques which were being applied in field work and the theories that lay behind this work. He emphasized that the archaeologist in his work destroys the evidence that he is collecting or trying to collect, and it was therefore important not to go into the field with any particular
objective in mind because this might bias the results on the one hand and would tend to have the researcher neglect some of the other evidence which was being destroyed. He championed the conjunctive approach. That is, that everything the archaeologist uncovers is important and records should be made of it. This is another lesson which I learned and which became important for me. Actually it is rather ironical that the so-called new archaeologists neglected this caveat of Walter Taylor's. They actually encouraged the formulation of hypotheses before going into the field. Now it is alright to have hypotheses. But they should not be cherished to the extent that you look for data that will reinforce and sort of verify and confirm the hypotheses but neglect other evidence which is on hand. Here is a little swipe at some of the new archaeologists (Borden Interviews 1979: 27-28).

Contacts and exchange of ideas were not restricted to North American universities. Teaching Archaeology at UBC put Borden in a position to apply for a University Research Committee Travel grant to visit Europe.

He comments:

I had always included some old world pre-history even in my Archaeology in British Columbia course. But, of course, I couldn't be very comprehensive in this. It was only a part of the introduction to the course. This was, again, a challenge and an opportunity to broaden my own knowledge in order that I might convey the developments (Borden Interviews 1979: 86).

He was awarded the travel grant and set out for Europe in the summer of 1953. He recounts his European travels in his account (Borden Interviews 1979: 86-124). It was an important journey as it put him in contact with world famous archaeologists and anthropologists such as V. Gordon Childe, and Andre Leroi-Gourhan. It broadened his archaeological experience and it heralded a new course - Anthropology 320, Old World Prehistory which, in turn, would attract more students.

But although Borden was given the chance to develop his interest within an academic forum, the latter was, in his opinion, limited. To begin with, it was not until 1969, that is one year before his retirement, that he was finally appointed full-time into the Department of Anthropology and Sociology as a Professor of Archaeology. The following passage from his account conveys his feelings on this state of affairs:
I had been promoted in the forties to Associate Professor in German. Then, in 1954, to Professor in German, but I didn't learn about this latter appointment until I returned from one of my field expeditions. And, when I received the notice, it didn't say in which department I had been promoted. It just said "promoted to Professor." I met the Deputy President Geoffrey Andrew and I asked him, "What am I Professor of?" He said he didn't know. I think Professor Hawthorn was in a bit of a bind at that time. I think he might have considered taking me full-time into the department if I had still been an Associate Professor. But a Full Professor carried with it, of course, a higher salary and there was simply not enough money to go around, I think, to make it possible to add a Professor of Archaeology to the department at that time, I would have really welcomed it because I could have then devoted my full energy to archaeology. Although I did publish, for the most part it was preliminary reports and syntheses ... There simply was no time to publish definitive reports on projects upon which we were engaged, and I think this is most unfortunate (Borden Interviews 1979: 34-35).

For Borden, an important and unfortunate consequence of this was that:

The two courses, that is the Old World Pre-History course, Anthropology 320 and the Archaeology in British Columbia course, the fourth year course, Anthropology 420, had to be given in alternate years. I think it would have been better for the students if the course could have been given concurrently. We could have attracted more students and there would have been a better flow through the program because some students, in the development of their course, couldn't fit in both courses because they were offered in alternate years. So I think we lost quite a number of students who might have specialized in archaeology (Borden Interviews 1979: 148).

and in his opinion:

Dr. Hawthorn leaned over backwards to support sociology and, of course, he favoured cultural anthropology. But archaeology always received marginal interest and had to develop along its own lines. The winds changed when Dr. Belshaw became Head of the Department - he saw the need (Borden Interviews 1979: footnote 35).

Hawthorn recalls that as an administrator, negotiating expansion with a limited budget was not an easy task. His interests were to expand social anthropology and the Museum collection. He also wanted to bring in linguistics (personal communication, H. Hawthorn, October 2, 1979).
Yet despite its limitations, as his account illuminates, Borden's teaching position in archaeology at UBC allowed him first, to expand his own knowledge of archaeology, most particularly his recognition of the archaeological potential in British Columbia. It allowed his interest in salvage archaeology to develop from romantic enthusiasm to a social commitment, his connection with the university having offered him experience in surveying and excavating and the opportunity to make contacts with other archaeologists. Second, his teaching position ensured that archaeological knowledge of the Northwest Coast, and the responsibility for the dissemination of this knowledge, should reside primarily with the intellectual academic community of which he was a member. Specifically, this knowledge was how to develop within the social organization of ethnologists and archaeologists.

As we shall see, his position at UBC was to help lay the foundation for legislation. First, it would place him in a strategic position from which he could go on to define the archaeological potential in British Columbia. Second, it would place him in a unique position from which he could proceed to raise public awareness to that potential, and would provide him with trained allies to lobby for him in this process.
CHAPTER TWO
DEFINING THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL POTENTIAL
IN BRITISH COLUMBIA


The answers to archaeological problems still lie buried in countless sites along the more than 1,000 miles of the once populous and archaeologically almost unknown coast between the Gulf of Georgia and the Pacific Eskimo region (Borden 1962a: 19).

Referring to this potential, he proposes:

Systematic excavations have just begun. It will take much time and effort before a clear understanding of prehistoric events in this area can be gained. But by patient investigation and with the assistance of scientists in other fields, with the help of individuals and groups ... we shall gradually approach this goal (Borden 1950a: 246).

The literature points out that "patient investigation" became pervaded with a growing sense of urgency. Borden summarizes the events preceding the Tweedsmuir Park Survey:

Wilson (Duff) informed me late in 1950 of the then Liberal Government's intention to grant the Aluminium Company of Canada a licence to construct a dam in the gorge of the Nechako River for the creation of a huge power reservoir in Tweedsmuir Park for the Aluminium Company's Kemano-Kitimat project. The backed-up water would flood more than 400 miles of archaeologically unexplored lake and
river margins (Borden 1977: 5).

And he goes on to urge (1954: 196) that "salvage operations be carried out wherever important prehistoric remains are threatened by urban expansion and industrial development."

An important question for me at this point is this: what were the dimensions to the organization underlying this urgent process of definition? The literature points to: (1) funding, (2) student participation, (3) the cooperation of non-funding agencies. Borden's account adds to our understanding of this process by providing anecdotal information and commentary which not only address these specific dimensions, but give us further insights into the values which give meaning to his accomplishments.

1. Funding

That financial support was important to Borden's definition of archaeology in British Columbia is clearly indicated in a document quoting sources of all funding between 1945 - 1967 (Laboratory of Archaeology, Department of Anthropology and Sociology August 15, 1967). It is interesting to note that Borden's first ventures during the years 1945 - 1948 were financed by himself and Akrigg, but thereafter the acquisition of funds became an important aspect of archaeological research.

Earlier, I suggested that Borden's development of a recognition of the archaeological potential in British Columbia within an academic forum would be important to his definition of that potential. This becomes clearer when consulting this financial document. Support from the UBC Research Committee (total $19,150) was available for the following projects: Whalen Farm, 1949; Chinlac, 1950, 1952; Tweedsmuir, 1951; Musqueam, 1951, 1952, 1954, 1956, 1960 and 1961; Old World-New World Relations, 1953; Marpole, 1955 and 1957; Fraser River, 1956 and 1958; Fraser Canyon, 1959, 1960, 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964; Point Grey, 1965; and B.C. Archaeology,
1967. The Anthropology Department alone funded the following projects (total $245): Marpole, 1949, 1950; and Musqueam, 1951. But although this was a start, the acquisition of funds was an ongoing problem. Borden comments,

I always received help from the University Committee on Research but their funds were limited. The pie had to be cut into many pieces because we weren't the only applicant for a slice of the pie (Borden Interviews 1979: 75).

The sense of urgency associated with the ongoing acquisition of funds is implied throughout the literature where footnotes acknowledge all support. But it becomes very explicit in the media. For example,

The money must be found ... the work must be guaranteed next year. Part of the village (Marpole) has already been destroyed forever by builders' bulldozers. Two city lots are reserved by the city for the midden foundations work (Great Fraser Midden Foundation). But city council can easily grow weary of waiting in face of the pressure of progress (Anon. 1956).

The media also points to the importance of public relations work in the process of acquiring funds. The Province, December 14, 1955:

Dr. Borden noted that funds granted the UBC Archaeological Survey for 1955 have run out and only the generosity of persons interested in pre-historic life in the Vancouver district can keep the digging going.

Referring to one such person, Borden recalls:

Some individuals were exceedingly helpful in contributing funds and here I must mention particularly the late H.R. MacMillan. I recall when we were working at the Marpole site which was really in its last throes at the time. We were very anxious to continue work, but we would have had to stop in the middle of the summer if additional funds did not become available. You see, the students did have to make some money. They had to earn some money in order to be able to return to University in the fall. And if they couldn't get it through archaeology, as they wanted to, then they would have to look for other work. So we were in dire straits for funds in 1954 at the Marpole site and were fortunate that a reporter just happened to come along and was interested in what we were doing. I always try to deal fairly and frankly with reporters, and I explained everything he wanted to know. But I also informed him that we would probably have to stop very soon because we had no further funds available. And lo and behold in the next issue of the paper there was an editorial, a very nice editorial, that
explained the situation to the public. That same evening, I received a call from H.R. MacMillan, and he offered to underwrite all the expenses that we had for the rest of the summer which I thought was really a marvellous thing to do. Unfortunately, I can't say that there were other individuals who did this except for the contribution of small amounts (Borden Interviews 1979: 76-77).

Funding was of paramount concern and lack of funds could lead to unforeseen hazards. Borden's reminiscences of the Tweedsmuir Park survey (1951) funded by the Provincial Government and UBC Research Committee are illuminating:

Now then let us turn to that venture, and I can almost call it an adventure. Wilson Duff of course was Provincial Anthropologist at the Provincial Museum and as a civil servant he heard many things that were not broadcast at the time and everything was sort of hush hush. But he had learned that the then Liberal Government planned to give the Aluminum Company of Canada a licence to build a dam in the Nechako gorge which would back up water right from the dam site to the head of Tahtsa Lake, and which would flood some 400 miles of archaeologically unknown lake and river margins. So Wilson and I got together, and we prepared a brief to the Provincial Government. And, when it was announced that this dam would be built and that the damage I just mentioned would actually take place, we were ready with our brief which pointed out that this area was archaeologically unknown and no doubt there would be important sites in this drainage system, and it was absolutely necessary that a salvage survey should be first conducted and then, possibly, followed by excavations in the ensuing year. To our satisfaction the answer, the response, was affirmative. We obtained a relatively small grant of $2,000.00 which at least enabled us to buy a boat, a fibreglass boat, only 12 feet long and with a five horsepower motor, and some other necessary equipment such as tents and so forth.

So it was in 1951, then, that we started out to conduct this survey. There were two other individuals with me. One was Alan Bryan who had excavated with me at Whalen farm and also Chinlac, and the other was Bob Steiner who was a geology student at the University and who supposedly knew the territory very well and knew how to handle boats and motors and so forth. So it seemed good at the time (Borden Interviews 1979: 50-51).

However, limited funds played a part in the following course of events:
We could not possibly afford any of the guides because they were charging $30.00 a day, and this was way beyond the budget we had. So the survey had to be carried out on our own. We loaded the boat with our provisions and equipment and supplies and set out one afternoon, and this was from the north shore of Ootsa Lake. The lake was just like a mirror, it was beautiful, and the sun was shining, and we set out. The shore was lined with some of the guides who shook their heads and predicted dire misadventures for us. Well, we were about half way across the lake when the sky darkened and from the coast mountains, whose icy peaks we could see in the distance in the west, came a blast. Within just a few minutes, the lake was churned and there were waves three, four, five feet high, and we began to ship water but fortunately we made it across the lake that time. We made camp and spent the night on the opposite shore. We hadn't learned our lesson yet, and we had to pay for that dearly. After we had spent the night there, we prepared breakfast and packed our gear and set out to go up to Tahtsa River and then, later on, to turn off to go towards Whitesail Lake. Well, we reached the western end of Ootsa Lake and were entering Tahtsa River which has a very strong current even in the delta area, and we were three in the small boat. Our freeboard was only about six inches which of course means that the boat was way overloaded, and there was a strong gust of wind coming, and we were beginning to ship water again. I was sitting in the middle, and Bob Steiner was operating the motor, and Alan Bryan was in the front. When we shipped water, I told Alan to fasten the tarp over the boat in front so that we couldn't take on so much water. Well, as he did that, Bob Steiner apparently had difficulty in keeping the boat headed up stream, and he turned up the motor, and, just as Alan Bryan was in front, instead of the boat rising somewhat, with Alan Bryan's weight right near the prow of the boat, the boat took a dive. Before we knew it, we were deep in the water. Fortunately, we were on one of the shallow places of the delta, and our feet found solid ground, but we were up to our chests in water, and the boat had sunk, the motor had sunk, and all the gear that could float - gas in cans and tents, blankets, and sleeping bags - was bobbing down the river and into Ootsa Lake. We were extremely fortunate that a boat of the forest service manned by two men saw all this gear. They picked up some of it, and by then they thought they had better see where this had all come from as maybe there were some people in trouble, as indeed there were. So they came to our assistance, and we were able to get the boat out onto dry land and the motor and some of the gear that had sunk. But not very much. They then went out onto the lake again and picked up some more tents and sleeping bags and so forth. One thing that I must mention - I dreamt about this quite often later on. In my brief case there were two cameras, a new Leica and a new Rolaflex together with notebooks; this all floated just beyond my reach. I could almost reach it but not quite, you know. It bobbed away and of course eventually sank. So that was a great loss. Well, at least we were alive. We had learned, the hard way, a very important lesson that you must never overload a boat, and after great difficulty we were able to start the motor again.
It wasn't running properly but at least it ran. And we were able to return to our starting point and there, lining the shore, were the guides with an I-told-you-so look on their faces. And of course we were very meek and humble. Another strange incident occurred. If we hadn't returned, my car would probably have burned up. Bob Steiner had left near the rear window of the car, with the concave face up, a shaving mirror. The late afternoon sun had focused the sun's image onto the ceiling of the car which had started burning and had already burned a long strip and was continuing to burn. When we opened the car, smoke billowed out, and we were able to put out the fire. So there was disaster upon disaster, but at least we were able to put out the fire. I called up my wife long distance to tell her what happened and asked her to phone the insurance company and inform them, and to go to the photographic store where I had obtained the cameras and purchase some new ones, which she did. So a couple of days later we started out again and with much less in our boat. From then on we carried out the survey without any further mishap which is almost incredible because it really was difficult; the lakes were very stormy at times with towering waves, frightening waves. But the boat was good; it behaved well. As long as it wasn't overloaded, it responded very nicely like a nutshell on the waves. And another interesting thing, when we came down some of these narrow waterways with the rushing water we would bump against rocks and stumps that stuck out, and the fibreglass would buckle in and buckle out again. So it really proved itself quite well as a survey boat. But the motor of course was somewhat inadequate (Borden Interviews 1979: 51-54).

Borden continues:

It was a rather difficult undertaking, particularly with the inadequate equipment we had, and the boat with a motor which was only 5 h.p. was not really strong enough for some of the fast mountain streams that we had to navigate. It gives one a very eerie feeling when one is out of contact with the world, out in the wilderness and the boat is running full force - the motor is running full force - and one makes no headway against the current. One goes from one bank of the stream to the other in an effort to find some slow water. But, instead of finding it, the boat goes downstream rather than upstream. And so it happened, frequently, that we simply had to go to the bank of the stream and pull the boat upstream which again was difficult because of course the vegetation along the banks of the stream made it awkward. Sometimes there was no other way of doing it but by getting into this ice-cold water and taking the boat by the whiskers and pulling it upstream which was very strenuous since we were thoroughly chilled before long. But eventually we always made it, otherwise I wouldn't be talking here now. So there are a few of the hazards that we encountered, but the survey on the whole was successful. We managed to locate a total of 130 sites (Borden Interviews 1979: 54-55).
As a result of these experiences, and when applying for funds, Borden made more careful calculations. With reference to the Tweedsmuir Park excavations in 1952, he remembers:

We calculated very carefully what we would need in the way of equipment and the amount of food and so forth. We planned on a crew of between ten and fifteen. I think we worked it down to the last penny ... this must have impressed some of the bureaucrats in Victoria ... we were really fortunate as far as this particular project was concerned. The Liberal Government responded very generously, I thought. When we had worked out the funds that would be necessary for the follow-up excavations in 1952, they gave us the full amount - $8,500.00 or something to that effect (actual figure $8,650.00) which was a fair sum in those days (Borden Interviews 1979: 56-74).

Then, it was not quite so easy to persuade the Aluminum Company of Canada to contribute a sum and one of the main reasons, according to them, was that they were somewhat annoyed by the articles that had appeared in the press. They felt that the press was unduly pressurizing them for a fund and giving them some bad publicity. But eventually they did come through, and they provided a sum of $5,000.00 which was exceedingly helpful because it enabled us to purchase a field truck. Prior to this, we had to transport all our own gear in our own cars or ship it by rail and so forth. But this field truck was very, very useful and it lasted for nineteen years. We took good care of it, and so forth and it became a veteran of many operations later on (Borden Interviews 1979: 75).

Borden's account further discusses how funds were spent and at the same time provides us with a glimpse of the organization required in planning a large-scale field trip. He refers to the first of the ongoing excavations in the Fraser Canyon project:

In order to plan the investigation of such a site it would require several seasons, and the necessary funding in those years was difficult to obtain. Now I think I mentioned briefly before that the National Museum, at the suggestion of Dr. Richard S. MacNeish whom we called Scotty MacNeish, was prepared to co-sponsor fieldwork if funds could be found locally and fortunately we were able to do so. The UBC Research Committee promised a moderate amount, and then we had a promise from Dr. H.R. MacMillan, the great lumber magnate, for five years of funding. If we combined these sources with the funds that we would obtain from the National Museum we would have sufficient to cover the most necessary expenditures (Borden Interviews 1979: 205).
Necessary expenditure covered, first, the day to day needs of his crew. His following commentary reveals his careful approach to planning for these needs:

Before one can go into the field - this of course had been true already of our Tweedsmuir Park project, but it was even more necessary here because one planned a program over several years - one has to be sure of adequate equipment. And I might list some of the essentials. It does not claim to be a complete list, but it does give you some idea of what is required. We needed large tents, that is a cook tent and dining tent. The cook and dining tents are usually combined under one large tent where there are collapsible tables and chairs. We needed a pantry tent for the storage of tinned goods, flour, sugar, beans, et cetera. And then the various members of the crew, of course, needed tents as well, and usually there would be two people to one tent. A lab tent was also required because much of the preliminary work could be done in the field after, or during, hours by assigning a certain member of the crew to do this particular work. And quite often I had this on a sort of rotating basis even at night - in the evening ... And, of course, when we have a crew out in the field they must be fed; if they are young they are usually ravenous after a day's work - and even during the day. Sometimes to me it seems they are bottomless pits, difficult to fill and satisfy. So, we need cooking equipment - Coleman stoves for the tents. Inside the dining tent, Coleman lanterns and fuel for them are needed, white gas we called it. Also, cooking utensils - pots and pans and all kinds of other cooking dishes and eating utensils, bowls, plates, cups, knives, forks, spoons, et cetera ... In addition, of course, there were all the various food items required for a field project of this kind. Often the bread is baked right on the site by someone who has the know-how to do so. Canned food and other staples can always be bought wholesale through the Purchasing Department which is a necessary intermediary between the persons who plan the project and the firms that sell the goods of various kinds. The Purchasing Department always obtains a better rate than an individual and the price is better when large quantities are bought. But it is not entirely possible to circumvent purchasing material locally, and I had to make arrangements with the Super Valu store in Hope and talked with the manager about our supplies of fresh fruit, vegetables, meat, et cetera which came at least twice a week. All of this has to be pre-planned and pre-arranged, consuming a great deal of time and effort (Borden Interviews 1979: 205-210).

Second, implements used during the process of excavating had to be purchased. Borden's previous experience in 1923 as Tool Keeper for the Domill Construction Company in New York (Borden Interviews 1979: 15-16) gave him a facility with tools which he considered very useful in some of
his expeditions in British Columbia. He talks about the tools he used in the excavations in the Fraser Canyon:

We needed implements such as shovels and picks. Now, I rarely use a shovel to excavate an archaeological site. To me it's too crude a tool. But it was quite obvious that the cultural strata at this Fraser Canyon site, to which I will refer to in the future as the Milliken site, were interbedded between sort of gravel deposits. Gravels had come down the mountain side as slides and had been deposited as sand deposits by a small stream which was now extinct as it had shifted its course farther down the river. Now these gravels were quite consolidated and we just couldn't shovel them out but had to pick a way through them. As a matter of fact, I occasionally considered the use of blasting powder to loosen the gravel in order to speed things up but I was afraid of the other consequences that this might have. The faces of the trench and so forth might collapse, so the crudest tools that I cared to use were shovels and picks and crowbars in order to get through these consolidated sand deposits. Now, when it came to working in the cultural strata which were usually much looser and not so consolidated as the other strata, we used trowels, spatulas, grapefruit knives, dentist tools, and assorted brushes when we came upon artifacts to expose them. In addition, other equipment is needed. When one excavates with trowels, one may miss small items such as microblades, beads, et cetera. So everything that we excavate with trowels is moved onto a sort of dustpan-like device and then put into a bucket, and the bucket is then taken over to a screen where such material is screened. This is a sort of procedure that is still widely used. I might just mention here as an aside that, before I started fieldwork here in the Pacific Northwest, screens were not widely used. Shovels were more common, and I think we would have missed a great deal by not using screens of various degrees of coarseness and fineness.

We also used specimen bags of various sizes. Each artifact is placed in a separate bag and the bag has stamped on it the site designation, code, number of site, and then the number of the artifact. Now, the artifact number can also be stamped on it. For this we used a rubber stamp which automatically progressed. This number then correlates with the entry in the artifact record book. And it is always very important that one does not dissociate the artifact bag from the specimen or the specimen from the bag. They must always stay together and this is why I think it is very important to clean the artifacts in the field and put the final label onto the artifact also in the field. And this, of course, is the preliminary lab work. Then we are much safer, you see, because there is always a danger that we might lose this important association of the artifact and all the information regarding its provenance and so if we don't have that. In addition, of course, we need the various recording forms which
are fairly standard although they change through time and become more and more demanding as time goes on.

And then there are other necessary tools, more mundane ones, like ordinary carpenters' tools because when setting up camp there are numerous occasions for their use. So we must have a complete set of carpenters' tools (Borden Interviews 1979: 205-210).

Although he always carried first aid equipment for "minor injuries" Borden emphasizes his efforts to avoid major accidents with tools:

I always tried to avoid major injuries and cautioned my crews to put all the tools in their proper places, such as saws, hoes, or axes. And anyone who used an axe must have had experience first. Thus, I have always been able to avoid major injuries (Borden Interviews 1979: 209).

A third necessary expenditure "included cameras and film to make progress shots of the exposed tools and of the stratification of any ... cultural feature" (Borden Interviews 1979: 209). Maureen Carlson (personal communication, July 11, 1980) remembers the care with which Borden approached photography. It is interesting to note here that earlier in his life, prior to entering UCLA, he had worked in a photo-engraving shop in Los Angeles (Borden Interviews 1979: 16).

Borden was able to avoid spending a great deal of money on expensive survey instruments through the help of "cooperative people" in the Department of Engineering who supplied him with aliades, plane table, levels and tripods. The only expensive instrument he did buy was a level. This was purchased with funds obtained from H.R. MacMillan (Borden Interviews 1979: 210).

2. Student Participation

Borden's position at UBC gave him the advantage of access to students who would participate in his surveys and excavations. To begin with, fieldwork was always an integral part of course work. For example, referring to the summer of 1949 Borden writes;
Students from both Universities (UBC and the University of Washington) joined forces and began the excavation on a large site on the Whalen farm at Boundary Bay, in the south-west corner of the Fraser Delta (Borden 1950a: 242).

The initials of these students, and those who participated in subsequent surveys and excavations during the fifties and sixties, are on record in fieldwork catalogues in the Archaeology Reading Room, UBC Museum of Anthropology. Their full names are on file in the Archaeology Laboratory, Department of Anthropology and Sociology, UBC (personal communication, Moira Irvine, April 21, 1980).

This information is a measure of the importance of the contribution of students to a definition of the archaeological potential in British Columbia. This is acknowledged in Borden's publications particularly in "Notes and News" in American Antiquity between the years 1959 - 61 when he served as Contributing Editor, and in Press coverage (e.g. Anon, 1957, 1965). But the information does not distinguish between Borden's own students in Anthropology 420 and those doing graduate work, high school students who also took part in the surveys (personal communication, Moira Irvine, April 21, 1980), and students from other universities. In a general way, Borden's account gives us insights into the variety of students, but more specifically, it adds to our appreciation of the importance of students to his work by conveying insights into the following: how he recruited students, what he expected of them and the qualities they demonstrated.

Borden explains various ways in which students became involved in addition to those doing fieldwork as part of their course work at UBC:

Sometime the Head of the Department would write to me and ask whether I was going to carry out some field work in the summer and that there were a number of students available who would be interested in participating. Professor McFeat contacted me in this connection, and so I suggested that the
individual students should write to me and give me a bit of background of their previous experiences (Borden Interviews 1979: 71).

Often, students applied to Borden directly:

... Sometimes the students in distant parts would hear about a project which was being planned through various channels. For instance, Paul Tolstoy of the University of New York wrote to me and applied for the position, and he had had considerable experience, and he was an interesting person. He came from a White Russian family and was a Master in Russian and English; he was equally fluent in both languages. He was very useful at the American Museum of Natural History. When given a publication in English or in Russian, he would read it off in English which was very useful. So, because of his other experiences too, I thought he would be an interesting member to have on the expedition. Then there were some people from the University of Washington like Roy Carlson for instance. Dr. Carlson is now the Head of the Department of Archaeology at Simon Fraser University. And some other students from the University of Washington had heard about this big project which we were going to carry out, and all of them had had some previous experience, and so I adopted them, accepted them, tentatively. And some of them, of course, were our own students (Borden Interviews 1979: 71-73).

And with reference to the Fraser Canyon project:

In particular, maybe I should mention Don McLeod from the University of Toronto. He was highly recommended to us by Professor MacIwraith who was the Head of the Department of Anthropology at the University of Toronto. And another student from there was Peter Harrison. Now, Don was really great to have on the site not only because of his ability as a fieldworker, but also because of his innate cheerfulness, his interest, and the way that he had with other members of the crew. For instance, he was quite well versed in physical anthropology, and in the evenings he managed to present a sort of course in physical anthropology to the students and to the other members of the crew who took a great interest in this. Peter Harrison (see American Antiquity, Vol. 27, no. 4, 1962) also proved to be a very good and meticulous fieldworker although he had a good deal to learn as all of them did. It was interesting to see that even from some of the best universities in Canada we were able to attract crew members. Then, again, we had some people from Washington who joined us and a few other individuals who were there on a part time basis. My sons also participated for various lengths of time in that second season during which we expanded a good deal eastward from the site of the original trench, that is the 1959 trench (Borden Interviews 1979: 225-226).
Above all, Borden looked for certain important qualities. Referring to the Tweedsmuir Park excavations, he explains,

I had to be absolutely sure, particularly in Tweedsmuir Park, that this was the kind of candidate that I wanted on the project. Preferably, they should have had some experience prior to this project and also know how to handle axes and so forth so that the axe would hit the wood and not their legs (Borden Interviews 1979: 72).

The survey undertaken the previous year had warned him of the potential hazards involved in working in wilderness areas. Therefore:

In the summer of 1952, I rounded up a crew consisting of some of my own students and also students from the University of Toronto and from the University of Washington and even from the University of New York. This was an untried crew and I was somewhat uneasy about taking them into the wilderness without having some kind of a trial period first. So, before we went back to Tweedsmuir Park, in 1952, I returned with the students to Chinlac where we had excavated in 1950, and where we had not quite completed the excavation of a house. So we were then able to complete the excavation of this particular house and to complete the mapping of the house and to add to the substantial collection which we already had from this one house which amounted to over 1,500 artifacts - just from this one site. This was quite considerable particularly when one considers that most of the artifacts were stone and lithic debris from manufacture. There was a very poor bone and antler preservation although we knew from reading some of the ethnographical reports that bone and antler were very important in their manufactures. Well, I cannot go into too much detail about this. I am happy to say that most of the students proved themselves exceedingly well. Some of them needed a little extra push, and I told them that if they didn't shape up they would have to be sent back, and they pulled up their socks and performed all right (Borden Interviews 1979: 56).

This was how Borden assembled his students for the Tweedsmuir Park excavations and for all his projects. In his words:

I wanted to be absolutely sure that ... students would get along with each other first of all and then that they were dedicated workers and knew about living outdoors without getting into trouble. It was in that way that I assembled the various students for the Tweedsmuir Park project and for other projects (Borden Interviews 1979: 73).

Enthusiasm was an important quality that Borden looked for in a student:
Times have changed, you know. Students now expect fairly high wages. They work a limited number of hours, with fewer hours every week, just like others who are working by the hour and being paid. ... They want two days off and, if possible, they want a beer parlour nearby and so forth (Borden Interviews 1979: 223). ... In those days, students were still fairly idealistic and more dedicated than most of the students nowadays. Now I deliberately said most of the students because there are still some dedicated ones, but there are others who participate in a project just to get as much out of it as they can. But I have always been very fortunate in having dedicated students (Borden Interviews 1979: 206).

Some of these students were high-school students:

Jim (Baldwin) ... was very much interested in archaeology and at that time (he was 16 years old, summer 1954), had planned a career in archaeology. He had visited a number of sites that Philip Drucker had recorded in his survey of the Northwest Coast in 1938. One of these was right on the outskirts of Prince Rupert and was in an advanced stage of being destroyed. Now, Jim had carried out some systematic excavations at this site on the basis of what he had learned during his experience at Tweedsmuir Park. The site was a very large one and even the remnant chunk was large. It was also quite deep so that Jim had never been able to get down to the very bottom of it. So I decided that we would dig a test pit into the margin of the site from the surface down to the sterile subsoil. This we did and made a careful recording of stratigraphy, and right at the bottom we were able to collect the charcoal sample which later was submitted for radio carbon dating. ... Now, Jim made all his records and the artifacts that he had excavated available to the university for study and research (Borden Interviews 1979: 153-154).

Another high school student whose finds became useful was Andrew Charles. Borden is reminded of his finds at Marpole and his work at the St. Mungo site:

Oh yes, I should not forget Andrew Charles who is a member of the Musqueam Indian band. He was in high school at the time and the first Indian, I think, who participated in excavations that might pertain to his ancestors here on the coast. He did excellent work. At one time, he discovered a rather large bone knife; he had not anticipated this and it fractured as he was excavating. Consequently he was mortified by the fact that he might have been responsible for breaking it. But he had another more gratifying experience in that he excavated one of the first pestle-shaped stone hand-mauls that were actually found in situ in cultural deposits, undisturbed cultural deposits. I think this deserves to be mentioned. He never lost his interest in archaeology and anthropology. Shortly after the Marpole project, he undertook excavations on
his own at the St. Mungo site and uncovered the artifacts of a phase that was at that time unknown to us. We did not know where it would fit in. I thought possibly it would fit in somewhere between the Marpole and the latest phase, the Stslex phase. But he donated his field notes, his drawings, and profiles, et cetera, to the laboratory of archaeology at UBC (Borden Interviews 1979: 196-197).

and explains the significance of Andrew Charles' find:

... it was on the basis of this information that I directed Gay Calvert, who is now Mrs. Gay Boehm, to the St. Mungo site where she carried out very careful and systematic excavations and was able to define the St. Mungo phase. And we have several components of the St. Mungo phase now, both at that type site, St. Mungo, and also again at the Glenrose about which I may make some comments later on. So without the work of Andy Charles we might not have been able to do that. It is very interesting to note that first events that seem relatively unimportant, you know, become significant later on (Borden Interviews 1979: 197).

Even high school students had to be resourceful on survey and excavation projects. Borden refers to a project at the Kitsumkalum village site in the Central Interior:

And, finally, we did locate the village site. But, like some of the great settlements in central America, you know, in the Yucatan and so forth, the area of the village was completely overgrown and hidden under vegetation. It's really part of the dense rain forest of British Columbia, and it is fully as dense as some of the jungles in central America. We did find, at some distance away from the actual settlement, a nice place to camp by the rushing Kitsumkalum River. There was no way that we could camp near the settlement, at the settlement itself. So we pitched our tent and, of course, the Queen's Scouts enjoyed fixing up the campsite according to what they had learned as scouts. They did an excellent job, and while they were there everything was conducted in a very proper manner. ... Every day of course the garbage was quite deeply buried and covered, but during our absence the camp was visited by a black bear and he carried out excavations on his own. Everything that had been buried he excavated and ate whatever he thought was fit to eat. He became more and more of a pest because eventually he was not satisfied to excavate our garbage but actually started to raid our food material that we left there without putting it away. But the bear compelled us to lock it up in the truck every morning before we went to work. He then tried to break into the truck where he left scratch marks all over it. He ripped off the rubber, you know, around the windows, et cetera. We were really overcome about all this. We had a consultation, and the boys had an idea
that perhaps we could proceed in the way of Neanderthal or Cromagnon man. So they prepared wooden spears for each one of us and hardened the tips in the fire. The bear eventually stayed right near camp, just within about fifty yards, so we really had to take some measures. So one day when everything was ready, each one with a spear properly pointed and hardened, the four of us made a semi-circle. The bear was sitting on the fallen trunk of a tree and we approached him from four sides and set up a huge hue and cry, but this animal would not be intimidated. It just sat there and clicked its jaws in the most menacing manner. He wouldn't budge. So we were at a loss as to what to do next. Finally, Jim Baldwin came up with the idea of starting the motor, revving it, and moving the truck back and forth so as to make the bear think that we were going after him with the truck. We thought this was a good idea and we tried it out. We started the truck and it went, rhmnm, rhmnm, rhmnm, you know. We moved in the direction of the bear, and eventually he decided that the monster was going after him and he took off over the hill, and we never saw him again. So that was one of our experiences (Borden Interviews 1979: 156-160).

The bulk of the work was done by university students who came out to surveys and excavations repeatedly. Borden recalls the Marpole project (1954-1957):

The crews rarely numbered more than five, six, or seven, but in actuality a great many more individuals participated in these excavations. Some came quite regularly, others only when they could spare the time. Perhaps as many as twenty actually took part and a few of them may be of particular interest: for instance, Mike Kew, now an Associate Professor of Anthropology in the Department of Anthropology and Sociology at UBC, Mike Ames, Professor of Anthropology in our Department and also the Director of the Museum. Roy Carlson and his wife Maureen came out repeatedly, also Keith Douglas who was and still is an engineer. He was very helpful and later on he will play a part in the Fraser Canyon project. Dr. Akrigg also came out repeatedly. And he, of course, was the one who started the salvage work with me in the Fraser Delta region. John Sendey, who is now the Director of the Museum at Port Alberni, was at that time a high school student working with me at Marpole. Also, his friend, Richard Cox who is now in the Department of Anthropology at the University of Connecticut. Bob Kidd is in the Department of Historic Archaeology at Edmonton, not at the University but, I believe, at the Museum there. And, then, Diane McEachern who is the sister of my daughter-in-law. Her sister Edna married my eldest son Harvey. Diana was also a member of the Archaeology Club and took a B.C. and M.A. with us here at UBC and then later went on to obtain her doctorate at the University of Washington with the material that she had
gathered in Australia among the Australian Aborigine women. All of these people were seriously interested (Borden Interviews 1979: 195-196).

Then, the Fraser Canyon project (1959-1961):

Roy and Maureen Carlson whom, as you will recall, met and fell in love during the Tweedsmuir Park project. They again participated at Marpole, were present during our survey in the east Kootenays, and were also with me in the first year of the Fraser Canyon project. And Maureen was our cook, and Roy was our field crew member. Maureen did excellently as a cook, keeping us well fed and healthy. She didn't like cleaning fish which we occasionally obtained as a present from some of the Indians who were fishing in the canyon at the time. Then Jim Baldwin who first worked with us in Tweedsmuir Park, later on worked at the Co-op site by himself, and later still entered UBC and worked at Marpole. Now he was with us as a crew member on the Fraser Canyon project. Harvey Borden, my eldest son, helped particularly during the initial stages of the project as did my other son, Keith. They were not regular crew members, but they were exceedingly helpful.

A crew member whom I have not mentioned yet, who was participating in two of the later seasons, was Don Mitchell. He eventually was another M.A. student of mine who later took his Ph.D. degree at the University of Oregon. He is now Associate Professor of Anthropology at the University of Victoria (Borden Interviews 1979: 229).

And, commenting on the resourcefulness of these students, Borden recalls:

One thing I must mention. It happened during the second season. Our source of water was a spring which originated underneath the "rip rap" and we siphoned water by means of a pipe which had been laid by the CNR engineers. It was where we obtained our water which we laboriously carried uphill into the kitchen tent. And this, of course, was not only water for cooking but served also for other purposes. It was a very tedious thing to carry the water up the hill, and if improvement was possible it should be made. Now, it was eventually forced upon us because as the season wore on, that is the second season in 1960, the spring gave out. It was a fairly dry year and the spring was eventually reduced to a trickle. So the nearest water source - of course we could not get any water from the Fraser; it was far too deep and too steep; it was impossible to obtain it from there - was some distance down the river through the short tunnel and again some distance onward and was what was geographically named Siwash Creek. I never liked that name because Siwash, of course, is a corruption from the French sauvage, which means savage and referred to the local Indians. I couldn't
possibly use such a word, but I couldn't change its geographic name. At any rate, Siwash Creek was our nearest source of water. So in order to obtain water— we couldn't, of course, carry the water from there to camp, it was far too far away. So I had to make a special trip to Vancouver and purchase about a half-mile of plastic pipe, and this was taken up by the way-freight, and we laid out the pipe from the camp down along the tracks, through the tunnel and then to a distance far enough up the Creek, Siwash Creek, which was really a beautiful mountain stream tumbling down the rocks, to an elevation high enough so it would be higher than the elevation of our camp. And here is where we placed the water intake, that is, a screen fastened to the end of the pipe which would screen out any dirt and so forth which might plug up the pipe. So the water ran from the intake all along the tracks and then up-hill to the camp site, to our camp. And it was always good to have members on the crew who are ingenious enough to do these things. They built a special sink with an outlet and had a tap which ran into the sink. So we had continuous running water in the kitchen tent which was very convenient and most helpful in many ways (Borden Interviews 1979: 224-225).

3. Assistance from non-funding agencies

Throughout Borden's publications, I find references to the cooperation he received from non-funding and "non-excavating" agencies which clearly assisted his definition of the archaeological potential in British Columbia. Much of this cooperation was in the form of technical assistance from fellow academics in related disciplines such as Geology, Chemistry and Engineering (Borden 1955: 15, 1960: 106). Another example of a generous source of support was the Canadian National Railway (Borden 1968c: 55). And one of the most notable of all forms of assistance was that offered by those lay individuals who directed Borden's attention to sites of archaeological potential (Borden 1953-4c; Anon 1957a: 6).

a) Assistance from related disciplines

Borden's account echoes his acknowledgement of this valuable assistance mentioning in particular Ken McCallum and staff, Department of Chemistry, University of Saskatchewan, and William Mathews, Department of
Geology, UBC. Borden tells of aspects of their assistance, when referring to his first encounter with the Fraser Canyon site:

Now, this early strata, stratum, was located in sand, and the only agent that could have deposited these sands was the Fraser river. But even at maximum, the flood stage of the Fraser river at present time is something like forty feet or more below the level of this bed of sand in which these early finds were made. And this, by itself, suggested to me a considerable age. Of course, I am not a geologist but I wanted a specialist to examine the site with me and to check out this conclusion. So, I think it was early in 1957 that I persuaded Dr. William Matthews of our Department of Geology to visit the site with Mr. Milliken and myself in order to assess the situation. His examination was of tremendous help, really, in understanding the rather complex geomorphology of the site (Borden Interviews 1979: 200).

During the examination Borden collected some charcoal and entire pits of a wild cherry (*Prunus Demissa*):

I submitted this sample for radiocarbon dating to Dr. Ken McCallum at the University of Saskatoon in Saskatchewan, and this was dated. They had established the first radiocarbon dating laboratory in the Department of Chemistry there. And as I may have mentioned before, Dr. Spinks, the Head of the Department, had invited me to submit samples and, of course, I availed myself of this opportunity with great alacrity. After some time, the result on this sample came in, and I was elated at the date. Before I mention the date here, I should say that I called Dr. Matthews and asked him how long it would have taken the river to deepen its bed between forty and sixty feet as seemed indicated. And he had confirmed, you know, my earlier conclusion that this was Fraser river sand, and he thought a moment and said, "Oh, perhaps 4,000 years." So I said, "Well, Bill, you can multiply this by two. The radiocarbon age of this stratum is 8,150 years plus or minus 350." And he said, "Well, this is very interesting." And, of course, I was elated because this was the earliest date that we had at that time in the Canadian West. And it was really one of the earliest dates in all of western North America. So, this was quite important (Borden Interviews 1979: 202).

Borden also received assistance from the Department of Engineering, he especially recalls:

Keith Douglas, an engineer, who had worked with us occasionally at Marpole and who had a great interest in archaeology, came out and was extremely helpful in making a professional survey of the site, establishing accurately its elevation above sea
level and then making a map of the site (Fraser Canyon). He then helped us to lay out our trench and establish various datum and reference points. He prepared a map which was later sent out to us (Borden Interviews 1979: 214).

b) Assistance from the Canadian National Railway

During at least the first two years of his Fraser Canyon project, the Canadian National Railway was a particularly useful and generous source of support (Borden 1968c: 55). Borden explains the nature of this support:

I had to make arrangements for the transportation of all our equipment for our field crew and for our future deliveries of our supplies. So I had to go to the top in order to secure the best possible deal. The C.N.R. district manager and superintendent were, fortunately, most cooperative; we were assigned a special box-car which could be attached to the work-train which made its way up and down the river at least twice a week - usually on Tuesdays and Thursdays - although there were changes. They were fairly predictable in their time, but their schedule could vary considerably. They were easily delayed. They were work-trains which provided goods and equipment to various scattered localities along the C.N.R. right of way, both specifically to C.N.R. people who were maintaining the tracks, and also to local residents who had no other way of communicating with the outside world. So I made this arrangement for this car to be attached to the work-train which is also the way-freight or the switcher. It has a locomotive and a few box cars which contain material which is needed along the way - we had our own box car - a caboose in which the people of the work-train could live. They sleep there, they cook there, and so forth. In the early days, they even had an old passenger car attached to this train because the Indians lived along the way, and others were in these isolated localities, and they could buy tickets and make their way up and down the canyon (Borden Interviews 1979: 211-212).

... We loaded all the equipment and other supplies onto the box car, and there was very little space left after that was completed. There were literally quite a few tons to transport. Then we had to purchase round trip tickets for everyone who was to be a regular member of the crew, even temporary help who would be riding as passengers on the train. So we were very fortunate in obtaining these box cars; this was not only in the first year but they were free of charge later on as well. They were just attached to the train. The train had to go up anyhow and no one asked any questions. So when everything was ready, the train departed and made its way slowly up the river to Hope (Borden Interviews 1979: 215).
... We also had to make arrangements for the train to stop at the site which, of course, was located not at any particular locality where they usually stopped by, on the contrary, was right out in the wild country at a point which was called mile 23.1. Mile 23.1 from Port Mann, I think. Now, Port Mann was a starting point, not too far from the Pattullo Bridge, which served as a starting point for many of these trains. Earlier, I should have mentioned another point. We had no way of refrigerating food, and so the people of the work train actually volunteered to bring us a big box of ice ... and deliver mail and fresh fruit and vegetables and meat which was delivered from the Super Valu at Hope ... (Borden Interviews 1979: 210-212).

... Backing up all of this preparation were various people among whom I should mention Miss Elisabeth Bouscholte above all. She was secretary to Professor Soward who was Head of the Department of History and also Dean of Graduate Studies at the time. She had an interest in archaeology and did a great deal for us in acting as a back-up person and an intermediary for the re-routing of mail, et cetera (Borden Interviews 1979: 212).

c) Recognition of sites by lay individuals


Jack Sewell had retired to Vanderhoof from Saskatchewan, where he had been instrumental in establishing an archaeological society. Borden had heard of his flint-knapping techniques and invited him to come and demonstrate them to his students. Borden says of Sewell:

He was an interesting man. He had come from Saskatchewan where he had been instrumental in establishing an archaeological society, and he had quite a large collection from there. And, then, he had also done a good deal of surveying and surface collecting in the vicinity of Vanderhoof and in the general Nechako-Stuart River drainage area. Well, to make a long story short, he came down here and demonstrated some of his flint-knapping techniques that he had evolved on the basis of his examination of Indian artifacts, stone artifacts, that he had collected. And so he was a man who was deeply interested in Indian culture and preserving sites - not destroying them. He discouraged amateur excavations. But he was in favour of conserving and surface collecting and keeping a good record of where the artifacts came from (Borden Interviews 1979: 47).

During the course of the visit, Sewell invited Borden to look at a site which was located on the Stuart River. Borden recalls:
He told me about a site which was located on the Stuart River in the vicinity of the confluence of the Stuart River with the Nechako, and he told me that it was an apparent Carrier site which, according to Father Morice who was one of the famous missionaries of that region, had been abandoned since the first half, since about 1745, of the 18th century. He mentioned, too, that according to one of his informants the site had been, the settlement had been, raided by Chilcotin Indians who had slain virtually everyone in the village. And that the village had not been inhabited since. So Mr. Jack Sewell invited me to come up there sometime and excavate at Chinlac which is the name of the settlement (Borden Interviews 1979: 48).

In the latter part of the summer of 1950, Borden and two of his students went to Chinlac:

We had excellent cooperation from Mr. Sewell and some of his acquaintances and friends in Vanderhoof. It is a site which at that time was very difficult of access because there were no roads leading to it, and all our equipment had to be transported there by boats with a very shallow draft because in some places the Stuart River, in particular, was very, very shallow. And so they were flat-bottomed boats which were driven by propellers like those which are still being used in the Florida swamps and so forth. Well, that was very interesting. We set up camp at the site ... a very, very interesting site which was established on the rim of the steep bank that led down to the Stuart River. When one came up that bank and looked along the bank one could discern at least ten outlines, slight depressions, that were houses that stood at one time. And we prepared a map of this site. It was a clearing which was still quite obviously an artificial clearing which the Indians had made in order to use the trees in the construction of the houses and for firewood and so forth. And it was just then being re-invaded by the surrounding jack pine forest, and most of the clearing was still free. So we spent the rest of the summer excavating most of one of the houses, and the deposits were, by contrast with our deep shell middens on the coast, quite shallow. So one had to be very careful not to disturb the successive strata. We were able to isolate an historic horizon and the pre-historic horizon. In the historic horizon there were some early trade goods which included glass beads, copper foil, tubular beads and a few items of iron - even a Chinese coin. Now this established this site without question as having been still occupied during historic times and abandoned sometime later. Then, beneath the historic horizon, we came to pre-history. So this was a sort of important situation if you can go from history to pre-history at one site with artifacts, you know, of the late pre-historic period continuing into the historic period. It provides an excellent basis for comparative studies of the finds later on (Borden Interviews 1979: 48-49).
Borden emphasizes the significance of the work accomplished:

At any rate, this work there, which went incomplete as far as this one house was concerned for the time being, at least gave me some idea of what the country was like in central British Columbia and the sort of conditions one might encounter in the wilderness there. And without this experience I doubt whether I would have dared to engage in the work – the tremendous work at Tweedsmuir Park (Borden Interviews 1979: 49-50).


Borden met Castillou in 1954 on the way to Prince Rupert on the Northern Northwest Coast of British Columbia. He reminisces:

We met Judge Castillou at Cache Creek. Now, Judge Castillou was quite a character and widely known in the Cariboo and on the coast among the Indians. He had defended many of the Indians who were accused of murder and he was quite proud of the fact that none of these had ever been convicted. Now, he was very much interested in the pre-history of the region but his approach to archaeology and pre-history was somewhat of a romantic one and he often mixed fantasy and fiction with fact and so forth. Nevertheless, I am much indebted to him for calling my attention, among other things, to burial grounds near Cache Creek, and on the way north we stopped off there. We met him and also the director of the small but interesting museum at Clinton, which is north of Cache Creek, and there he pointed out to us a series of cairns. These cairns were accumulations of rocks – boulders – that the Indians had used to mark their graves. We decided to explore at least one of these graves, and in the course of doing so I learned a great deal about how to excavate one of them. It was a trial-and-error technique. The Indians buried their dead in quite a complicated way. They dug a pit about three or three and a half feet in depth and then laid the dead individual in a fairly tight-flexed position into the grave. They then built a sort of tent-like structure of many stakes over the grave and set this afire. Perhaps, and very likely probably because some of these practices carried on into ethnographic times, they also suspended some of the belongings of the dead on this superstructure. After this had been set afire, the charcoal and the ashes fell into the grave and covered the dead. And in the course of this conflagration, part of the body was often charred including occasionally even some of the bones. But, the trick then would be, or the technique in order to excavate such a burial properly, to dig around it and expose the structure which remained under ground. This we did at a later time. So this was a good learning experience (Borden Interviews 1979: 50-51).

Although Borden was indebted to Castillou for calling his attention to burial grounds, Borden's following remarks convey both his disapproval
of Castillou's display of burials in the Museum at Clinton and his feelings about his own ethical stance as an archaeologist:

From the Cache Creek burial ground we proceeded to Clinton and stopped off there at the museum, a very interesting little museum with many significant items of the early history of the Cariboo on exhibit there. I may mention here that the staff and some helpers of the museum who were under the influence of Mr. Castillou did something of which I didn't at all approve. They excavated one of these cairn burials by themselves. According to Judge Castillou these were very old graves, dating back to the late Pleistocene times, which would have made them 9,000 or 10,000 years old, you see. And the burial was on exhibit. It had been put together again with the grave additions and was in a glass cage with the legend attached to this display. I am very much opposed to having burials of that kind in the museum on display because it is offensive to the Indians. Their sensibilities must be considered, and even in recent years strong exceptions have been expressed against these practices. The museum at Kamloops had, for instance, on exhibit a burial that had been excavated by a local teacher. The Indians became very much upset about that, and through the Archaeological Sites Advisory Board we persuaded the museum to dismantle this display and to return the skeleton material to the Indian band who had control over that territory ...

(Borden Interviews 1979: 51-52).

Borden also recalls Castillou's generosity:

Because of my friendship with him, he and his wife visited our home. I remember one evening when I showed him some of the slides that I had taken in Europe, you know, the caves and so forth, and he was very much interested in that. Well, to make a long story short, in his Will he indicated that he wanted all his collections to go first of all to me and then to the University, and so that's where they are housed now. So there is a tie-up with the university again and also the museum. Well, from Williams Lake ... no there was another thing there. At Williams Lake, Judge Castillou also pointed out some pit-houses that were built along a terrace of the lake shore, so we made a recording of that site (Borden Interviews 1979: 153).

(iii) August Milliken

Milliken directed Borden to the famous Fraser Canyon site. In DJRI 3 An early site in the Fraser Canyon British Columbia (1957: 106)

Borden thanks Milliken for his assistance as guide and for his hospitality. He also acknowledges Milliken's assistance in "A late Pleistocene Pebble
Tool industry of Southwestern British Columbia" (1968). Borden refers to his help as "a splendid example of the assistance lay people can render archaeologists" (Anon 1957: 2). Borden goes on to explain:

... the Fraser Canyon project ... lasted from 1959 to 1963. But first I should mention some of the initial steps that led up to this important project. It was around 1955 or 1956 that I received a letter from Mr. August Milliken of Yale. He was a retired businessman who spent a good deal of his time exploring around the environments of Yale, often sleeping out, prospecting, and looking for evidence of recent and early occupation by the Indians. On one of these trips, he examined the work being done by the C.N.R. (Canadian National Railway) engineers at a place about 2½ miles up river from Yale where a slide had occurred. It covered the tracks of the C.N.R. right-of-way and required several days in which to clear the tracks before the trains would start moving again. Now, in order to prevent a recurrence of such a slide, the engineers had sent a bulldozer into the adjoining sediments to dig out a large, virtually circular pit deep into these sediments. Then they paved the bottom of the pit with large blocks of rock and put in a culvert which siphoned off the water and let it out beneath the tracks of the railroad. Now, when Mr. Milliken, usually called Gus Milliken although he dislikes the abbreviation to Gus, came to this site, he naturally inspected the exposed face that the bulldozer had created. He noticed a strata, a dark strata, charcoal-stained strata, which contained numerous chips, that is, the detritus of the lithic manufactures of early occupants of the site. There were several of these strata; one of them in particular was quite deep, approximately twenty feet from the surface.

and continues:

Now, upon this discovery, he wrote me a letter and invited me to come up and have a look at this site. I think it was sometime in 1956 that Jim Baldwin, who had been with me at Tweedsmuir Park and then again at Marpole, went up with me to visit Mr. Milliken. He rowed us across the river where we were turned around in the whirlpools several times to be carried much farther down the river than where we had started. But we made it across quite safely, pulled out the boat, and hiked up the tracks past the South Yale CNR station, then through the 2,000 foot long tunnel through a mountain spur which juts out westward towards Yale and diverts the river along this spur. So we passed through this long tunnel and then another 2½ miles along the winding track of the CNR right-of-way to the place where the slide had occurred. During this first visit we cleared and straightened up some of the faces of the exposure. I noted that the earliest evidence of occupation was about twenty feet from the surface, and we recovered some chipping detritus from that and bits of charcoal. And also something else which I hadn't known at the
time, but which came to light later after examining some of the bits of charcoal under magnification, was that it was obviously the pips of some wild fruit. I gave these to Dr. Taylor and Dr. J. Kuijt, who identified them as pits of a wild cherry for which the Latin name is Prunus demissa (Borden Interviews 1979: 198-200).

It was the charcoal and the cherry pits that he sent to McCallum for carbon dating and which indicated that, in Borden's words, "the potentials of this site were great." Borden called the site Milliken after "Mr. Milliken, the discoverer of the site" (Borden Interviews 1979: 201).

Borden's publications, as representative of his definition, give us a glimpse of the extent of the energy he expended in this urgent process by dint of sheer volume. Another way of estimating this is put forward in Newsletter (Anon, 1978) which suggests,

Some conception of the magnitude and dedication of Carl's efforts may be gleaned in the fact that he has examined 10,000 archaeological sites in British Columbia and has contributed 80,000 artifacts to the New Museum of Man in Vancouver (Anon 1978: 1).

His account, however, adds to our understanding of the significance of this process by showing that Borden's urgent definition of the archaeological potential in British Columbia was negotiated in the intellectual community of UBC. A consideration of the dimensions important to this process of negotiation illustrates not only how he used the opportunities that his position at UBC offered him, but also his emerging sense of academic responsibility towards salvage archaeology. This is most clearly demonstrated in his approach to his students. Not only was sound scholastic work incorporating "careful and systematic investigations" and "good meticulous" fieldwork important, but also, as his account evokes, a sense of commitment to archaeology. It was important that students "proved themselves" and were "fairly idealistic" and "seriously interested." By instilling this sense of academic responsibility in his students, Borden
ensured the further dissemination of archaeological knowledge in British Columbia. Some students carried it with them to other centres of learning in British Columbia. For example, Don Mitchell to the University of Victoria and Roy Carlson to Simon Fraser University, Vancouver. Others as we shall see, carried it to government positions critical to the establishing of legislation to ensure the protection of the archaeological potential in British Columbia.
CHAPTER THREE

CALLING PUBLIC ATTENTION TO THE
ARCHAEOLOGICAL POTENTIAL IN BRITISH COLUMBIA

As I noted in chapter two, Borden's position at UBC placed him in a strategic position from which he was able to work towards a definition of the archaeological potential in British Columbia. Although this definition was important to the establishment of systematic archaeology, it was not enough to stop the oblation of archaeological sites. Borden stresses that in the 1950's the large scale destruction "of uninvestigated ancient sites through industrial development, road construction, power reservoirs, urban expansion, farming, and the lumber industry" continued (Borden 1977: 7). It gradually became clear to him that it would be necessary to call attention to the urgent need for legislation in British Columbia to protect archaeological remains (Borden 1955: 19).

Borden's early concern with legislation is reflected in the nature of the contents of his personal files dealing with the preservation of sites and labelled Legislation (see C.E. Borden Papers, UBC Archives). Copies of acts, for the preservation of ancient sites, already passed in the U.S.A. and Canada, are interspersed with letters and personal comments. Amongst them, is a copy (see copy in appendix 2) of the "Historic Objects Preservation Act" (Chapter 145, Revised Statutes of British Columbia, Victoria, Queen's Printer 1948) on which Borden had scribbled the following:

The historic objects Pres. Act should be amended so as to require archaeological salvage operations to be carried out wherever important losses may occur through construction work, flooding by reservoirs etc. Costs of salvage work should be included in the overall cost of a project (C.E. Borden Papers, UBC Archives).
This concern eventually led Borden to join forces with Wilson Duff, Provincial Anthropologist, and Willard Ireland, Provincial Archivist, in an intensive long term campaign to protect archaeological sites and to call attention to the urgent need for legislation (Borden 1977; Carlson 1979; Ed. note to Borden 1955; Anon 1978). Simonson (personal communication, April 10, 1980) and Carlson (personal communication, July 10, 1980) suggest that Duff, in his capacity as civil servant, was the prime mover in the passage of the Archaeological and Historic Sites Protection Act in 1960. Borden, as an academic, was an outsider. Both Duff and Ireland could not directly involve him. From the resources at my disposal, I suggest, however, that Borden's university position is important to an understanding of his special contribution to the campaign. It placed him in a unique position from which he could proceed first, to raise public awareness to this urgent necessity for an act, and second, to engage in activities to maintain public interest.

I. Raising Public Awareness

Borden embarked on an intensive course of action to raise public awareness to the necessity of legislation. The Editor of Indian Time comments:

Dr. Borden has been indefatigable in his efforts to preserve at least some part of the Marpole Midden for research. Public interest in the project is increasing as the facts become known (Borden 1955: 9).

This was accomplished because Borden was in a position to freely speak his mind on the issue of legislation and was, therefore, able to inspire and persuade people to lobby for him. Duff and Ireland were limited as to the public pressure they could bring to bear on the matter. Their jobs were at stake. Borden was free to pressure the government through public channels. Without this pressure, the act may not have been passed
Borden recalls one of the ways in which he brought his concerns to public attention: "I gave lectures to numerous service clubs, to schools, wherever they wanted to hear me." Letters thanking Borden for these lectures (C.E. Borden Papers, UBC Archives) are an indication of the interest with which they were received. For example, on March 2, 1953, he received a letter from the Council of the Canadian Clubs of B.C. to arrange a date for a further talk in the fall of that year. A letter from the B.C. Mountaineering Club (April 9, 1953) thanks him for his "informative and interesting talk," and a letter from the Vancouver Natural History Society (July 3, 1951) thanks him for his "very excellent and interesting address" (C.E. Borden Papers, UBC Archives).

In addition to these lectures, and as early as 1948 (Borden 1948), Borden gave talks over the radio. These were not limited to Canada as he points out:

Incidentally, I even gave at least one talk over "Hier Spricht Canada" that is the "Voice of Canada" in Germany. So that was beamed to Germany and was very well received there. I understand that it was re-broadcast a number of times there (Borden Interviews 1979: 74).

Besides encouraging a general public interest in the archaeological potential, Borden's active concern inspired and encouraged others to lobby for the cause. As previously recorded in chapter two (p.3), Borden recalls always trying to deal fairly with reporters and notes, "We were very fortunate in having the press and media on our side" (Borden Interviews 1979: 74).

Both The Vancouver Province and The Vancouver Sun showed great interest and informed the public of Borden's efforts (see, for example,
"Archaeological Sites need protection," and continues:

"There is an urgent need for legislation to protect B.C.'s archeological sites, which are rapidly disappearing," Dr. Charles E. Borden of UBC told a capacity audience at a Vancouver Institute meeting Saturday night.

"Archaeological importance to the Western Hemisphere of the Pacific Northwest region is second only to the ancient civilizations of Central and South America," said Dr. Borden, an anthropology professor who has spent several months excavating at the Marpole midden.

"Unless our archeological sites are preserved, there will be a serious gap in our knowledge of early history of the northwest coast."

Dr. Borden claimed that the sites are being destroyed by expanding cities and industrial projects. He said that a "strongly worded petition" had been sent to the Provincial Government last year "but it was ignored" (Anon 1956a).

Further, as Borden points out, "even editorials appeared in the newspapers" (Borden Interviews 1979: 74). An editorial by Elmore Philpott in the Tuesday, October 11, 1955, edition of The Vancouver Sun reports on Borden's work at Marpole, a site which, in Borden's estimation (1955), was among the most important in the Fraser delta. Philpott writes:

"There is sensational new evidence just dug up by the noted archaeologist, Dr. Charles E. Borden of the University of B.C., that Vancouver is among the oldest sites of human habitation in Canada - perhaps the oldest of all.

Chiding the public for ignoring their heritage, he continues by reminding his readers that elsewhere this find would inspire action:

"When I heard about this amazing find right on Vancouver's original front doorstep I thought to myself: "What would the Norwegians do if they had made that find?" This summer in Oslo, I saw a building which houses some of the most famous ancient galleys in which Norsemen crossed the seas ... if the City Fathers of Oslo had our Marpole midden, they would make a
tourist attraction of it.

and suggests:

the site of the Marpole midden would make a fine little park ... a visible reminder to the vast numbers of passers-by that at this very spot where the mighty Fraser meets the mighty western sea there were human settlements very many years ago (Philpott 1955).

Public appreciation of the efforts of the press is reflected in the following extracts from a letter sent to the editor of The Vancouver Sun (R. Rowe Holland 1955) on behalf of the "Totem-Land" Society:

Your work to date in awakening public opinion to "the tragedy of the Midden" being sacrificed, indeed, to immediate commercial desires, is worthy of the highest commendation. I can only fervently hope, along with Dr. Borden, that your efforts may be successful (C.E. Borden Papers, UBC Archives).

But it was not only the local press that generated public interest in the campaign for saving and protecting archaeological sites in British Columbia. Borden continues:

Much of what the local newspapers published was picked up by newspapers in the various provinces across the country ... even the Christian Science Monitor picked it up, and the New York Times I think published two or three articles on this and always stressed that we were urging the Government to pass legislation that would provide protection for archaeological sites and that they should also provide funds for the necessary surveys and follow-up excavations (Borden Interviews 1979: 74).

The New York Times, Sunday, July 3, 1955, reports on the Fraser Midden:

Dr. Borden hopes that he and colleagues in other parts of Canada eventually will persuade authorities to pass legislation protecting archaeological sites (Anon 1955).

Besides securing the help of the press, Borden's determined efforts inspired others to lobby for him. The following resolution sponsored by the Marpole Chamber of Commerce was submitted to the Quarterly Meeting of the Associated Boards of Trade of the Fraser Valley and Lower Mainland at White Rock, British Columbia, September 14, 1955.
WHEREAS recent emergency excavations carried out by The University of British Columbia in the Marpole area have resulted in the discovery of valuable prehistoric relics, ancient dwellings, burials, etc., and

WHEREAS such archaeological remains would be irretrievably lost in the event the property were sold for building purposes without efforts being made to salvage and to restore same and

WHEREAS in the past some of these ancient sites have been lost beyond recovery

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Associated Boards of Trade of the Fraser Valley and Lower Mainland urge the Government of the Province of British Columbia to place on the Statute Books an act designed to ensure the preservation of this and other similar sites throughout the Province as records of National History and to provide means for adequate scientific investigation of such sites (C.E. Borden Papers, UBC Archives).

It was regularly moved, seconded, and carried "that the above resolution be approved and adopted and sent forward to the proper Department of the British Columbia Provincial Government for consideration and action" (C.E. Borden Papers, UBC Archives).

This kind of response is echoed in the following extract of a letter sent to Borden from C.R.W. Rogers on behalf of the Natural History Society of British Columbia (September 24, 1955).

I thought you might be interested in receiving a copy of the letter we recently sent to the City Council concerning your work at the Marpole Midden this past summer.

We have not as yet heard from the Council, but I will send you a copy of their reply when we hear from them.

We were all very interested in your work and certainly hope that the City will consider making a park of this area (C.E. Borden Papers, UBC Archives).

The letter sent to the City Council (September 13, 1955) begins by stating that at a recent executive meeting of the Natural History Society, considerable discussion was given to the work being conducted by Borden in the excavation of the Marpole midden. It continues:
We understand that some thought is being given to keep these three lots as a city park and certainly wish to take this opportunity to express to you how solidly our Society is in accord with this proposal.

In commending Borden's efforts and his "painless work," this letter puts forward a strong argument in Borden's support by addressing itself to the kinds of issues to which any council would be morally committed. It notes:

This area should certainly be set aside as a permanent memorial for the people of Vancouver. It would seem from the work being done that this spot may contain some of the earliest history of men known in B.C. We understand outlines of an Indian long house has been uncovered which dates back to the start of the Christian era or earlier. As well as this, remains of a woman and child have been found and many thousands of artifacts.

And recommends:

All these things we believe would be most interesting to the people of this city if a small museum could be built there to exhibit them and explain not only what a midden is, but also give the history of these early places. If these three lots were reserved now for a city park our feeling is that it might then be possible to preserve all these relics for the enlightenment of our present and future citizens.

May we therefore earnestly treat you to give very serious consideration to the permanent preservation of this area by reserving it indefinitely as a city park (C.E. Borden Papers, UBC Archives).

The Marpole midden was not saved. During the course of the interviews Borden, still fighting undiscerning progress, explains:

I should mention something about the ultimate, sad, really very tragic tale of the Marpole site. That is, what was left of the site, ... was overwhelmed by so-called progress. This means the extension of the beer parlour of the Fraser Arms Hotel westward over the site. And then in 1958, because of the huge beer parlour (I think it was the largest on the lower mainland), and the need for further parking space, this parking area was then expanded also to the west and eventually covered what was left of the site (Borden Interviews 1979: 197).

He also calls into question the decision making ability of the city council:
So this is rather sad and is not a favourable reflection of the councilmen of Vancouver who permitted a decision of this kind to be made (Borden Interviews 1979: 201).

Despite the setback at Marpole, Borden's efforts in the campaign for the protection of sites continued to inspire members of the public to lobby after support of an "antiquity act." Even English geologists became part of the campaign. The following is an extract from a letter (October 14, 1959) sent to Borden from A.C. Dalton, a member of the Geologists Association of London, England.

I have today written to Premier Bennett the enclosed letter in support of your work and the adoption of the "Antiquity Act." Also I have written the Van. Nat. Hist. Soc. asking for their views and support, also the Audubon Soc. of Canada.

Dalton continues to suggest to Borden how the campaign might strategically proceed:

My experience is such that as many personal letters as possible and as from a wide a field as possible is often of some influence, which perhaps you could augment.

I trust you will approve of my action, and wishing you every success (C.E. Borden Papers, UBC Archives).

Borden's position at UBC allowed him the opportunity to proceed with the campaign in this way, urging "the public and government that they had a moral obligation to see that ... unrenewable resources were not wasted" (Borden Interviews 1979: 64), and pointing out an important dimension to this obligation:

In many ways we also had an obligation towards the Indians because, although we personally could not be held responsible, at least the ancestors of ours that had come here first had done their best to destroy the Indian culture. Whether they had wanted to or not they had committed genocide, you know, through the introduction of diseases to which the Indians had no immunity and so forth. But the most important part was that the Indian culture was undermined and the Indians were demoralized. We had an obligation to at least salvage the pre-history of these Indians which, to some extent, then could be used in perhaps recovering some of the later ethnographic culture (Borden Interviews 1979: 64).
That Borden's position allowed him the opportunity to influence the press and an interested public to lobby for him is an important factor in the intensive campaign for legislation to protect archaeological sites. His most significant contribution, however, was the influence he exerted over his students. As former student Don Abbott points out (personal communication, July 11, 1980), "we may not have agreed with everything Borden said, but we were influenced by him."

As stressed in chapter two, one of Borden's major aims was to instil in his students an interest in salvage archaeology. His efforts were rewarded in the interest his students took in the campaign for legislation. A letter to Duff (October 26, 1955), informing him of the formation of the Archaeology Club at UBC, conveys Borden's hopes that the club would participate in the campaign. He tells Duff that one of the main objectives of the club is to campaign for an antiquity act. He writes:

At present enthusiasm is running high. I wonder how long it will last. At any rate, they seem to be off to a good start (C.E. Borden Papers, UBC Archives).

This enthusiasm lasted. In 1959, the UBC Archaeology Club sent a letter (November 14, 1959) to the Editors of The Vancouver Sun thanking them for the recent articles and an editorial calling attention to "our unique and irreplaceable archaeological resources;" and agreeing with The Vancouver Sun that the provincial legislature should at its next session "consider and pass an Antiquity Act designed to permit sufficient time for systematic investigation of sites threatened with destruction, and to provide financial support for such research." The letter suggests that, "The law should stipulate that funds for archaeological investigations be included as part of the construction costs," and points out that "such funds, as indicated by data from the United States, will never amount to more than a
small fraction of one per cent of the total construction cost." The letter then goes on to stress:

The Antiquity Act will in no way impede the economic growth of the Province or the progress of our own culture. Yet, it will assure that future generations are not deprived, through our mismanagement, of the opportunity to acquire a knowledge of the past. It must not be said of us that we were a self-centered, materialistic people who, oblivious to both past and future, thoughtlessly exploited the resources of our country and, thus, showed ourselves to be unfit guardians of the heritage entrusted to us (C.E. Borden Papers, UBC Archives).

Some of Borden's students later went on to take critical positions for the future of archaeology in the Province. Among the students who took his message of salvage archaeology seriously was Wilson Duff, who Borden describes as:

A brilliant young man who ... had been with the Royal Canadian Air Force during the war ... he did brilliantly at least in my part of the course, and I know from Dr. Hawthorn that he also excelled in other areas of Anthropology (Borden Interviews 1979: 24).

Duff graduated from UBC with a B.A. in the spring of 1949. By 1950, in his capacity as Provincial Anthropologist, he was already putting forward suggestions for legislation in response to a request by D. Leechman, Chairman of the Canadian Museum Association for the Protection of Archaeological Sites. Duff's suggestions were:

1. Some provision to set important sites aside and make it against the law to touch them without permission. This would stop the use of such sites as gardens or sources of free shell, and would also keep out pot-hunters and unqualified archaeologists.

2. Provision to make some sites permanent monuments.

3. Some control over outside archaeologists who work in the Province. If we made them get a permit to dig, we could keep tab on what's going on, get a copy of their reports, and above all, have some say in what happens to the artifacts they uncover. I think a representative share of the artifacts should stay in B.C.

As for ethnological materials, I think we should have some power to keep outstanding articles and collections in B.C.
Borden's reaction to these suggestions is reflected in his letter to Hawthorn (November 10, 1950), who, with Duff's knowledge, had written to Borden for any additions to these suggestions that he might think of.

In principle, Borden agreed with the suggestions. He writes:

I have given some thought to the proposed legislation for the protection of archaeological sites. Needless to say, I am much pleased that such legislation is being contemplated. In general, I am in agreement with Wilson Duff's suggestions. It is good that every effort be made to protect important sites and to save them for future investigation.

However, he makes two proposals in response to Duff's suggestions. First, doubting that legislation aimed at protecting archaeological sites "would seriously affect the decision as to whether the reservoirs needed for the power are to be created," he proposes that agencies contemplating development on sites of archaeological potential should provide funds to bear the costs of emergency surveys and excavations. He continues:

Similarly, the granting of permission to build factories or other structures at places where sites are located, should be made contingent on the provision by the interested parties of funds for the investigation of such sites before construction commences. 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.

Second, he proposes:

Any legislation aiming at the "control over outside archaeologists" should be phrased with the utmost caution. As it is there are enough factors which act as deterrents to archaeologists to work in these parts. We should not add to them. The archaeology of the Northwest will never be adequately known without much assistance from qualified workers from the U.S.A. and elsewhere. Expeditions should be permitted to take out all finds for thorough study, although arrangements might be made for the return of certain items after the study and the report have been completed (C.E. Borden Papers, UBC Archives).

Legislation did not occur for some ten years. But in the meantime, Borden and Duff cooperated in the task of salvage archaeology, meeting each situation as it arose. As Borden points out (Borden 1977: 5), Duff
as a civil servant learned of government plans for industrial development long before public announcements were made, and was able to make salvage plans with Borden’s help before it was too late.

One of their first cooperative ventures was the Tweedsmuir Park project. As detailed in Chapter two, Duff had informed Borden of the then Liberal government’s intention to grant the Aluminium Company of Canada a licence to construct a dam in the gorge of the Nechako River. As Borden recalls (Borden Interviews 1979: 63) aside from the scientific results obtained by the survey and the subsequent excavations, a number of precedents were set and several important points established:

1. Archaeologists must be given sufficient lead time to plan (a) adequate regional site surveys in threatened areas and subsequently (b) problem oriented investigations at selected key sites.

2. Whenever the Provincial Government is involved in industrial and similar developments, it has a moral obligation to provide funds for surveys, to assess the archaeological resources in the affected areas and, if necessary, for follow-up salvage operations. Finally,

3. Private companies are similarly obligated (Borden Interviews 1979: 63).

And as he further comments:

Now, it was on these three main points that Wilson Duff and I then based an intensive campaign during the 50’s for the establishment of legislation that would protect archaeological sites and which would obligate government agencies and private firms to support salvage work – survey first and then salvage work to follow if the need should arise (Borden Interviews 1979: 63).

Letters exchanged between Borden and Duff on the Frobisher-Ventures project exemplifies this cooperation. In 1954, Northwest Power Industries Ltd., which is a branch of the Frobisher-Ventures companies, planned to build a dam on the Lewes River at Miles Canyon, four miles south of Whitehorse, Yukon Territories. The rising water above the dam was
expected to flood a total of 636 miles of lake and river margins, 399 of which were in British Columbia. Duff in a letter to Borden (October 20, 1954) had learned that Frobisher-Ventures were eager to improve their public relations and might be approached to finance a definite program of work prior to the building of the dam. He also felt it would be better if the University were to make the approach since the government and the Company were in the midst of negotiations (C.E. Borden Papers, UBC Archives).

Borden's reply to Duff's letter reflects his recognition of his academic responsibility in cooperating with Duff. In his letter (October 7, 1954), he writes:

The Frobisher-Ventures project, of which you write in your letter, has been much on my mind and conscience. As you will understand, I have been most reluctant to become involved in such a large undertaking so far from home base, particularly when so many important projects further South demand attention, - not to speak of work already done which needs to be written up. But, of course, Harry and you are right in suggesting that the University of British Columbia is the logical institution that should take a leading part in the organizing and arranging for the financing of salvage operations in the areas to be flooded. Well, I'll do my best, - but I'll need help.

He continues:

First of all, I am as yet not acquainted with the details of the project. I should know what and how many miles of lake and river margins will be flooded. I need to know this so that I can give an estimate of the funds that will be required to carry out an archaeological survey of the area. I would appreciate it if you could give me any information on this that you may have. I'll try to find out what I can. As soon as I know, I'll prepare a brief with a request for funds for this preliminary investigation. Further requests will have to be based on the results of the survey (C.E. Borden letter files, Division of Archaeology, B.C. Provincial Museum).

Some two months later, Borden received a letter from Duff (December 13, 1954) informing him:
Things have developed somewhat farther on the Frobisher business. A few weeks ago, as a result of my memo to the minister on the need for archaeology in this area, he asked me to prepare an outline and budget for the work that should be done. I did so, and he sent it to Mr. Summers, who in turn has sent it to the Comptroller of Water Rights. Now when Frobisher apply for their water license, they will be told that they have to provide funds for archaeology before they flood the area. (Maybe that is too strong a statement - at least the subject will enter into the negotiations.) (C.E. Borden letter files, Division of Archaeology, B.C. Provincial Museum)

The cooperation between Duff and Borden continued throughout the fifties until in Borden's words:

Gradually the sustained public campaign by Wilson and myself for legislation to protect British Columbia's archaeological resources, combined with growing public pressure, was beginning to have its impact on the politicians in Victoria at that time (Borden 1977: 7).

In a letter to Borden (October 11, 1957) Duff writes of the interest shown by The Honourable Ray Williston, Minister of Lands and Forests, in salvaging archaeological resources threatened with destruction by the Wenner-Gren power project on the Peace River:

I phoned Mr. Williston yesterday to ask if any consideration had been given to archaeology. He said that none had, but that if I wrote him a brief memo on it he would see what he could do. He seemed confident that something should and could be done (C.E. Borden Papers, UBC Archives).

Duff then proceeded with a memorandum to Williston (October 10, 1957) reminding him:

It is now a general practise in North America to recognize the obligation of studying prehistoric remains which are to be destroyed by industrial developments, and many places have well-organized programmes of salvage archaeology, backed up by legislation.

and, stressing that "in B.C. we have not yet faced up to this general problem posed by our rapid development, and we have to meet each situation as it arises," he went on to write:
The Peace River project will completely obliterate all prehistoric remains in the river valleys which form the reservoir area. Since early man lived mostly in the valleys, the flooding will in effect destroy almost all of the remains in the whole general area. Since no archaeology has been done in the area we do not know what it contains, but its potential importance is very great. It was one of the first areas of B.C. to be free of glacial ice, and probably contains traces of very early hunting populations of 10,000 or more years ago. Also the Trench itself is a natural migration route of early man, joining the heart of the continent with the north.

We cannot predict exactly how much archaeology will have to be done, but the following will serve as a rough guide. The present staffs of the Provincial Museum and University could probably not do more than provide overall direction to the project. Funds must be provided to obtain qualified field workers. The necessary surveys and excavations would probably take three seasons. Provision should be made for a supervising archaeologist, for summer field crews, for equipment, and for expenses. The entire reservoir area should be surveyed on foot. The amount of excavation necessary will depend on what is found, but in general it should be enough to provide an adequate sample of the characteristic remains of the area and to provide more thorough investigations of any sites of outstanding age or other importance. Some provision should be made for the study and analysis of the excavated materials and the publication of results. The total costs over the three years would probably be in the order of $50,000.

I understand you to say that you would attempt to obtain some action on this matter. Needless to say, if we can assist by providing further information, or if there are any other steps you think we might take, we will be anxious to do so. Many thanks for your interest so far (C.E. Borden Papers, UBC Archives).

Legislation did not occur for another three years but eventually, in 1959, after consulting with Borden (Borden 1977: 7), Duff conferred with the legal advisors of the provincial government and worked out the draft of British Columbia's first Archaeological and Historic Sites Protection Act. It seems that beyond this point, Borden was not involved with the details of the Act. In January 1960, a memorandum which Borden prepared for N.A.M. MacKenzie, President of the University of British Columbia, suggests that Borden seriously doubted the success of this attempt. He writes:
In order to assure the provision of funds for archaeological salvage operations, it will be necessary to place on the statute books of this Province an Antiquity Act designed to deal with emergency situations of this sort. Over the past few years, sporadic attempts have been made by individuals, organizations, and the press to call to the attention of the Provincial Government the need for such an act. All these attempts have failed. Obviously, a more concerted effort is needed to achieve the objective.

Borden's letter suggests that he saw the responsibility of effecting this concerted effort as lying with the University. He continues:

It is for this reason that I propose to you that a committee be formed whose task it will be (a) to prepare a brief, outlining in some detail the need for legislation to assure the study of archaeological sites prior to their destruction, and (b) to present a draft of an Antiquity Act that will provide for all foreseeable emergencies.

In my opinion, such a committee should include:

(a) A member of the UBC Administration;
(b) A legal expert;
(c) Someone conversant with plans for power development in British Columbia;
(d) A geographer;
(e) Someone with experience in conservation measures;
(f) The Indian Commissioner of British Columbia;
(g) An archaeologist

(C.E. Borden Papers, UBC Archives).

The Act was, however, passed in March. Borden responded by letter (March 19, 1960) to Duff's note informing him of this event:

Many thanks for your note of March 18 and the copies of Bill No.67. It is wonderful, but still hard to believe that it is actually law now.

The papers have been most neglectful in reporting what was going on in the Legislature. I had no confirmation that the Bill was passed until your letter arrived to-day. The Province carried a brief summary of the Act after its first reading. I also notified the Sun reporter on the Campus at that time, but the paper - after years of plugging for such legislation - evidently lost interest once there was a real chance that the bill would pass.

I had an opportunity to "make pleased noises" about the act over CBUT (6:45 p.m. news, March 9) and on CBC 'Byline' (Trans-Canada, Friday, March 11, 5:40 p.m.). I understand transcriptions of both were requested by the Premier's Office.
The next step, I suppose, is the formation of the Advisory Board. How do we get the Minister to get the Lieutenant Governor to do so?

Once again, Many thanks! (C.E. Borden Papers, UBC Archives)

The Act did make provision for the establishment by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council of an Archaeological Sites Advisory Board (ASAB). The membership of the board was to compose "the Director of the Provincial Museum or his representative (Wilson Duff), the Provincial Archivist (W.E. Ireland), and a representative from the appropriate department of the University of British Columbia (C.E. Borden). Also included was the Deputy Provincial Secretary (L.J. Wallace)" (Borden 1977: 8).

During the course of the interviews that I conducted with Borden, I asked him how he felt about the ten year wait for a protection act:

Well, that is an interesting question. Of course we would have preferred to have been successful earlier than we were, but you must remember that there had been a change of government from Liberal to Socred. I shouldn't just say Socred, I should say Social Credit Party. And, of course, they had to first of all establish themselves and organize the Government as they wanted to....

He went on to stress that the constant continuous strategy he had employed to achieve legislation was essential:

It is not enough to say it once, but you have to say it again, and again, and again. It is just like advertising. I mean, without advertising some of these companies wouldn't be able to sell their products. And without our sustained campaigning we wouldn't have been able to have this legislation introduced and passed in Parliament. ....

And as he pointed out, the subsequent legislation was worth the wait:

So you might say it's an unreasonable length of time, but it was a first. It was a pioneering first. And after this Act had been passed in British Columbia, it was picked up by various provinces in Canada, and they very soon passed Acts that were worded in a very similar manner to our Act. And even though, as for instance in Alberta, there were other later developments, at least this is the way they originally established their legislation. ....
Above all, Borden's reply conveys his understanding of his academic responsibility to educate the government and the general public to the importance of salvaging what was left of the cultural heritage. He says:

But not only they (government) but the general public needed to be educated to the needs of this and persuaded that not only schools, roads, and railroads, were important but that it was also necessary to salvage whatever was left of the cultural heritage, the pre-historic heritage, of Canada (Borden Interviews 1979: 77-78).

2. Maintaining Public Awareness

Even as a pioneering first, the Act had its limitations. Borden recalls:

Now our legislation, too, had to be modified. The Act of 1960 was not, by any means, perfect. It had its good and weak sides, but it needed teeth. And in order to enforce the Act, particularly when it came to the destruction of sites, you know, piping agencies and corporations, because any delay was costing them money, I always stressed the need for sufficient lead time and that the archaeologists be informed a fair amount of time ahead of when a development was going to go ahead. In addition to that, we always had the problem of vandals who were excavating sites illegally in order to retrieve souvenirs and goodies from sites, particularly burial sites. All of this, of course, was illegal, but we had no means really of enforcing it (the Act). And not only vandals would go ahead and do this but also some construction workers, contractors, and so forth. If they, for instance, accidentally came upon a burial site, rather than report it as they were supposed to do, they would try to cover it up and just get rid of the burials and go ahead. Of course, this was very bad, not only because it made for very poor relations with the Indians when they found out about that, but it was a loss of important information on these cultural remains (Borden Interviews 1979: 78-79).

Borden also realized that public interest in the Act had to be maintained, and saw it as his responsibility to see that it was. He continues:

We were able to obtain some cooperation from the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, and they added a sort of liaison who sat in on our board meetings. This was a very good thing because they then informed all the various local R.C.M.P. establishments of the existence of the Act and what they should do; what the individual officers should do when they came upon illegal activities of this kind so that the individuals could be prosecuted. Now, when this became known, it was something of
a deterrent at any rate.

But in a sense the Government itself in its various vicious construction projects wrought the greatest devastation. They were working with big machines, you know, and they would plough through a pit house village site in short order. We saw this with great concern. So I wrote to the Honourable Mr. Black, who was the Provincial Secretary at the time. That was in the sixties. And I exerted all the pressure that I could (Borden Interviews 1979: 79).

Borden's files contain two letters written to the Honourable Wesley Black. One (August 11, 1971) deals with the ASAB's proposed amendment of the 1960 act, and the other (October 25, 1971) informs Black of the ASAB's unanimous recommendation that 'Mr. Simonsen's appointment as Provincial Archaeologist be made permanent' (C.E. Borden Papers, UBC Archives).

The task of enlisting help to lobby for effective legislation was not over. During the sixties, Borden's efforts to see the existing act amended were aided by yet another group composed of interested amateur archaeologists: The Archaeological Society of British Columbia.

Borden's feelings about amateur archaeologists were ambivalent. As I have pointed out in chapter two, Borden acknowledges the help of amateur archaeologists such as Sewell and Milliken. But Carlson (personal communication, July 11, 1980) suggests that, at this point, besides these persons, Borden had very little time for amateurs. Borden's files contain a manuscript titled 'Middens not for Muddling: The Integration of Professional and Amateur Archaeology in B.C.' In this he writes:

We have great need of more Jack Sewells, Gus Milliken, and Jim Baldwins. Their activity contrasts sharply with the archaeological atrocities perpetrated by those irresponsible and selfish individuals who rape and devastate archaeological deposits to private gain and pleasure (C.E. Borden Papers, UBC Archives).

Borden was suspicious of amateurs (Bunyan, 1978: 14-16). He felt strongly that archaeology should be left to the professionals (personal communication, D. Abbott, April 11, 1980). A letter (March 15, 1955) to the South Peace
Junior-Senior High School conveys his feelings on the subject:

Dr. Hawthorn has asked me to supply, if possible, some of the information you requested and which may be helpful to the members of your recently formed archaeology club. While as a rule, we try to dissuade untrained amateurs from actual digging for fear they might destroy important information, this stricture does not apply to sites which are threatened with immediate destruction by industrial development, road construction, etc.

Amateurs can make significant contributions by carrying out our emergency salvage excavations. The thing to remember in connection with archaeological specimens is not so much what you find but how you find them. It is important to know their chronological position and the cultural, and in the case of very ancient finds, the geological context in which they occur. ...

If you hear of the fossil remains of mammoth or other extinct mammals being exposed in some gravel pit by a road cut or by a stream cutting into a bank, etc., see if you can find any hints, either chips or manufactured stone objects definitely associated with the animal remains. If you do, do not dig but notify us. Take photographs and, if possible, have a competent geologist study the situation (C.E. Borden Papers, UBC Archives).

In 1966, the Archaeological Society of British Columbia (which I shall in future refer to as the ASBC) was formed at the suggestion of Carlson (Ennenburg 1975: 11), who with Duff felt that amateurs had an important role to play in the development of systematic archaeology (personal communications, R. Carlson, July 11, 1980; B. Simonsen, April 10, 1980). I suspect that Borden came to realize that the ASBC was an important vehicle for the dissemination of archaeological concerns to maintain lay interest. Carlson (personal communication, July 11, 1980) adds that Borden saw the difference between two kinds of amateurs, the relic hunters and the intellectuals. Members of the ASBC had an intellectual interest in archaeology. They could be trusted. For example, when the Delta Rockhounds' application to sift the Delta Midden was removed on Borden's advice, the Delta Municipal Council said future digs would be conducted by the Archaeological Society or a university team.
In November 1968 (Anon 1968: 3), the ASBC formed a committee, headed by Bill Lane, to study the implementation of existing laws for the protection of archaeological sites in British Columbia, to consider methods of preventing the export of artifacts; and to investigate possible new legislation at provincial or federal levels. Borden encouraged this political aspect of the Society. The February 1970 edition of The Midden (Anon 1970: 3) reviews a panel discussion held at the end of the UBC Extension lectures in the fall of 1969 and reports that Borden, when asked about the law in connection with archaeology, replied:

B.C. is the most progressive province in legislation but more is needed. The ASPA needs amendments which will be suggested to the government. Amendments will strengthen the Act. Section 10 is to be changed so that sites might be surveyed before construction begins. We need a Provincial Archaeologist. The ASAB was appointed when the Act became law, to advise the minister in all matters that relate to this Act.

It continues to report that:

Dr. Borden suggested that we let our M.L.A.'s know that we want a full-time appointee. British Columbia also needs a federal archaeological protection act because there are over 1,600 Indian reserves in the province (Anon 1970).

In April 1973 (Anon 1973a), Ron Sutherland was appointed to the Archaeological Sites Advisory Board, and in December of the same year "The Future of the Past," a brief, was presented to the Provincial Government Caucus by the ASBC (Anon 1973b).

The Act was eventually revised in 1972 (see copy in appendix 2) so that as Borden suggests:

The government itself became much more restricted in its activities. It couldn't go ahead just as it pleased and it had done so before. I mean there are many instances where there are ways of diverting a road in such a way, you know, to avoid destroying a site or if a bridge was to be constructed
across a river or a gorge then it was often possible to move the location of this particular bridge to another location (Borden Interviews 1979: 79-80).

A very important and significant aspect of the revised Act was the appointment of a full-time provincial archaeologist. Borden comments:

But what we needed, really, was a full-time archaeologist. For quite a number of years, Dr. Don Mitchell, of the University of Victoria, had served as part-time archaeologist. But he had a full-time job as professor, and he was interested in carrying out field work, and he just couldn't cover all of this. But a full-time archaeologist, preferably with a staff of assistant archaeologists, would be able to do this. So, I also strongly advocated that a full-time archaeologist be appointed (Borden Interviews 1979: 80).

Bjorn Simonsen, one of Borden's former students who later went on to get his M.A. at the University of Victoria under Don Mitchell, also a former student of Borden, was appointed to the position of Provincial Archaeologist. Borden says of Simonsen:

Mr. Simonsen has really done exceedingly well. ... he has done an excellent job in his position. He knows how to deal with politicians and with the heads of Crown Corporations and private firms, and he has been able to expand, to build up a staff, to expand his staff, so that he has now quite a stable of archaeologists to call on to conduct surveys and, if need be, salvage excavations. So instead of having just one part-time archaeologist, like myself, crying in the wilderness, there are now a fair number (Borden Interviews 1979: 66).

And continues:

and now the funds that do become available for field work have no comparisons to the limited sums with which we had to operate in earlier years. I mean sums in the range of $100,000.00 to $150,000.00 for one project are quite common now. The Provincial budget, the Archaeologist's budget, even just a few years ago, was over $½ million dollars, and I believe it is close now to one million dollars a year. So it has really boomed since we have had a full-time archaeologist (Borden Interviews 1979: 80).

Borden's remarks are significant. Legislation did not resolve all archaeological problems, and Simonsen (personal communication, April 10, 1980) states, his office is always working on improving legislation.

However, prior to legislation, Abbott (personal communication, April 11,
1980) points out, archaeologists were thinking small. Their hopes and ambitions seemed unobtainable. Borden's recognition of his responsibility as an academic, to continue to maintain public interest in adequate legislation for the protection of archaeological sites, helped shape an act which initiated a change in scale for archaeology in British Columbia. The act made provision for a Provincial Archaeologist with an increased number of archaeologists and increased funding for archaeological work. It also enlarged the forum within which the resolution of archaeological problems might be approached.

Knut Fladmärk (1980: 10-11), observes that the formal establishment of a Provincial Archaeologist's Office in Victoria was a development which has had the single greatest effect on the amount and direction of archaeological fieldwork carried out in the '70s. He describes the dimensions of this change in scale:

Ably managed from the outset by Bjorn Simonsen, this provincial government agency has administered, organized, and controlled the bulk of archaeological research funds, field-projects and field-employment available in the province in the 1970's. Working with the Archaeological Sites Advisory Board and under the guidelines of the Archaeological and Historical Sites Protection Act, (replaced by the Heritage Conservation Act passed in 1977), the Provincial Archaeologist's Office has provided managerial control and planning affecting the nature and long-term direction of archaeological inquiry in British Columbia. Simonsen's office has worked to open avenues of communication with other government agencies and development companies such as B.C. Hydro and the Department of Highways and has strived to direct archaeological energies toward long-term rational management of the non-renewable and rapidly diminishing archaeological resources of the province. The Provincial Archaeologist (now titled: "Chief, Resource Management Division, Heritage Conservation Branch") and his 9 full-time co-workers have co-ordinated systematic site surveying or "resource inventories" across the province, so that over 13,000 archaeological sites are currently documented in the provincial site-file. In addition, they have managed numerous salvage excavation programs on the southern coast and throughout the interior, and have been generous to a fault in providing resource funding opportunities for students.
and faculty of virtually all the colleges and universities of the province (Fladmark 1980: 11).

Borden's account (Borden Interviews 1979) confirms what the literature suggests. Borden was not an "armchair academic." Although he approached archaeology from a scholarly perspective, he was also very concerned with getting the artifacts out of the ground before it was too late. This process he realized, was partly dependent on the world outside that of academic archaeological discourse. In this chapter, I have shown how his efforts to interest the everyday world in archaeology played an important role in achieving legislation which would make for a situation where both archaeological and public interests might be negotiated in the process of establishing a knowledge of British Columbia's prehistory.
EPILOGUE

Accomplishing an understanding of the contribution of Carl Borden to the establishment of archaeology in British Columbia is a continuous process of definition by many persons with different perspectives. My approach has been to reach an understanding of one aspect of his contribution from a perspective which makes its point of reference the social context of ideas, developing this perspective through the construction of an interactive history. The account that emerges adds an anecdotal, perceptual aspect to what is already known of his contribution. Using this account, in conjunction with other sources of information, I bring into focus his contribution to widening the forum for the pursuit of archaeological research in British Columbia by establishing legislation for the protection of archaeological sites. As I indicate, there are at least two important dimensions to this contribution. First, Borden's position at UBC and second, his commitment to the idea of conservation archaeology.

1. Borden's position at UBC

Borden's faculty position firmly established him as a scholar. Despite his lack of formal training in archaeology, it was considered appropriate for him to take upon himself the responsibility of initiating a teaching program in archaeology. In chapter one, I explain how Borden took advantage of his position at UBC to develop his recognition of the archaeological potential in British Columbia by gaining experience in surveying and excavating, and by making contact with other archaeologists. At the same time he ensured that archaeological knowledge of the Northwest Coast, and the responsibility for the dissemination of this knowledge, should reside within the academic community.
Lack of formal training in archaeology did not appear to be a disadvantage to Borden. His published work which defines the archaeological potential in British Columbia has gained both a national and an international reputation. For example, his "Uniform Site Designation Scheme for Canada" (Borden 1952), a code system for designating and locating archaeological sites, has been adopted (1956) by the National Museums of Canada, and now forms the basis of the National Inventory Data Bank. The scheme is also being utilized in the area east of Lake Rudolf in Kenya (Isaac, Leakey and Behrensmeyer 1971: 1129). In chapter two, I show how Borden's position as Lecturer in archaeology, despite its limitations, offered him opportunities to work towards a definition of the archaeological potential in British Columbia. I discuss, too, how he used these opportunities and dealt with their associated problems.

Throughout his career, Borden felt strongly that archaeology should be left in charge of the professionals, those with formal archaeological training such as the training he provided at UBC. As Simonsen points out, professionalism for Borden was based on academic criteria (personal communication, B. Simonsen, April 10, 1980). During the course of the interviews, I asked Borden how he felt about his own lack of formal archaeology training. His reply, which I have already recorded in chapter one (p.11), suggests some regret, but at the same time his emphasis on the application of scholarly method to archaeology conveys his feelings about the importance of an academic perspective, so much a part of his own experience, to being "professional:"

Borden provided the basis for an academic route for those interested in pursuing a career in archaeology. As I explain in chapter three, it was with the help of some of his students who were products of
this academic route and who went on to become professional archaeologists, that he was able to intensify the campaign for public recognition of archaeological legislation and to establish a forum for the negotiation of both archaeological and public interests.

2. Borden's commitment to the idea of conservation archaeology

Borden's commitment to the idea of conservation archaeology is essential to and unifies the process of establishing archaeology as a function of government. He writes just prior to the act of 1960:

If the act will make adequate provision for salvage archaeology, it would mean the attainment of an objective toward which we have been working for many years (Borden 1960: 149).

Borden's sense of responsibility towards saving Native Indian culture from destruction reverberates through both the literature and his account. In chapter one, I indicate how it shaped his recognition of the archaeological potential in British Columbia. In chapter two, I suggest it lends a sense of urgency to his definition of this potential. And in chapter three, I explain how his effort to instil this responsibility in his students was rewarded with their interest and active participation in gaining public recognition of the necessity of legislation.

Borden was not the first archaeologist to show concern for finding and preserving Native Indian prehistory. He was, however, the first archaeologist in British Columbia to provide for the translation of this concern into public policy. It was the interplay between first, his position at UBC and second, his concern with the idea of conservation archaeology that laid the foundation for legislation. Borden used his position at UBC as a vehicle for the translation of this concern into public policy. From this perspective, the campaign for legislation commenced in the very early days of Borden's career in archaeology when he
started excavating with Akrigg, and when, as Akrigg observes, Borden became increasingly more absorbed in archaeology and in an awareness of the desperate race to rescue objects (chapter one, page 8). It proceeded through his scholarly definition of the archaeological potential which convinced him of the necessity of legislation and of his responsibility as an academic to take action to raise public awareness to the necessity of an act. It reached its peak in the passage of the act in March, 1960. As I have pointed out, however, adequate legislation is illusive. This is reflected in the efforts of some of his students, now government and university archaeologists, who are presently trying to improve legislation.

The campaign initiated by Borden continues ...
1. Articulating the process in terms of "recognition," "definition," and "taking action" was inspired by reading Becoming a Patient in An Introduction to Medical Sociology (Tucket 1976).

2. According to Moira Irvine (Archaeology laboratory, Department of Anthropology and Sociology, UBC), the Rip-Rap consists of very large boulders which bridge the rift, caused by the slide, in the rock situated between the railway track and the higher ground.

3. For complete survey of all newspaper clippings see Press Files (Borden Collection, UBC Archives).
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INDEX TO TRANSCRIBED INTERVIEWS (PP 225) WHICH ARE LOCATED WITH THE TAPES (14 HRS) IN THE UBC MUSEUM OF ANTHROPOLOGY ARCHIVES

Tape 1, sides 1 and 2 ................................................................. 1
- Charles E. Borden's recollection of experiences which influenced his interest in archaeology both prior to and immediately following his arrival in Vancouver, British Columbia.

Tape 2, sides 1 and 2 ................................................................. 18
- Continuation of recollection of experiences referred to above.
- Initiating B.C. archaeology course at University of British Columbia (UBC).

Tape 3, sides 1 and 2 ................................................................. 36
- Initiating B.C. archaeology course at UBC continued.
- Contact with archaeologists at University of Washington and University of California at Berkeley.
- Discussion of events leading up to Tweedsmuir Park project.

Tape 4, sides 1 and 2 ................................................................. 54
- Tweedsmuir Park project. Discussion of archaeological and political significance of this project.
- Efforts to raise public attention to archaeological potential in British Columbia and to the necessity of legislation to protect archaeological sites.
- Involvement of students in archaeological projects.

Tape 5, sides 1 and 2 ................................................................. 72
- Involvement of students continued.
- Further recollections of efforts to establish a protection act.
- Discussion of 1960 Archaeological and Historic Sites Protection Act.
- Reflections upon socio-political commitment to archaeology.
- Preparations to visit Europe, summer 1953.

Tape 6, sides 1 and 2 .................................................. 90

- Experiences in Europe, summer 1953.

Tape 7, side 1 only .................................................. 116

- Experiences in Europe continued.

Tape 8, sides 1 and 2 .................................................. 128

- Commentary on content of Course Anthropology 320, Old World Prehistory.
- Feelings expressed about limitations imposed on teaching archaeology at UBC.
- Reminiscences about surveys and excavations on the Northern Northwest Coast of British Columbia.

Tape 9, sides 1 and 2 .................................................. 152

- Continuation of reminiscences referred to above.
- Surveying in the East Kootenays.
- Excavating at Marpole. Discussion of archaeological significance of finds at Marpole.

Tape 10, sides 1 and 2 .................................................. 176

- Discussion of archaeological significance of finds at Marpole continued.
- Financial aspects of Marpole project.
- Students involved at Marpole.
- Borden's feelings about political aspect of Marpole project.
- Preparations for Fraser Canyon project.

Tape 11, sides 1 and 2 .................................................. 201

- Fraser Canyon Project continued. Discussion of social organization of project.
- Discussion of archaeological significance of project.

Tape 12, side 1 only ......................................................... 225

- Discussion of archaeological significance of Fraser Canyon project continued.
APPENDIX 2

QUESTION PLAN FOR INTERVIEWS WITH CARL BORDEN

Part I - The Early Years

a) How did you (Carl Borden) become involved in the archaeology of British Columbia? How far back in your life does your interest in archaeology extend?

b) To what extent did the fact that you knew that British Columbia was potentially a place of archaeological interest influence your decision to come to UBC?

c) What was your perception of the archaeological situation in British Columbia upon your arrival:

(i) How did archaeology compare with the rest of Canada?
(ii) How did it compare with the rest of the world, particularly the United States of America?

Part II - The Growth of Borden's Personal Interest in Archaeology in British Columbia

What factors influenced the growth of your personal interest in archaeology in British Columbia?

Part III - The Growth of Borden's Academic Interest

What factors influenced the growth of your academic interest, including interest in teaching archaeology?

Part IV - The Growth of Borden's Political Interest

a) When did you first realize the necessity for legislation?

b) What measures did you take towards achieving legislation?

Part V - Archaeology in British Columbia Now - Where is it Going?

a) National/international impact.

b) People now involved.
APPENDIX 3

LEGISLATION

A. An Act to Provide for the Preservation of Historic Objects (Copy)

1. This act may be cited as the "Historic Objects Preservation Act". R.S. 1936, c. 117, s. 1.

2. The Lieutenant-Governor in Council may declare any primitive figure or legend cut in or painted upon rock, or any group of such figures or legends, or any structure, or any natural object existing within the Province to be a "historic object" within the meaning and scope of this Act, and may make provision for the erection and maintenance in the vicinity of such historic object of a notice referring to this Act, in such form as may be deemed advisable. R.S. 1936, c. 117, s. 2.

3. When a notice has been erected in the vicinity of any historic object pursuant to this Act, no person shall, except pursuant to a permit in writing of the Provincial Secretary first obtained, remove, deface, obliterate, alter, add to, or otherwise interfere with that historic object, or the notice so erected, nor shall any person cut, or carve, or write, or paint any figure, legend, or name in or upon any rock or material comprised in or appurtenant to that historic object. R.S. 1936, c. 117, s. 3.

4. Every person violating any provision of section 3 shall be liable on summary conviction, to a fine not exceeding five hundred dollars. R.S. 1936, c. 117, s. 4.

Sites Reserved Under
"Historic Objects Preservation Act"

1196/27 Indian Rock, Stanley Park.

754/27 Petroglyph at Nanaimo on Blk. D.

' ' ' Sproat Lake on Lot 52 Alberni District.

' ' ' Great Central Lake on Lot 749 Clayoquot District.

' ' ' Aldrich Point on Lot 94 Sooke District.

The erratic rock on Coldstream Ranch O.D.Y.D.

955/28 Memorial erected at Leach River re discovery of Gold by Lieut. P.J. Leach, 1864.
637/30 Dinosaur tracks in Rocky Mountain Canyon and fossil bones, Peace River District. Amend 0/c 1475/30.

1474/41 Petroglyphs, Kulleet Bay, Kulleet Indian Reserve Van. Is.

814/31 Craigflower School, Victoria. See o/c 31/52.

1449/33 Near Barkerville to mark terminus of Yale-Cariboo Wagon Road.

1110/33 Monument to mark Fort Alexandria in 1821.

1230/35 Indian Carvings, Nicol Street Extension, Nanaimo. For land reserve see o/c 417/48.

1363/37 Stuie Sepulchre and Rock with Indian Paintings.

921/40 Pictographs on limestone bluffs in Marble Canyon on the east shore of Pavilion Lake, Lillooet Land District. No special land reserve made, but is covered by large reserve made for Parks Div. 0/c 1498/54.

204/45 Richfield Court House.

417/48 Pictographs located on lot 1 of Sec.1 Nanaimo District on Chase River.

720/51 Indian Pictographs located on Frac. legal Sued. 12 of Sec.25, Twp.25, R.8 W.617. Beach Bay Shuswap Lake. o/c 963/51.


B. Archaeological and Historic Sites Protection Act (1960) (Copy)

(ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND HISTORIC SITES PROTECTION - CHAPTER 15)

Title.

1. This Act may be cited as the Archaeological and Historic Sites Protection Act. 1960, c. 2, s. 1.

Interpretation.

2. In this Act, unless the context otherwise requires,

"archaeological site" means an archaeological site designated as such under section 3;

"historic site" means a historic site designated as such under section 3;

"archaeological object" means any object in or from an archaeological site;

"historic object" means any object of historical significance found in or on a historic site;

"Minister" means the member of the Executive Council charged for the time being with the administration of this Act;

"permit" means a valid and subsisting permit issued under this
Designations by Minister.

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 remain
   as an archaeological site.

(2) The minister may designate any site, parcel of land, or structure of historical significance as a historic site. 1960, c.2, s.3.

Acquisition of site.

4. (1) The Minister may, with the consent of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council and on behalf of Her Majesty, acquire, by purchase, gift, or otherwise, any archaeological or historic site or object.

(2) The Minister shall pay as compensation to the owner of any archaeological or historical site or object acquired under subsection (1) an amount to be fixed by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. 1960, c.2, s.4.

Prohibitions.

5. (1) No person shall knowingly destroy, desecrate, deface, move, excavate, or alter in any way an archaeological or historic site or remove or cause to be removed therefrom any archaeological or historic object, except to the extent that he is authorized to do so by a valid and subsisting permit issued under this Act.

(2) No person shall knowingly destroy, desecrate, or alter any burial-place in the Province, or remove therefrom any skeletal remains, except to the extent that he is authorized to do so by a valid and subsisting permit issued under this Act.

(3) No person shall knowingly destroy, deface, or otherwise alter any Indian painting or carving on rock in the Province, except to the extent that he is authorized to do so by a valid and subsisting permit issued under this Act.

(4) No person shall knowingly destroy, deface, or otherwise alter, excavate, or dig in any Indian kitchen-midden, shell-heap, house-pit, cave, or other habitation site, or any 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. 1960, c.2, s.5.
Issue of permits.

6. (1) Upon application made to him in writing, the Minister may issue a permit to any person to excavate or alter an archaeological site and remove archaeological objects therefrom, or to remove, move, or alter a historic site and remove historic objects therefrom.

(2) The Minister may limit a permit as to time and location, may require such reports as he deems proper, and may impose such other terms and conditions as he considers proper.

(3) The Minister may cancel a permit at any time. 1960, c.2, s.6.

Consent to and compensation for excavations, alterations, and removals.

7. (1) A person shall not excavate or alter an archaeological or historic site or remove any archaeological or historic object therefrom without the consent in writing of the owner of such site or object.

(2) When, as a result of excavation or alteration of an archaeological or historic site or the removal therefrom of an archaeological or historic object, it is shown that the value of the interest of any person in any site, parcel of land, building, or structure affected thereby is diminished, the person carrying out or causing to be carried out the excavation, alteration, or removal shall pay to such person in respect of such diminution in value such compensation as may be mutually agreed upon or, in the absence of agreement, an amount to be assessed upon application to a Judge of the Supreme Court. 1960, c.2, s.7.

Seizure of objects.

8. (1) Any archaeological or historic object that is taken by a person who is not a permit-holder or by a permit-holder in contravention of his permit may be seized by a person authorized to do so by the Minister and turned over to and deposited in such public institution as the Minister may designate.

(2) The Minister may direct that any archaeological or historic object or material taken under the authority of a permit be turned over to and deposited in such public institution as he may designate.

(3) The Minister may direct that any Indian skeletal remains in the possession of a private individual be turned over to and deposited in such public institution as he may designate. 1960, c.2, s.8.

Penalty.

9. A person who contravenes any provision of this Act or a permit or direction of the Minister under this Act is guilty of an offence, and, on summary conviction, is liable to a penalty of not more than five hundred dollars or to imprisonment for a term of not more than six months, or to both fine and imprisonment. 1960, c.2, s.9.

Preventive and recording measures.

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. 1960, c.2, s.10.

**Notices.**

11. The Minister may make provision for the erection and maintenance on or near any archaeological or historic site of an appropriate notice referring to this Act. 1960, c.2, s.11.

**Agreements.**

12. The Minister may make provision or enter into agreement with other authorities to develop any archaeological or historic site as a permanent monument by the erection of appropriate buildings, cairns, notices, or by other means. 1960, c.2, s.12.

**Advisory Boards.**

13. (1) The Lieutenant-Governor in Council, upon the recommendation of the Minister, may establish an Advisory Board or Boards to advise and make recommendations to him on any or all matters to which this Act refers or arising out of the operation thereof.

(2) Any Advisory Board or Boards established under subsection (1) shall include 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.

(3) The members of the Advisory Board or Boards shall serve without remuneration, but each member shall be paid his proper travelling and other expenses incurred in the work of the Board or Boards. 1960, c.2, s.13.

**Regulations.**

14. The Lieutenant-Governor in Council may make such regulations and orders not inconsistent with this Act as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act according to their obvious intent or to meet any cases that arise and for which no provision is made in this Act, and, without restricting the generality of the foregoing, may make regulations or orders

(a) nominating that member of the Executive Council who shall be the Minister charged with the administration of this Act;

(b) appointing the members of the Advisory Board or Boards, fixing the number of members of such Board or Boards, fixing the term of office of the members, and prescribing the quorum and procedure at meetings of the Board or Boards;

(c) approving orders made by the Minister as provided herein. 1960, c.2, s.14.

**Repeal.**

15. The Historic Objects Preservation Act, being chapter 145 of the Revised Statutes of British Columbia, 1948, is repealed, but each site
declared to be a "historic object" under that Act is an archaeological or historic site within the meaning of this Act. 1960, c.2, s.15.

Expenses.

16. Any expenses incurred in the administration of this Act during the fiscal year ending on the thirty-first day of March, 1961, shall be a charge on and paid out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund. 1960, c.2, s.16.

C. Archaeological and Historic Sites Protection Act (1972) (Copy) (Archaeological and Historic Sites Protection Chap.4)

Interpretation.

1. In this Act, unless the context otherwise requires,
   (a) "designated," when used in relation to a site or an object, means designated under section 2; and "designate" and "designation" have corresponding meanings;
   (b) "minister" means the member of the Executive Council charged from time to time with the administration of this Act;
   (c) "object" means an object of archaeological or historic significance;
   (d) "permit" means a valid and subsisting permit issued under this Act;
   (e) "site" means land of archaeological or historic significance, and includes land covered by water. 1972, c.4, s.1.

Designation by the minister.

2. (1) Where, in the opinion of the minister, land is of exceptional archaeological or historic significance, he may, by order, designate it as an archaeological site or as an historic site.
   (2) Where, in the opinion of the minister, an object is of exceptional archaeological or historic significance, he may, by order, designate it as an archaeological object or as an historic object.
   (3) Where land is designated under this section and it is shown that the value of the land is diminished by reason of the designation, the minister shall pay to the owner an amount to be determined by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. 1972, c.4, s.2.

Acquisitions of sites and objects.

3. The minister may, with the consent of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council and on behalf of the Crown, acquire, by purchase, gift, or lease, any site or object. 1972, c.4, s.3.

Prohibitions.

4. No person or agency shall knowingly
   (a) destroy, desecrate, deface, move, excavate, or alter in any way a designated site or remove from it an object;
   (b) destroy, desecrate, or alter a burial-place or remove from it skeletal remains;
   (c) destroy, deface, or alter an Indian painting or carving on rock;
(d) destroy, deface, alter, excavate, or dig in an Indian kitchen-midden, shell-heap, house-pit, cave or other habitation site, or a cairn, mound, foundation, or other site or object situated on Crown lands, except to the extent and in the manner that he is authorized to do so by a permit. 1972, c.4, s.4.

Issue of permits.

5. (1) Upon application made to him in writing, the minister may issue a permit to excavate, or alter a site and to remove, move, or alter objects from it.
(2) The minister may limit a permit as to time and location, may require such reports as he deems necessary or proper, and may impose other terms and conditions that he considers necessary or proper.
(3) The minister may cancel or suspend a permit at any time. 1972, c.4, s.5.

Excavation of private land.

6. Where a person is excavating or altering, with the consent of the owner, a site or an object that is not situated on Crown lands or that has not been designated, the consent or agreement between that person and the owner shall be deemed to contain the following conditions
(a) that the consent or agreement is subject to sections 4 and 7; and
(b) that the person shall report to the minister the results of his findings and work, and shall submit to the minister such reports as the minister deems proper or necessary; and
(c) that the person shall not remove from the Province any object derived from the site without the written consent of the minister. 1972, c.4, s.6.

Preventive measures.

7. (1) For the purposes of this section
(a) "site investigation" means the examination of a site for the purpose of recording, removing, moving or salvaging objects;
(b) "site survey" means the examination of land for the purpose of determining the archaeological or historic resources of the land.
(2) Where, in the opinion of the minister, land contains a site that is likely to be altered, damaged, or destroyed by reason of commercial, industrial, agricultural, residential, or other development or activity, or is likely to depreciate or become dilapidated, he may
(a) order a site survey and, if he considers it necessary, a site investigation; and
(b) order the owner or person responsible for the development or activity to provide sufficient funds for the site survey and, if required, the site investigation; and
(c) order that the development or activity be suspended in whole or in part until the site survey and, if necessary, the site investigation, have been completed.
(3) Where a site survey or site investigation is ordered under subsection (2), it shall be undertaken forthwith and in such a manner that
it will not cause undue hardship on the owner or person responsible for the development or activity. 1972, c.4, s.7.

Penalty.

8. A person who contravenes this Act, or a permit or direction of the minister under this Act, is guilty of an offence and is liable, on summary conviction, to a penalty of not more than one thousand dollars or to imprisonment for a term not exceeding six months, or to both the fine and the imprisonment. 1972, c.4, s.8.

Notices.

9. The minister may erect and maintain on or near any site an appropriate notice referring to this Act. 1972, c.4, s.9.

Agreements.

10. The minister may, on behalf of the Crown, enter into an agreement with any person or agency respecting the development, maintenance, or renovation of any site or object. 1972, c.4, s.10.

Advisory boards.

11. (1) The Lieutenant-Governor in Council may, upon the recommendation of the minister, establish advisory boards to advise and make recommendations to him on any matter to which this Act refers or arising out of its operation.

(2) Any advisory board established under this section shall include the director of the Provincial Museum, the Provincial Archivist, and a representative from each of the public universities in the Province.

(3) A member of an advisory board shall serve without remuneration, but shall be paid his proper travelling and other expenses incurred in the work of the board. 1972, c.4, s.11.

Regulations.

12. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act according to their intent, the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may make such regulations and orders as are ancillary thereto and not inconsistent therewith and as are considered necessary or advisable; and every regulation or order made under this section shall be deemed part of the Act and has the force of law. 1972, c.4, s.12.

Act repealed.

13. (1) The Archaeological and Historic Sites Protection Act is repealed.

(2) Notwithstanding subsection (1), every designation made and every permit issued under the former Act continues good and valid, and may be rescinded, varied, enforced, or otherwise dealt with under the provisions of this Act. 1972, c.4, s.13.
Commencement.

14. (1) This Act, excepting this section, comes into force on a day to be fixed by the Lieutenant-Governor by his Proclamation and he may fix different dates for the coming into force of the several provisions of this Act.

(2) This section comes into force on Royal Assent. 1972, c.4, s.14.

(NOTE.-Act proclaimed in force May 11, 1972, Part II Gazette Vol. 15, p.419.)
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