

*Edited by Julia Harrison
and Regna Darnell*

Historicizing Canadian Anthropology



UBCPress · Vancouver · Toronto

13

Anthropology and Sociology at the University of British Columbia from 1947 to the 1980s

Elvi Whittaker and Michael M. Ames

The history of the Department of Anthropology and Sociology at the University of British Columbia can be looked at as a combination of unique events, particular personalities, and selected ideological currents, all positioned within more general social and historical forces and conditions.

We will outline five major clusters of “events” or stages in the life of the department, each a creature of its times, as a framework for a departmental history. Running through these happenings like firestorms was a series of intellectual and academic debates about what constitutes a proper social science, who should practise it in universities, how students should be educated, and the ways in which these combined activities should be organized. In the background of these matters are ideological issues and their implications for, among other matters, the training of students and the face the department presents to other departments in Canada and elsewhere, and to the world outside the university.

The Founding Culture, 1947-70

When the first anthropologist, Harry Hawthorn, and the first sociologist, Coral W. Topping, arrived at the University of British Columbia, there was a Department of Economics, Sociology and Political Science awaiting them. Higher education in the province had been proposed in 1877, passed into existence by an act of the provincial legislature in 1890, and conducted through affiliation with the universities of McGill, Toronto, and McMaster. The first convocation occurred in 1890 in Victoria. The new University of British Columbia was enacted by the legislature in 1908 and began teaching in 1915. The university calendar of that first year listed the department, but showed it as having no faculty. The following year Theodore H. Boggs, an economist, was appointed to teach four of the six courses then listed. By 1920, another economist, Henry F. Angus, was added. A course in sociology was indicated in that calendar year, and Samuel E. Beckett (MA Queen’s), who had an interest in finance and in sociology, was appointed to teach it.

Thereafter sociology was taught sporadically. In the next eight or nine years, the same three faculty members constituted the department, aided by various assistants with baccalaureates from the University of British Columbia. By 1926, courses were offered toward an MA in economics, but not in political science or sociology. Beckett died in 1929 and Topping, a sociologist with a doctorate from Columbia, replaced him. Sociology grew to three courses with this appointment. The content of one of these courses, *Social Origins and Development*, was heavily anthropological, offering “different views relating to the origin and evolution of human society; the geographic factors and economic methods in their bearing upon social life; primitive mental attitudes; the development of ethical ideas among primitive peoples, primitive institutions, tools, art and their modern forms; the growth of cardinal social ideas through the ancient and classical period to the present time.” The texts included works by Boas, Lowie, Wissler, Ogburn, Goldenweiser, Osler, a text on Egyptian civilization, and Wallis’ *Introduction to Anthropology*.¹ In 1930 a course in social anthropology was introduced. Apparently there was an interest in the subject on the part of the students, the department, and the university.

During the Depression of the 1930s, there was little growth in the department, with faculty numbering five in 1930 and four in 1940. During this decade, departmental responsibility had expanded, now offering courses open to candidates seeking a diploma of social service, later to become a diploma in social work, in commerce, and in criminology. To accommodate these new offerings, the title of the department was changed in 1932 to the Department of Economics, Political Science, Commerce and Sociology. The academic slate was further augmented in 1942 when Marjorie J. Smith was appointed as an assistant professor of social work.

In 1945, Norman MacKenzie, the president of the university, became an honorary department lecturer in government. The department grew after the war years to ten members. There were now sixteen courses in economics (including agricultural economics, forest economics), seven courses in government, six in sociology, one in social work, and one in criminology. It was also possible to earn a master’s degree in economics, political science, or sociology. Topping remained the only sociologist. No anthropologist had been appointed.

Harry Hawthorn, after completing his PhD in anthropology at Yale University in 1941, began teaching at Sarah Lawrence College. In 1947 university president Norman MacKenzie and the head of the department, Henry Angus, invited him to Vancouver to establish a department of anthropology to serve the university and the province. “It is hoped we can find a professor in Anthropology whose major interest would lie in social anthropology, with special reference to the problems presented by the North American Indians in British Columbia.”² It was expected that “any appointee would wish to

devote a good part of his summers to fieldwork among the Indians in British Columbia” and that the position would involve firstly “the rounding out of other courses in the Social Sciences in order to give the students a comprehensive grasp,” and secondly “the application of knowledge to the welfare of the native Indian population ... One of the attractions in teaching in a Western university is that you have a great deal of influence in forming the policy which will be followed and can plan your work in a large degree to conform to your judgment of local conditions.”³ MacKenzie (1947) wrote to Hawthorn that “the government at Ottawa might also be interested in contributing to work of this kind.”⁴ There was to be a new department, separate from the existing academic combination of economics, political science, sociology, and criminology. The president also invited Audrey Hawthorn, Harry’s wife, to become an honorary curator and take custody of the ethnographic collections, mostly from the South Pacific, already on campus and under the jurisdiction of a zoologist.

Before coming to Vancouver, Harry Hawthorn visited the University of Toronto to consult with T.F. McIlwraith about the state of anthropology in Canada. McIlwraith had been appointed to the University of Toronto in 1925 and was the head of the first department of anthropology in Canada (Barker 1987b; Darnell 1998b). After taking the position and with the assistance of university officials, Hawthorn obtained a grant totalling \$75,000 over five years from the Carnegie Foundation in the early 1950s to build anthropology at UBC and in the province. This funding was necessary, as the budget for the whole university at that time was less than that of some of its departments today. It enabled him to hire faculty, conduct research, and recruit students. These developments would have been delayed by at least a decade without the help of the foundation. Thus, when Henry Angus retired in 1956, the large combined department was separated into the Department of Anthropology, Sociology and Criminology,⁵ and the Department of Economics and Political Science. Criminology subsequently moved to the Department of Social Work in 1959. Prior to 1956, Hawthorn used the Museum of Anthropology, opened under Audrey Hawthorn’s care in 1949, in the basement of the main library, as the platform for organizing the new department. The first public statements of the department appeared on the museum’s stationery.

In those days, the administrative style of the university and its faculties was informal, benevolent in a paternalistic way, and run by a few senior men (no women occupied such positions). The men socialized together, typically around the swimming pool of a prominent university benefactor or on fishing expeditions. Using his personal networks, Hawthorn began to build a department and a museum with relevance for the university and for British Columbia. He took it upon himself to make the important decisions, and if he consulted at all, it was with senior administrators who were, coincidentally,

also his fishing buddies. He found himself, however, at the end of disparate expectations. "People at the University had different expectations of what I would do, and a number of individuals with widely different orientations let me know, each in a warm and welcoming way, that they were responsible for my coming. Thus the anthropologist was expected to be ancillary to social work, to sociology, to geography and palaeontology, to psychology, and other subjects and to take charge of a small museum."⁶ Of course, he also worked closely with his wife at the museum. In regards to the museum, he frequently noted in conversations and formally at conferences, "Audrey was the motivation and I was the assistant. But in keeping with male society, I stood on the podium" (Ames and Fenger 1998).

Early in his tenure as department head, Hawthorn engaged other faculty and students in a number of applied interdisciplinary research projects that gained international attention, *The Doukhobors of British Columbia* (Hawthorn 1955), *The Indians of British Columbia* (Hawthorn, Belshaw, and Jamieson 1958), and the two-volume *A Survey of the Contemporary Indians of Canada: Economic, Political and Educational Needs and Policies* (Hawthorn 1966, 1967). These major projects clearly announced the department's Canadian orientation and were researched and written with policy issues in mind. Indeed with the early culture of the department including criminology, social work, commerce, forest economics, and other such policy-related courses, the applied thrust of anthropology seemed set. Hawthorn wrote later, "Perhaps above all I wanted to put anthropology to good use."⁷

Working relationships with First Nations artists and band councils were also established during those early years. Once settled at the university, Harry and Audrey Hawthorn visited the different regions of British Columbia to meet people, especially members of First Nations (Hawthorn 1993, 6-7). On one of their first trips to Vancouver Island they met residential school students and some of their parents, visited carvers and weavers, and attended ceremonial dances. Two of the students they met on that trip – Gloria Cranmer and Della Charles – subsequently worked for the museum. Gloria Cranmer later became the founding curator of the U'mista Cultural Centre at Alert Bay. A third student they met on that occasion, Judith Morgan, became a well-known artist. Harry and Audrey also established a friendship with Della's parents, Andrew and Christine Charles, of the Musqueam Reserve, which was adjacent to the university campus. The Charleses sponsored their attendance at spirit dances around Vancouver and Vancouver Island. The Hawthorns continued to travel around the province over the next few years, visiting Indian agents, band councils, artists, and residential schools. One of the students in Harry's first anthropology class was Percy Gladstone, a Haida from Haida Gwai'i (Queen Charlotte Islands). Judging by the number of former students who remain in contact with Hawthorn, and the departmental faculty who served under his directorship, he continues to be widely respected, even by those

who may not have been comfortable with his benevolent paternalism. He was elected to the Royal Society of Canada in 1956, the same year he began as the founding head of the Department of Anthropology and Sociology (a position he held until 1968), and served as the first chair of the new Canadian Sociology and Anthropology Association, formed in 1956. He also served as the founding director of the university's Museum of Anthropology from 1947 to 1974. His many accomplishments were feted in a publication in his honour (Serl and Taylor 1975), and he continues to be honoured in his retirement, most recently by having a condominium development on campus named Hawthorn Place.

The department grew dramatically after the appointment of Hawthorn. By 1953 the composite department had twenty faculty members. Among the anthropologists appointed in the 1950s were Wayne Suttles and Cyril Belshaw. Carl Borden had moved part-time from the German department to teach and continue his research in archaeology (Williams 1983). The Carnegie grant supported the appointments of these professors. Other research was also ongoing: Borden's work on archaeological complexes of the Fraser Delta, Suttles' work with the Coast Salish, Mungo Martin's carving of new poles for the university, and the provincial government's sponsoring of the Nechako River project. At the same time, grants from the Social Science Research Council of Canada brought Robert and Barbara Lane from the University of Washington to do research with the Chilkotin, and Ida Halpern, a musicologist attached to the extension services of the university, studied Kwagiutl music.

Topping alone carried the teaching of sociology, teaching four courses a year, until the appointment of Kaspar Naegele in 1954. The faculty numbers needed for further separation of the combined department in 1956 were now in place. The master's degree programs for both sociology and anthropology were also in place. The first MA was awarded to David Chaim Kogen in sociology in 1951, and the first MA in anthropology to Milena Nastich in 1954. By 1960 six anthropology and eight sociology MAs had been awarded. In the 1960s, twenty-four anthropology and thirty-three sociology MAs were earned; and in the years 1970-80 there were fifty-four of the former and fifty-nine of the latter. The first doctorates were awarded in 1970, UBC being the second university in Canada to offer the PhD degree in anthropology and in sociology.

The Radical and Roaring 1970s

By the mid-1960s and early '70s, major changes were taking place in universities across North America: rising enrolments, rapid growth in the numbers of young faculty, radicalism by students and faculty, vocal challenges to mainstream academic traditions, and a gradual formalization of university governance. A number of events at UBC altered the department in fundamental ways.

(1) There was a change in headship in 1968 from Harry Hawthorn to Cyril Belshaw, a New Zealander like his predecessor. During his administration, Belshaw introduced a more parliamentary system of governance, in keeping with the increasing bureaucratization of university affairs. Audrey Hawthorn, who had served as a curator on a voluntary basis from 1947 until Harry stepped down from the headship, was now appointed to the faculty.

(2) The first doctoral students joined the department in the 1960s and were awarded their degrees in 1970. The possibility of a doctorate had existed on paper since the middle 1950s, offered with caution, and only if it was in "Canadian History, Economics and Anthropology ... and that the department concerned is in a position to supervise and to supplement by appropriate courses." Erik Schwimmer and Ian Prattis were the first UBC PhDs in anthropology. Patricia Marchak and Mitsuru Shimpō graduated in sociology in the same year. In 1971 Gordon Inglis and John Cove finished in anthropology, and in 1972 David Stevenson, Robert Tonkinson, and William Foddy finished in sociology. In 1973 Marjorie Halpin, Vernon Kobrinsky, and Joan Ryan were awarded doctorates in anthropology, and Patricia Groves and Victor Ujimoto in sociology. The early anthropology PhDs went on to teaching positions at the universities of Calgary, Carleton, Laval, Memorial, Western Australia, and British Columbia. The department eventually hired many of its own baccalaureate, master's, and doctoral students. These include Michael Ames, John Barker, Michael Blake, Madeleine Brondson-Rowan, Julie Cruikshank, Wilson Duff, Marjorie Halpin, Michael Kew, David Pokotylo, Margaret Stott, and Elvi Whittaker in anthropology. In sociology Yunshik Chang, Patricia Marchak, Martin Meissner, and Ken Stoddart were appointed.

By the 1970s the department had established its primary areas of emphasis: an Americanized four-field model in anthropology; and comparative, experimental-quantitative, and interpretive-ethnomethodological research in sociology. In anthropology there was a concentration on the Northwest Coast, South Pacific, East and South Asian culture areas.

(3) There was rapid growth in the size of the department. Between 1960 and 1975, thirty-eight tenure-stream appointments were made, as many as three to five in some years. Among those appointed during the administration of Harry Hawthorn (and the two terms of acting administration under Cyril Belshaw, 1959-60 and 1967-68) were Braxton Alfred, Michael Ames, Kenelm Burridge, Wilson Duff, Michael Kew, and William Willmott in anthropology, and Werner Cohn, Yunshik Chang, Robert Ratner, and Reg Robson in sociology. In the following administration under Cyril Belshaw, among the anthropologists appointed were David Aberle, Nadia Abu-Zahra, Brenda Beck, Michael Egan, Helga Jacobson, Elli Köngäs Maranda, Pierre Maranda, R.G. Matson, Bonnie MacDougall, Scotty MacDougall, Richard Pearson, Jay Powell, Robin Ridington, and Elvi Whittaker. Among the sociologists were Tissa Fernando, Martha Foschi, Patricia Marchak, Martin Meissner,

Blanca Muratorio, Ricardo Muratorio, David Schweitzer, Dorothy Smith, Ken Stoddart, and Roy Turner.

During this period of great expansion only three were denied tenure, and another handful left for other reasons. It is clear that Belshaw envisioned the existence of a large department by the 1980s. "I think the department may need services for around 50 professionals on the whole rather than 40 odd."⁸ Because of intense competition for faculty in western Canadian universities, many were hired with unfinished dissertations, causing stress in the early teaching years and predisposing at least some to identify more closely with students, to whom they were closer in age and status, than with senior colleagues. Unfinished dissertations eventually made reappointment and tenure more problematic when the university gradually began to tighten its standards.

(4) The large influx of young American-trained faculty from the politically active US campuses brought their political culture with them (see Graburn, this volume). Academically the department had an American, British, and French focus, in degrees awarded, nationalities of individual professors, and theoretical ideologies favoured. In 1980, the faculty held anthropology degrees from Australian National University (Kenelm Burridge), Berkeley (Elvi Whittaker), Bryn Mawr (Marie-Françoise Guédon), Chicago (Martin Silverman, Judy Pugh), Colorado (Braxton Alfred), Columbia (David Aberle, Audrey Hawthorn), Cornell (Helga Jacobson), Davis (R.G. Matson), Harvard (Michael Ames, Robin Ridington), Hawaii (Jay Powell), London (Cyril Belshaw, Margaret Stott), Oxford (Nadia Abu-Zahra, Brenda Beck), UBC (Madeline Bronsdon-Rowan, Marjorie Halpin, John LeRoy, David Pokotylo), Washington (Michael Kew), and Yale (Harry Hawthorn, then retired, Richard Pearson). The first Canadian PhD to be appointed to anthropology at UBC was Marjorie Halpin (UBC 1973), followed by David Pokotylo (UBC 1978). Similarly in 1980 in sociology, the faculty's degrees were from Berkeley (Blanca Muratorio, Ricardo Muratorio, Roy Turner), Cornell (Graham Johnson), London (Adrian Marriage, John McMullan), Michigan (John O'Connor), Minnesota (Reg Robson), New School (Werner Cohn), Oregon (George Gray, Martin Meissner), Oxford (Tissa Fernando), Princeton (Yunshik Chang), Santa Barbara (Ken Stoddart), Stanford (Martha Foschi), Toronto (Barbara Williamson), UBC (Patricia Marchak), UCLA (David Schweitzer), Waterloo (Neil Guppy), and Yale (Robert Ratner). The first Canadian PhD appointed in sociology was Patricia Marchak (UBC 1970) (see also Guppy and Stoddart 1992). The expanded size of the faculty was evident in 1980. There were thirteen professors, eleven associate professors, twelve assistant professors, seven instructors, and one professor emeritus. In total there were forty-three appointed faculty, not counting the sessional lecturers. In addition there were four honorary research associates for that year, Kathleen Gough Aberle, Guy Buchholtzer, Wolfgang Jilek, and David Roth. Virginia Miller was a visiting research fellow. The department was

not able to maintain this number of appointed faculty, and in more recent years the numbers have dwindled through retirements and smaller budgets. Even though the faculty were graduates mainly from British, American, and Australian universities, there were at one time thirteen different national origins represented among them.

(5) The continuing trend was toward the rationalization of university administrative procedures, especially in appointments, promotions, and tenure. This trend required a move away from the informal swimming pool and fishing trip gatherings to faculty and senate meetings and cocktail party caucuses. According to Cyril Belshaw (personal communication), until the mid-1960s or thereabouts there were no such things as appointment, promotion, or tenure committees. "The normal move was from the Head up to the President, who did not necessarily follow the Head's advice ... the influence of the Head in appointments nevertheless was substantial. In an era of expansion it was a seller's market, and candidates were appointed during their PhD years."

Promotions and tenure became increasingly crucial issues during the 1970s, however, which led to clearer procedures articulated in writing. This rationalization, in the Weberian sense, was quite possibly in response to growth in students and faculty, and to increasing calls for "democratic" procedures in keeping with the spirit of the times.

Within departments there was a corresponding move toward elected committees and increased participation in decision making. Even so, a conservative framework of heads appointed by the administration continued, which meant that ultimate authority and responsibility still rested with a senior member of the department, one appointed by higher levels of administration. (Acting heads in most cases, however, were elected by colleagues.) These ideas clashed with the more aggressively egalitarian view of young faculty trained in the United States, who called for more open discussions, decisions by popular vote, and elected chairs rather than university-appointed heads. Heads to this day continue to be appointed, recently for five years, by the dean and approved by the provost, upon the recommendation of a selection committee also appointed by the dean.

(6) Radicalism grew, including opposition to the university establishment, both among those active in campus politics and those opting out like the "hippies" and the "flower children" active in Vancouver during the late 1960s and early '70s. The proposition that heads or other administrators could be trusted, and that a paternalistic head could, or would, be fair to all, was no longer realistic. Cynicism toward authority had become part of a common-sense attitude toward the world. They received support from younger faculty who were calling for "student-centred teaching" and student participation in departmental decision making. Students were added as representatives to monthly departmental meetings, to graduate studies

committees and elsewhere, fulfilling some of the demands for student participation in governance.

(7) A crisis of tenure occurred when the promotions and tenure committee of the department voted by a small majority to deny tenure to three department members, thereby creating a cause célèbre.

(8) A number of ideological debates occupied the department, adding fuel to the tenure crises and creating further divisions among faculty and students. The most vociferous debates, which may have involved personality clashes along with intellectual concerns, occurred among the sociologists who advocated one or another version of positivism, ethnomethodology, phenomenology, structural-functionalism, and neo-Marxism. Debates among anthropologists were more muted, perhaps because of the entertainment provided by their contentious sociological colleagues. Occasional brickbats were tossed about within the ranks of anthropology, however, between “cultural ecology positivists,” including the archaeologists, and the Geertzian “symbolic” or “interpretive” anthropologists; between American four-field anthropology and British-style social anthropology; and between those who imagined that structural-functionalism had died a timely death and others disinclined to accept any such funeral announcement. A set of alliances and a debate that cut across disciplinary lines were forged between those who considered themselves ethnographers and those who opted for statistical, positivist methodologies. There were ethnographers in sociology as well as anthropology, and they felt a kinship with each other. Similarly, there were positivist scholars in both arms of the department.

(9) The department first positioned itself on a wider stage than the provincial or Canadian one. It already had a Canadian, American, British, and French focus in education, intellectual preference, and national origins. Cyril Belshaw in particular put effort into connecting UBC anthropology to the American Anthropological Association, where the executive committee had two members from the department at the one time (Belshaw and Aberle) and thus could partake in debates on some of the pressing issues of the early 1970s, such as professional ethics, the Thailand controversy, and the war in Vietnam (Belshaw 1976, 255-74). Belshaw also became active in the International Union of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences and assumed its presidency in the late 1970s. In addition, he became the editor of *Current Anthropology* and brought the journal to UBC. These activities raised the profile of the department considerably. As might be expected, not all members of the department could be induced to involve themselves with these endeavours. In addition, the department had during this period more anthropology members of the Royal Society of Canada than any other department in the country.

(10) Ansoc or AnSo, as the department became known, came out of the 1970s separated from the culture of its origin. It had become much larger and more diverse in its offerings, consequently weakening the common-

alities between anthropology and sociology. Anthropology became more four-field in the American tradition – cultural anthropology, archaeology, linguistics, and physical anthropology – in its ideology, and the department’s organizational culture transformed into a more bureaucratic, committee-based, Robert’s Rules of Order-style of democracy. Factions, particularly on methodological and personality grounds, were by then firmly entrenched. It could be argued that cynicism toward authority had become, in the grand tradition of the myth of the hero of the American frontier, part of the shared attitude toward the world.

Moving to the Promised Land and Restructuring the Department

One of the expectations of university departments in the 1970s was to have buildings designed for their own purposes. The Museum of Anthropology was planning a new facility to showcase its growing collections, and the department was arranging to renovate the former women’s student residence. This was to take place in an area called Fort Camp, a remnant of the accommodations for the exploding numbers of students who came to the campus after the end of the Second World War. The move from a diverse set of faculty offices in Ponderosa, the Angus Building, and various huts to the new location came in the mid-1970s. The museum moved from the library to a grand new building designed by Arthur Erickson, which opened in 1976. The department moved next door to its renovated quarters. The enlarged space permitted three new laboratories, lounges, conference rooms, teaching and seminar rooms, and a library.

In the late 1970s, a series of events once again changed the direction of the department and restructured its internal arrangements. First, the Museum of Anthropology, with Michael Ames as its director, proceeded to build an international reputation separate from the department. The museum merits its own history at some other time, and indeed some commentaries have been published (Hawthorn 1993; Krug 1997; Krug, Fenger, and Ames 1999). We will note here that one of the issues arising with the emergence of the new museum was a certain distancing from the department. Cyril Belshaw had cautioned against this separation in the early 1970s, arguing that “the professionals of the Museum are members of the Department, so members of the Department, to greater or lesser degree, are members of the Museum ... The boundary must not be allowed to develop.”⁹ Such an idealized possibility carried another kind of risk, namely that the larger numbers of department members could outvote the museum professionals on matters of the museum, thereby creating yet another boundary. One difficulty that university museums face, including the Museum of Anthropology, is the apparent unwillingness of many academics to recognize the crucial differences that museums have in basic economic conditions (they tend to be more self-supporting), ideological commitments, the interplay between academic pursuits and practical efforts,

the position of professional staff, not to mention their obvious accessibility to the public. The department and the Museum of Anthropology continued to discuss, through ensuing years and without resolution, their different views on joint appointments, appropriate recognition of museum professional and scholarly staff, what constituted “real” anthropology, and what entity should control the museum.

Another important event that occurred after the department moved into new quarters was an external review of its operations instituted by the dean in 1982. One response to criticisms raised by the reviewers was to formalize the graduate program and divide it into anthropology and sociology streams, with separate committees, graduate regulations, and standards. Anthropology and sociology faculty caucuses were also instituted so that each discipline could work out its own priorities on curriculum and recruitment, with their recommendations forwarded to the department as a whole for ratification. This separation provided increased autonomy for sociologists within a department traditionally dominated by anthropologists. Appointments, promotions, and tenure continued to be managed by jointly constituted committees. With the exception of a three-year term by Patricia Marchak, and an acting term by Elvi Whittaker, all heads and acting heads have been male – Harry Hawthorn, Cyril Belshaw, Kenelm Burrige, Martin Silverman, Richard Pearson, and more recently sociologist Brian Elliott and archaeologist David Pokotylo. Prior to the term by Patricia Marchak, and a one-year acting term by Adrian Marriage, the heads have all been anthropologists. The question of the separation of the department into two smaller ones has persisted throughout the department’s history. This proposal for changing the structure seems to be most avidly supported by newer colleagues, often from universities with single departments, while those with a long history at UBC seem more content to continue with the joined disciplines. The issue of separation continued to be discussed even as late as 2005-06.

Ideological and Intellectual Disputes

A number of disputes have endured throughout the history of the department, flaring up from time to time, leaving their scars and other residues. When department members reflect on the nature of the department in the 1970s, they recognize some classic scholarly divisions. The differences between anthropology and sociology are immediately noted, of course, and are followed by a recitation of the officially recognized divisions in both. In anthropology the four-field model of sociocultural anthropology, linguistics, archaeology, and physical anthropology prevailed, even if linguistics and physical anthropology were underrepresented by faculty and courses. Museum anthropology was treated as an orphan of uncertain value within the sociocultural camp. In sociology the divisions were equally obvious: experimental social psychology, Canadian society, comparative sociology

(which included those involved in area studies), and ethnomethodology. The emergent women's studies program at UBC, pioneered by Helga Jacobson and Dorothy Smith, addressed both disciplines. Yet even as these divisions are listed, there is a clear recognition that, in themselves, they did not account for the social dynamics of the department, nor for the emergent friendships and intellectual bonds. They suggest indisputable formal academic differences, but not the key to the way things really worked. The next level of probing would produce a more sensitive division, one that recognizes where department members locate social science truths and proprieties. Those thinking of themselves as "positivists" are separated from those deeming themselves "non-positivists" or "post-positivists." The Marxists, neo-Marxists, and the political economists would be seen as in opposition to those deemed to have either idealist or conservative leanings. "Traditional" was widely employed as a critical label for those perceived as generally uninformed about the progress in theoretical reasoning in the two fields, or as ignorant of wider political issues in the world. Those aware of feminist social science were separate from those completely uninformed. Added to these already numerous divisions were silent appraisals about the intellectual attributes of various colleagues, about the positions taken on the Canadianization of anthropology and sociology so important in the 1970s (Ames et al. 1972; Magill 1981), about the liberality or rigidity of department policies and procedures, about the amount of coddling or rigour applied to dealings with graduate students, and about the accrued evidence on such elusive qualities as judgment, honesty, and trustworthiness. To complicate these divisions and assessments further, there was a final, residual category, euphemistically subsumed under "personality," which comprised those department members who dominated every meeting, those who were perpetually late, those who had developed reputations of various kinds with students, those whose main interest was deemed to be personal power, those with excessive amounts of self-indulgence, those who always had "agendas" (presumably hidden yet widely recognized by colleagues), those who did not return phone calls or memos, and those who could not be expected to support this or that issue. These obvious differences (as well as subversive, ideological, and practical ones), along with some kind of ongoing utopian expectation that consensus was actually possible and desirable, contributed to the dynamics of the department.

In the most formal sense, some of the differences played themselves out in the management of scarce resources such as appointments, space, and the chairing of major committees. They became visible in the estrangements, widely recognized by all, that had arisen in the almost legendary earlier disputes – the kinds of understandings that called for sensitivity in organizing retirement dinners and student advisory committees.

The most notable reflection of some, if not all, of the differences became concentrated on the ever-present issue of standards in the graduate program.

Following the departmental review of 1982, the separation of the graduate programs occurred. The anthropology graduate program reflected an emerging ideology, articulated in terms of the tightening employment opportunities. Some argued that as many future PhD graduates would not find academic positions, the education for all students should reflect that possibility. It was also argued that preparation in the methodologies of research would constitute the strongest preparation for graduate students, especially for those who might not find academic positions on graduation. Thus a required course in statistics was added to the graduate program to the pained outcries of many students. The interesting anomaly was that the quantitative methods course was a required one, while the qualitative one was not. This particular decision reflected not only a climate of awareness of standards and requirements of rigour, but also a dominating positivist influence in the department and the tenor of the era that was witnessing, and perhaps objecting to, the rapid movement into interpretive discourses. This requirement was to be changed within a few years, and qualitative methods were made a requirement. The standards of the program were to change several times in the ensuing years.

The scholarly portrait of the department was also revealed in graduate student dissertation topics, faculty publications, scholars who spent time there (Edmund Carpenter, Helen Codere, Ralf Dahrendorf, Ronald Dore, Louis Dumont, Raymond Firth, Anthony Giddens, Diamond Jenness, Claude Lévi-Strauss, and Rodney Needham, among many) and those who were given annual speaking awards in the name of former illustrious members of the department, Harry Hawthorn and Kaspar Naegele.¹⁰

The Feminization of the Department

Audrey Hawthorn was the first woman appointed to the department in 1968. Previously Helen Codere had spent one sabbatical year at UBC in the 1950s. With nepotism no longer an issue in the department, three couples were hired within years of Audrey Hawthorn's appointment: Bonnie MacDougall and Scotty MacDougall, Elli Köngäs Maranda and Pierre Maranda, and Blanca Muratorio and Ricardo Muratorio. The MacDougalls and the Marandas were to move away from the department after some years. In 1966, Helga Jacobson joined the department in anthropology, and in sociology Dorothy Smith and Martha Foschi were added. Nevertheless, the numbers of women appointed remained small; during the years of great growth from 1960 to 1975, ten of the forty-five appointments were women, or 22 percent of total appointments. In anthropology these included Nadia Abu-Zahra, Brenda Beck, Marjorie Halpin, Helga Jacobson, Elli Köngäs Maranda, Madeline Bronsdon-Rowan, and Elvi Whittaker. In sociology the women appointed were Patricia Marchak, Dorothy Smith, and Martha Foschi.

Dorothy Smith and Helga Jacobson made a significant contribution to the feminist movement on campus. Together with two women from other

departments, Meredith Kimball from psychology and Annette Kolodny from English, they were instrumental in introducing women's studies, both as courses in departments and as a program, paralleling other such changes across North America. In the late 1960s, these four women taught a non-credit evening series with internationally prominent visiting lecturers such as Kate Millett and Germaine Greer. Planning for the credit courses began in 1970, and they were finally in place by 1972 and were taught by the same four women. This program was not won without considerable strife, being instituted in the midst of misinterpretations about the intent of the program, and the widely held belief on the part of male administrators that there was "no point to it." The women in the department supporting the program described those in power as "basically extremely ill-informed about these important social issues, unhelpful, and completely unwilling to read anything that might be relevant." As feminist folklore in the department retells it, even as late as the mid-1970s, the dean of arts is reported to have remarked, in answer to a request for more tenured faculty for women's studies and for added courses, "Well, if you girls want to start something, you girls had better finish it."

In the following twenty years, various department members, in recognition of changing social mores, as well as pressure from articulate female colleagues, made room in their courses for a mandatory lecture on women. Token as they were, such lectures were delivered for many years. Finally, however, the fast-developing feminist discourses could no longer permit this kind of marginality, and a stronger demand was made by arguing that it wasn't a matter of a token lecture here and there but rather the unquestioned inclusion of the feminist perspective in all lectures. It was suggested that women should be integrated into all research in their own right, not subsumed under "men" as previously, and that they should enter into anthropological and sociological analysis as well. It was obvious, however, that in the 1970s feminist anthropology and sociology, as it is now known, with its emphasis on feminist theory, methodology, and epistemology, had a long way to go. For example, a course on feminist anthropology dealing with these very issues was proposed in the 1980s, but was not supported for incorporation into the curriculum.

Meanwhile, one of the barometers against which the need for feminist and gender studies is frequently measured, the gender ratio of female to male students enrolled in a department, shows the beginning of a definite trend by the mid-1980s. Until the mid-1970s, men outnumbered women two to one among graduate students in anthropology and sociology: 29 women, 46 men in the former; 26 women, 59 men in the latter. Enrolment changed to almost equal numbers in anthropology in 1980 (24 women and 23 men). In sociology, men (25) still outnumbered women (18). By 1987, however, the ratios indicated that the women (28) admitted to anthropology

outnumbered men (9) three to one, while in sociology the distribution was essentially equal (15 women, 16 men).

Another barometer, faculty salaries, remained continually problematic. A university-wide review of women's salaries in 1972 found them to be lower than those of their male peers by an average of \$2,000. (One woman in AnSo was hired at a salary \$6,000 below that of the male who was comparably prepared and published.) Again in 1975, a peer-matching review identified anomalies, and increments were awarded to twenty-nine women faculty members. Between 1982 and 1984 yet another review found that salaries had slipped again, and that men earned on the average 4.2 percent more than women. As expected, 73 percent of the women were concentrated in ranks below associate, while only 26 percent of males were in these ranks. Further, it was estimated that it took women 15 percent longer to be promoted. Appointments to senior administrative positions were virtually non-existent and even those to lower level administrative positions, such as department heads and chairs of major committees, were equally rare. The absence of a comfortable climate for women was reflected in a departmental retort frequently evoked in those years by many of the women, and even some of the men, about meetings dominated by male colleagues: "The big boys are beating their chests again."

Another measure of gender inequality is the presence or absence of sexist language. Departmental language was essentially purified of such terms as "girls," "the study of man," and derogatory allusions such as "old wives' tales" by the early 1990s. Male insecurity about proper usage was reflected, until that time, by the use of "lady," ignoring the supposedly more abrasive "woman" and the unacceptable "girl." Transgressions on appropriate language usage still happen but are not considered as alarming as they once were and no longer always call for public correction. Instead, such "misspeaking" is more likely to be seen as an occasional lapse in a student's or colleague's consciousness, or as a lack of an appropriate education in academic and social proprieties. Within the department, the term *feminist* evolved from a totally negative descriptor to an appropriate description of certain theoretical and political positions and a new, sophisticated development in theory and epistemology.

The 1980s and 1990s brought another shift in departmental organization. It was initiated by the retirement of older members – Harry Hawthorn, Cyril Belshaw, David Aberle, and Kenelm Burridge in anthropology, and Reg Robson, Werner Cohn, Adrian Marriage, and Martin Meissner in sociology. Along with these retirements was an influx of new faculty members who had had no personal contact with the founding culture or the hectic 1970s at UBC. By the turn of the century, there was to be a complete transition to new membership. All those hired by Hawthorn and Belshaw, and those who had been their students at UBC, were retired by 2003. We were students in

the early and middle years of the Hawthorn era and novice faculty toward the end of his tenure. This makes us part of the old guard now fading into that very history we are attempting to construct in this volume.