

**Moderator: Gerald A. Oetelaar (University of Calgary)**

## **Participants:**

**William Dumas, Byron Gislason, Ellen Lee, George P. Nicholas and Brian Reeves**

Archaeology is at a crossroads in many of its facets. On one hand it is moving in exciting ways to encompass to a greater degree partnerships with First Nations; however, it is also facing serious issues at a variety of levels. These challenges include declining political will and support, inadequate legislation and problems in protecting the resources. There is often inadequate return of knowledge to the public and commemoration of our archaeological heritage. Questions of who owns this heritage have also arisen. The scope of archaeology is being redefined and problems have occurred in academic training. In this session, a panel consisting of representatives from government, academia, cultural resource management, First Nations and the public will discuss the issues facing archaeology with the audience.

L'archéologie, avec ses nombreuses facettes, est à la croisée des chemins. D'une part, elle évolue de façon surprenante pour s'adjoindre différents types de partenariats avec les Premières nations, d'autre part, elle est confrontée à des enjeux sérieux pour plusieurs de ses facettes. Parmi ces enjeux, se trouvent la baisse de la volonté et du soutien politique, l'insuffisance des lois et la difficile protection des ressources. La divulgation des connaissances acquises à la population est souvent inadéquate, et notre héritage archéologique n'est pas bien reconnu. Des interrogations sur la propriété du patrimoine sont aussi apparues. On redéfinit actuellement la portée de l'archéologie. On a signalé des difficultés dans la formation universitaire. Au cours de cette séance, un groupe formé de représentants du gouvernement, des universités, du monde de la gestion des ressources culturelles, des Premières nations et du public discuterons avec l'auditoire des problèmes auxquels l'archéologie est confrontée.

## **Biographies of Plenary Session Participants/Biographies des invités à la séance plénière**

**William Dumas** is an *Asiniskaw Ithiniwak* (Rock Cree) Elder from the community of South Indian Lake and member of Nisichawayasihk Cree Nation. At present he is an Aboriginal Education Consultant for the Mystery Lake School Division in Thompson, Manitoba. As an educator William has an active role in promoting and preserving Cree heritage through curriculum development for northern students. While William believes archaeology is an essential part of Cree heritage, it cannot be seen as the only method of understanding Cree history. He believes that archaeology should be used to complement other sources of information including oral history and traditional ecological knowledge.

**William Dumas** est un ancien *Asiniskaw Ithiniwak* (Cri des rochers) de la communauté du lac South Indian et un membre de la nation crie Nisichawayasihk. À l'heure actuelle, il est consultant en éducation autochtone à la division scolaire du lac Mystery, à Thompson (Manitoba). En tant qu'éducateur, M. Dumas joue un rôle actif dans la promotion et la conservation du patrimoine crie, notamment dans l'élaboration des programmes d'éducation des étudiants vivant dans le Nord. Bien qu'il croie que l'archéologie constitue une partie essentielle de l'héritage crie, il considère qu'elle n'est pas la seule méthode permettant de comprendre l'histoire de Crie. Il pense que l'archéologie devrait compléter d'autres sources de connaissances, notamment l'histoire orale et les savoirs écologiques traditionnels.

**Byron Gislason**, Film Producer/Director. Thirty years of documentary filmmaking have taken Byron Gislason around the world. However, it is his most recent documentary, "Where the Grandfathers Walked", that Byron realized an almost forgotten world and unsolved mysteries that lie within the stones of the Sacred Circles out on the Great Western Plains.

**Byron Gislason** est réalisateur et producteur de films. Pendant trente ans, la production de documentaires l'a entraîné autour du monde. Sa production la plus récente, *Where the Grandfathers Walked*, lui a permis de comprendre qu'un univers quasi éteint et des énigmes non résolues dormaient sous les pierres des cercles sacrés, laissés dans les grandes plaines de l'Ouest.

**Ellen Lee** is Director of the Archaeological Services Branch of Parks Canada, an organization responsible for the national parks and national historic sites programs of Canada. Her Branch facilitates the commemoration of Aboriginal history and develops operational policies for the management of archaeological resources managed by Parks Canada. She has written on a range of topics related to cultural landscapes and the commemoration of Aboriginal history in Canada, and maintains an

interest in the overlapping of cultural and natural values for protected area management. Ellen is part of a team working on the Historic Places Initiative, which, among other things, seeks to get the federal house in order by providing statutory protection for archaeological resources on federal land.

**Ellen Lee** est la directrice de la Direction des services archéologiques de Parcs Canada, une agence responsable des programmes des parcs nationaux et des sites historiques nationaux du Canada. Sa direction facilite la commémoration de l'histoire autochtone et élabore des politiques opérationnelles pour la gestion des ressources archéologiques gérées par Parcs Canada. Elle a écrit sur plusieurs sujets connexes aux paysages culturels et à la commémoration de l'histoire amérindienne au Canada, et elle s'intéresse toujours au chevauchement des valeurs culturelles et naturelles pour la gestion des aires protégées. Ellen fait partie d'une équipe de l'*Initiative des endroits historiques*, une mesure qui cherche, notamment, à mettre de l'ordre dans les affaires du gouvernement fédéral en offrant une protection statutaire aux ressources archéologiques sur les terres fédérales.

**Dr. George P. Nicholas** is Associate Professor of Archaeology at Simon Fraser University and the Secwepemc Education Institute in Kamloops, British Columbia, where he has directed the Indigenous Archaeology Program since 1991. He holds adjunct faculty positions in the Department of Anthropology at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, and the Department of Archaeology, at Flinders University, Adelaide, Australia. His research focuses on Indigenous archaeologies, the archaeology and human ecology of wetlands, hunter-gatherers past and present, archaeological theory, and intellectual property rights—all topics he has written extensively on. Nicholas is the editor of the *Canadian Journal of Archaeology*. His edited volumes include *At a Crossroads: Archaeology and First People's in Canada* (with Thomas Andrews).

**George P. Nicholas** est professeur agrégé d'archéologie à l'Université Simon Fraser et à l'Institut d'éducation de Secwepemc à Kamloops (Colombie-Britannique) dont il dirige le programme d'archéologie autochtone depuis 1991. Il est également professeur auxiliaire aux départements d'anthropologie de l'Université du Massachusetts, à Amherst et de l'Université Flinders, à Adélaïde en Australie. Il effectue des recherches sur les archéologies autochtones, l'archéologie et l'écologie humaine des terres humides, les chasseurs-cueilleurs d'hier et d'aujourd'hui, la théorie de l'architecture et les droits de propriétés intellectuelles. Il a largement publié dans ces domaines. Le professeur Nicholas est l'éditeur du *Journal canadien d'archéologie*. Parmi les ouvrages collectifs qu'il a dirigés, on trouve *At a Crossroads: Archaeology and First People's in Canada*, (en collaboration avec Thomas Andrews).

**Dr. Barney Reeves**, Professor Emeritus, Department of Archaeology, University of Calgary and Principle Archaeologist for Lifeways of Canada Limited (est. 1972). He taught at U of Calgary for 30 years. He has 42 years research, including 40 years in the Northern Rockies and Plains. Awards include Government of Canada, Minister of Environment, Canada Parks Service, Heritage Services Award 1993; Government of Canada 125th Anniversary of Confederation medal for Cross-Cultural Communication, 1993; Piikani Nation, Honour Dance and Naming for Sacred Site Protection, 1993; and Canadian Archaeological Association Carl M. Wittenberg Life Time Achievement Award 2000. He is mayor of Waterton Lakes National Park Municipal Council, 2000-present.

**Barney Reeves**, professeur émérite, Département d'archéologie, Université de Calgary et archéologue principal chez Lifeways of Canada Ltd. (fondée en 1972). Il a enseigné à l'Université de Calgary pendant 30 ans. Il effectue de la recherche depuis 42 ans, dont 40 ans dans le Nord des Rocheuses et dans les Plaines. Son travail a été souligné par le prix des services patrimoniaux de 1993, attribué par Parcs Canada, (Environnement Canada); par la médaille commémorative du 125<sup>e</sup> anniversaire de la Confédération du Canada pour les communications interculturelles attribuée en cette même année par le gouvernement du Canada; par la danse honorifique et la désignation pour la protection de sites sacrés, de la nation Piikani encore en 1993; par le prix Carl M. Wittenberg honorant l'ensemble de ses travaux remis par l'Association canadienne d'archéologie en 2000. Depuis 2000, il est maire du conseil municipal du parc national des lacs Waterton.

## **Gerald Oetelaar:**

Good morning. Before we start the conference and this particular plenary session, I would like to call upon William Dumas to please say a prayer on behalf of the conference attendees.

## **William Dumas:**

Good morning. It's a great honour to be here. I always think prayer comes in many forms and you're all very serious looking people this morning, so we'll use one of the great medicines called humour to start our prayer day.

It's a story. I'm a storyteller, and I travel across and tell stories. I've been into some major storytelling festivals so I'm going to try this one out on you guys, okay? If you think that it's good, I can tell by the way you laugh.

I'm from northern Manitoba and most of you are archaeologists, you have studied the past, you probably know a little bit about the Cree culture. This is a story about the Witego. How many of you know what a Witego is? Oh, a few of you; well, Witego is a cannibal. In the old days, people would turn to cannibalism when food went short, so this is my first public one with this one; you're my guinea pigs.

It was in the springtime and two witego met each other on the Churchill River and the other one start complaining to the first witego right away. He said, "You know it's been a tough winter, I haven't been able to get a good tender tasting missionary. They've all been tough. I've tried cooking them in many ways. I've roasted them. I've barbecued them. I've stewed them. I've boiled them as long as I can. I've even marinated one. There's just no way of getting a tender tasting missionary". The other witego looks at him and says, "Where are you getting these missionaries from?" "Just down by the Rusty, where the Rusty opens into the Churchill." You know where that is, eh, Leo? Well you have to go there; it's a beautiful place. "Down there, there is a whole bunch of them hanging around. There they all have got these long brown robes on with a rope tied around their waist. They got no hair on top, just a little line of hair around their heads." The other witego looks at him and says, "Aha, there's your problem, those are FRIARS!" That's a good prayer, eh?

Let's begin our day. Our creator, we thank you for this wonderful day that you've gathered us here. There is a saying amongst all people that study history in many ways. They say those that can look into the past in a good way will be able to see the future. That is what we ask of you today; for us to look into the past in a good way so we can find a good future together. This we ask of you in a humble way. Bless our work today. Hi hi. Amen.

## **Gerald Oetelaar:**

Thank you very much William. I would like now to call upon Greg Monks who is the conference organizer to say a few welcoming words before we start our plenary session. Greg.....

## **Greg Monks:**

Thank you, Gerry. Mr. Moderator, panelists, guests, colleagues welcome to Winnipeg. If you stay five more days, I will buy you each a bottle of 15 SPF sunscreen. Never mind; if you don't like the weather just stay around fifteen minutes and we'll have something different for you.

We have been swimming upstream. I remind myself of a salmon; I seem to be swimming upstream with this conference. We're up against the SAA's, we're up against the snow, we're up against a big conference in Copenhagen at this moment, but we're all still here. Throughout the organizing of this, I've been assisted most ably by an extensive committee of people that I'd like to acknowledge as a group right now. I thank them all very much for their work and I think that you'll all find that their work has been most effective. It was always clear that this conference was going to be a relatively small one, and as you can see with the size of the crowd here; this is the plenary session. It is small but we decided that this was going to be a small polished gem, and I hope that you saw from the food last night, for example, that it is turning out to be the case. We're all very desirous that you have a wonderful time here.

Now about this conference theme and the panel. "At a Crossroads" is not a new term; obviously, the volume that George put out attests to that. But it is nevertheless an ongoing theme with the Canadian archaeological community because there are many crossroads, and we stand at them moment by moment on many different levels. The opening prayer that Mr. Dumas offered for us is an excellent example. We have to look into the past and we have to look into the future and we need to do both of those tasks very perspicaciously. That is what this panel is about and that is what this conference is about. So I hope that the outcome is beneficial for the Archaeological Association in Canada in years to come.

This proceeding is going to be tape recorded and then transcribed. So you all are duly informed and have informed consent. If you wish to stand up and speak later, you'll all be on tape. I hope that this generates lots of discussion in this room and also afterwards on an ongoing basis.

On a sort of procedural note, those people who indicated that they wanted to take the bus tour on Sunday are encouraged to most emphatically to sign up at the registration desk before the end of lunch hour today. So if you'd please do that, we can get that part of it organized and straightened away. So again, thank you very much for coming. Welcome to

Winnipeg, despite the snow. Welcome to Winnipeg, you'll have a warm welcome despite the temperature outside.

## **Gerald Oetelaar:**

Thanks Greg. One more small item of business before we proceed with the panel discussion. A number of conference attendees have not been able to make it yet. They have been stuck either on Highway one going east, going west, roads going north, or roads going south, so there are going to be changes in the programs. Please look at the listings on the door. They're going to be updated regularly, just to let you know that some of the papers will not be happening at the times that they were originally scheduled, okay?

Alright, my name is Gerry Oetelaar and I am the moderator for this plenary session. I do hope, as Greg has pointed out, that it will generate discussion. We're especially looking for constructive type comments to help the archaeological community, the Canadian Archaeological Association, deal with some of the issues that we face at this important crossroads. So essentially the format will be as follows: We have a panel of five George Nicholas will be speaking first, then Barney Reeves, Ellen Lee and we had Byron Gislason scheduled, if he makes it we'll slot him in, if not, William will sort of conclude the plenary session.

After the plenary session there will probably most likely be a coffee break and we want you to come back in after the coffee break and address questions or raise other issues that may not have been brought up during the sessions by moving up to one of the microphones and speaking into it clearly. Do not stand far away from the microphones, try to come up about 6 to 8 inches so that your voice will come across very clearly. We want you to sort of have a free flow of ideas, so if there are two people and you want to have a discussion back and forth with two or three people talking at the same time, that will be okay. The one thing that we ask is that when you come up to the microphone, you identify who you are, please, so that it will be on the transcripts. Also, other members of the audience can address questions to you as an individual or refer back to something that one of you may have said. That is the only stipulation that we're trying to ask of you, and that is that you be willing to state who you are and then pose the question. Alright? So without further ado, I pass the microphone on to George Nicholas who will give us the first presentation.

George P. Nicholas

## **Always Seeking Enlightenment: Indigenous Archaeology, Intellectual Property Rights, and Other Challenges**

Let me begin by thanking the First Peoples of this territory for their hospitality.

Archaeology is the study of people's lives through their material culture. Ancient lifeways are reconstructed, technologies replicated, and diet reconstituted through the archaeological record. Archaeology is concerned with what happened and why. However, to this minimalist definition, I would add that Archaeology is as much about the living as it is about their predecessors; and that the type of archaeology we do is very much a product of our times. It is these two points that ground my presentation. Archaeology has always been in a state of transition, responding to technological and methodological developments, as well as to stunning theoretical growth. In recent decades, it has also had to respond both to critiques raised by descendant communities, and to political circumstances. My argument is that such challenges, whether raised by the Kennewick Man controversy or other events, is a very good thing.

I operate in two very different realms of archaeology. While my field research focuses on the archaeology of prehistoric hunter-gatherers, particularly as it relates to past land-use practices, I am also theoretically committed to the postcolonial transformation of the discipline by promoting a more inclusive, equitable archaeology.

Today I look at three tasks archaeology must undertake in seeking enlightenment. These are: recognizing the potential impacts of archaeology; dissolving conceptual boundaries; and addressing intellectual property issues.

### **Recognizing The Impacts Of Archaeology**

The contributions of archaeology are the primary means by which we find out about the past. We make observations, develop and test hypotheses, and propose theories to expand our knowledge—what could be more desirable than this? But often left unasked is the question: what do our interpretations do to the knowledge that Aboriginal peoples already possess through oral history and worldview?

To Aboriginal Australians, not only is the landscape composed of ancestral beings, but also it is literally timeless. Western worldview separates the “real” and “supernatural realms and the present from the past; time is linear. These separations do not exist in indigenous societies where ancestral spirits are part of *this* existence, and the sacred qualities of the landscape are not an abstract concept. This realization is significant because archaeology's separation of past and present illogical according to some indigenous peoples, and threatens the integrity of aboriginal worldview and beliefs. Ancestral sites are important not just because they were created by the ancestors, but because those ancestors reside there *now*. Places are sacred not just for their value

as a place where mythological events happened, but rather where they *continue* to happen. Archaeology may threaten this.

Archaeology may also challenge notions of cultural continuity. First Nations peoples may augment their understanding of the past by turning to pictographs found in their territory. While archaeologists find any interpretation of rock art problematic, some elders are able to “translate” rock art panels with confidence. Archaeologists may be skeptical of such interpretations, and by the fact that this elder can as easily translate images that may be a few hundred years old as those that may be thousands of years old. “How do you know this to be so?” may be answered by elders stating, “We don’t need to know how.”

Similar confidence in their knowledge of the past is exhibited some Secwepemc, both young and old, who insist that their ancestors *always* lived in the pithouses that were in use at the time of contact, and that salmon was *always* the mainstay of their diet and economy. The archaeological record, however, suggests that this way of life developed only 4,000 years ago. Likewise, band members may be wary of interpretations of the earlier prehistoric record and some contend “we have always been here.” Here is a case where archaeologists offer an interpretation of the past that may be objectionable because it threatens traditional beliefs. Indeed, archaeology may be considered a threat because it ultimately seeks to replace their view of the past with one explicitly “scientific.” Western scholars tend to accept oral tradition as legitimate only when it can be correlated with archaeology, but Aboriginal people may accept archaeology only when it is corroborated by oral tradition. Sites and artifacts may contribute to their understanding and appreciation of the past, but such things don’t define that past.

Archaeologists thus must consider carefully the impacts of their desire to discover the past may have on Aboriginal communities; that we cannot take without giving; and that the objects we excavate represent ancient lives linked to contemporary ones.

## **Dissolving Conceptual Boundaries**

Much of the debate concerning the relationship between Indigenous peoples and archaeology has concerned the *process* of doing archaeology. The increased participation of descendant communities in the process of archaeology is extremely important. And the discipline benefits as new voices and new perspectives filter through it, and also as Indigenous peoples become practicing archaeologists and educators. That said, I contend that it is time to think about seeking the end to Indigenous Archaeology. I am being intentionally provocative here but am also arguing an important and fundamental issue.

Currently, Indigenous perspectives are generating a distinct form of archaeology, and some would suggest a very separate one. Indigenous archaeology has today become a vital dimension of contemporary archaeology, complete with a broad literature base. However, while I have worked to facilitate this long-overdue element in archaeology, at the same time I suggest that we must also work to eliminate it as a creature that resides solely outside of the mainstream. Rather than working to develop indigenous approaches to archaeology separate from others, we

should be trying to incorporate them within the discipline. Failing to do so will limit significantly or marginalize the potential contributions of archaeology as a more representative and responsible discipline, and constrain its continued intellectual growth. Why?

The value of archaeology has been recognized as aiding Aboriginal peoples in many things, and we are now seeing a broad spectrum of Aboriginal involvement in archaeology. At one end is found their application of conventional archaeological methods in heritage management, and land claims. At the other end are efforts to develop an archaeology that is distinctly their own. Of course, some decry the politicalization of archaeology as a dangerous concession to special interest groups while ignoring the political nature that archaeology has always had. Each of these fundamentalist positions needs to be respected, but ethically the inequalities that have existed, and which continue to exist between indigenous peoples and Western science, are indefensible.

In addition to contributing to a more equitable, representative, and accessible archaeology, the real contribution of indigenous archaeology is that it gets us thinking about things. The past become more solid when we incorporate oral histories, landscape knowledge, and other ignored or underutilized tools in archaeological investigations. Clearly not all sources of data are equal or pristine, but it is arrogant to think that Western minds can comprehend fully those of very different cultures, past or present. Some of the stories that emerge from a more inclusive archaeology may reveal new things about the archaeological record or about how Native people think about that record.

Furthermore, by keeping Indigenous archaeology separate from the main stream, it becomes both ghettoized and marginalized, thus constraining severely its potential contributions both to the discipline and to Aboriginal communities. It also runs the risk of potentially lower standards. An analogy is the development of Feminist and/or Women's Studies programs in universities and colleges beginning in the 1970s. While clearly a long-needed expansion of intellectual discourse, the relegation of feminist scholars to their own realm removes their voices from other departments and faculties where they are needed, and especially from those students who might benefit the most from insights into, for example, the cultural construction of gender or feminist methodologies.

Many of the developmental stages associated with Feminist archaeology are found in Indigenous Archaeology, and there are striking similarities in the literature of each. For a time, the focus of the feminist or gender-oriented archaeological studies was on the Goddess, who, like Elvis, seemed to show up everywhere. The literature subsequently became more diverse, the theory more interesting, and the methodology more robust. The situation is similar with Indigenous Archaeology where a significant percentage of the literature developed from, or in response to the highly charged atmosphere of reburial. Despite growth, both fields largely remain entities to themselves, with limited presence in the larger arena. This separation is probably necessary for initial phases of growth, but both are more robust now and can hold their own.



While I strongly encourage the pursuit of indigenous-oriented methods and theories as long overdue in contemporary archaeology, we need to include them within the mainstream. But I also recognize the continued need for non-mainstream approaches so that Indigenous archaeologies can and should maintain their own identity. By promoting a more ethical and collaborative archaeology, we can work with descendant communities without marginalizing them. This can make archaeology more representative, relevant, and responsible, and contribute to a more even playing field in which ideas on or from indigenous perspectives are given the consideration they are due. And this brings me to my final topic.

## Intellectual Property Rights

Indigenous archaeology has been very much about the *process* of doing archaeology, and as such will be an important element of all future archaeology. But little attention has been paid to the *products* of doing archaeology, regardless of who is doing it. Here we enter a realm in which intellectual property rights must be considered.

Intellectual property rights are globally a rapidly expanding topic, particularly in relation to biotechnology and ecological knowledge, but archaeologists have yet to consider how it may affect their research. While material property issues have certainly arisen with repatriation and reburial, the question of intellectual property rights has not, perhaps due to the challenges of defining “intellectual property.” But archaeological sites and data potentially fall within the realm of *both* cultural and intellectual property.

To what degree do the descendants have rights over *intellectual* aspects of heritage? In North America, the protection of archaeological materials is based exclusively on the notion of *physical property*. While legislation protecting *intellectual* property is extensive in both countries and could offer additional protection to sites, no explicit protection for the intellectual component of archaeology exists under any federal, provincial or state heritage policies. Most archaeologists, in fact, would not recognize an intellectual component at all. Even if they did, many would argue that the great age of most sites puts this information in the realm of shared heritage.

The situation is very different for communities with a vested interest in their own heritage sites. Aboriginal Australians are very concerned that: “The focus of cultural heritage laws is on tangible cultural heritage, such as specific areas, objects, and sites, but the intangible aspects of sites, such as associated stories, songs, and dreaming tracks, are not protected.” IPR legislation may provide new avenues that Indigenous peoples can pursue to protect their cultural and intellectual property as *they* define these entities.

How has the archaeological record been appropriated and commodified? Taking and affixing a price to what many would consider inalienable and priceless—affects the cultural identity and integrity of contemporary Native societies. Should cultural and intellectual property be protected from such exploitation? If so, should protection be from outside interests only or from *all* users, including Indigenous peoples themselves? What if Indigenous groups want to

exploit their own past for commercial gain? Does this *Homo habilis* skull belong as much to me, as a descendant, as it does to the African paleoanthropologist who found it in her homeland?

The collection and sale of antiquities has gone on for thousands of years, but today occurs at unprecedented rates to satisfy the growing interest in items prized for their age, rarity, exoticness, or “Aboriginal-ness.” Even Indigenous peoples contribute to this, such as the often-impoorished indigenous Central Americans who find tombs and then sell the artifacts to support their families.

The appropriation and commodification of artifacts may also take less obvious forms. Images of artifacts and sites, sometimes including those once or still cherished and sacred, appear on t-shirts, magazine ads, billboards, postcards, and other media. Sherwin-Williams uses Upper Paleolithic rock art to sell house paint. Even anthropologists and archaeologists, who should be more sensitive to this, sometimes assume that ancient objects become divorced from contemporary cultural impacts when they enter the public domain. More generally, we use artifacts as illustrations, seeking permission only from the museums that “own” those items.

There is also the theft of intellectual property through the unauthorized use of Aboriginally produced images, ancient and modern, something particularly widespread in Australia. Worldwide, rock art images representing the ritual knowledge of past people appear in books and other media, but seldom with attribution to the descendants who still occupy that territory. And when there is permission by Aboriginal persons to reproduce those images, is it with the approval of the larger community, tribe, or nation?

Regardless of the intention of their creators, appreciation of artifacts and rock art was very different in the past than today, as images are disseminated and altered. A personal story shows how easy it is to alter tangible idea and how little control we have over its dissemination. About ten years ago, I was preparing slides for a lecture on hunter-gatherer economy and “access to the means of production” and other ideas influenced by Marx. The next thing I knew, the old boy’s head was pasted onto the body of a !Kung hunter. And then onto an Upper Paleolithic “Venus.” I sent copies to colleagues, including one at the University of Massachusetts, where I had completed my Ph.D. I later learned that this figure appeared on a t-shirt prepared for the department’s 25th anniversary. I was honored that this late night whimsy had found fame, but wonder where my intellectual property may ultimately end up.

What has occurred with material property is also occurring with the intellectual property of Indigenous peoples. Knowledge once restricted to specific cultures now has been made widely available, and seldom due to the decisions of the communities themselves. Immense public interest in “things Aboriginal” has for centuries prompted collecting, scrutinizing, and even imitation of Indian curios and lifeways, such as shown by this slide of a non-Aboriginal woman in New Zealand outfitted as a Native American, complete with a Geronimo tattoo). Not surprisingly, intellectual aspects of cultural property and cultural identity have been appropriated and commodified in the recreation of the past through tourism and museums.

Cultural tourism is now a significant industry worldwide. Many living museums include reenactments of life in the past, utilizing speech and actors/guides in period clothes to represent both the colonizers and the colonized. The “best” of these include participant voices; the “worst” blatantly exploit and stereotype Indigenous peoples. There is also today a proliferation of Aboriginally developed and run heritage parks, tours, and “experiences.” The way that Aboriginal communities choose to present themselves is critical to whether the experience is perceived and appreciated as one of cultural education and sharing, or criticized as cultural “prostitution.”

“Control” of knowledge is at the heart of the issue—not simply for economic reasons, but because it is integral defining or restoring cultural identity for present and future generations. Archaeologists have controlled the dissemination of information derived from the past through publishing practices, and by restricting access to site locations. While such management helps to preserve sites, there are negative aspects. For example, much information has been kept from Indigenous communities, often inadvertently. Since archaeologists choose what they will or will not publish, information potentially useful to communities may not be available simply because it fell outside of the interests of the investigator and was not pursued. Access to knowledge is obviously the first of several key steps to more equitable control of knowledge.

Copyright is one mechanism now being employed. The Site Investigation Permit of the Kamloops Indian Band stipulates “joint copyright between the Permittee and the Band” for all resulting publications. Indeed, copyright may be one of the more commonly used forms of intellectual property protection. Trademark is also gaining recognition as a potentially useful tool in the context of protecting Indigenous images and designs. The Nanaimo First Nation successfully registered with the Canadian Intellectual Property Office ten petroglyphs as “official marks” to *prevent* them from being copied and reproduced by anyone for any purpose. Patents may also seem fairly unrelated to archaeological research but archaeological research at the molecular level may involve ancient DNA. In North America, DNA has been successfully extracted from preserved brain tissue from 8,000-year-old sites. The full value and applications of these findings is still unknown, but human genetic material is patentable in many countries. Thus, if ancient human DNA were to play a critical role in future medical treatments for diseases, or some other scenario of widespread contemporary benefits, there would be many important issues to resolve involving cultural heritage and intellectual property rights.

How should we proceed from here? Contending with IPR concerns in archaeology and other fields will require new approaches, policies and research paradigms that draw from applied anthropology, policy analysis and law. I offer two recommendations.

The first is to recognize how intellectual property and intellectual property rights are being used and defined in particular situations, both by archaeologists and by other stakeholders. The second is to consider archaeology as a “negotiated practice” among parties with varied, and sometimes conflicting, interests and responsibilities. This may entail crafting new terms of engagement and compromise to protect and respect indigenous knowledge and the archaeological record alike. In Australia, the Barunga with whom Claire Smith works have the right to censor harmful aspects of her research, but she designs the study with them to minimize this possibility and retains ownership over intellectual results of the research.

## Some Closing Thoughts On Postcolonial Issues

If archaeology were always just about what happened and when; if archaeologists were content to only construct and refine culture histories and artifact typologies; if archaeologists were not challenged to justify, defend, or explain themselves to a skeptical, occasionally hostile public, then the task of dealing with the past would be some much easier. But would it be any better? Would we learn to think about the past in new ways? These questions lead to the subtext of this presentation—that archaeology is constantly seeking enlightenment but always being only halfway there. I offer this Zen-like aphorism in all seriousness because I think that archaeology is now, and always has been, in a state of transformation. And this reflects the great strength of the discipline and its ability to respond to new ideas, challenges, and partners in the development of a more ethical and equitable archaeology.

Thank you.

The following citations address in greater detail some of the issues raised in this presentation:

*Nicholas, G.P.*

2004 The Persistence of Memory, The Politics of Desire: Archaeological Impacts on Aboriginal Peoples and Their Response. In *Decolonizing Archaeological Theory and Practice*, edited by C. Smith and H. M. Wobst. Routledge. In Press.

2004. What I Really Want from a Relationship with Native Americans. *The SAA Archaeological Record*, Society for American Archaeology. May: 29-33.

2003 “Seeking the End of Indigenous Archaeology.” 5th World Archaeological Congress, Washington, D.C.

2001. The Past and Future of Indigenous Archaeology: Global Challenges, North American Perspectives, Australian Prospects. *Australian Archaeology* 52: 29-40.

2000. Indigenous Land Rights, Education, and Archaeology in Canada: Postmodern/Postcolonial Perspectives by a Non-Canadian White Guy. In “Native Title and the Transformation of Archaeology in the Postcolonial World,” edited by I. Lilley. *Oceania Monographs* (special issue), pp. 121-137.

*Nicholas, G. P., and T. D. Andrews*

1997. Indigenous Archaeology in the Postmodern World. In *At Crossroads: Archaeology and First Peoples in Canada*, edited by G.P. Nicholas and T. D. Andrews, pp. 1-18. Archaeology Press, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, BC.

*Nicholas, G. P. and K.P. Bannister*

2004 ‘Copyrighting the Past’: Emerging Intellectual Property Rights Issues in Archaeology. *Current Anthropology* 45(3): 327-350.

2004 Intellectual Property Rights and Indigenous Cultural Heritage in Archaeology. In *Indigenous Intellectual Property Rights: Facing*, edited by M. Riley, pp. 309–340. AltaMira Press, Walnut Grove, CA.

*Nicholas, G. P., and J. Hollowell*

2004 Intellectual Property Rights in Archaeology? *Anthropology News* 45(4): 6, 8. American Anthropological Association.

## Gerald Oetelaar:

Thanks George. I'd like to call upon Barney to give his talk.

### Barney Reeves

Thank you Gerry. Good morning. At least we can blame Alberta or B.C. for this storm. We can't blame the Americans, which we usually blame for all kinds of things. I don't know how many of you were here in Winnipeg for the first meeting of the CAA. Anybody here? Leigh. This is where there CAA was founded, what was it Leigh, 38 years ago? 35? 33? I'm trying to remember; it was the late sixties. I'm not sure; was it this hotel? Marlborough. That's right! That's before we destroyed the Fort Garry a couple of times. Back then it was the same size crowd; it was the middle of January. As usual you know what Portage and Main was like then and we only had enough papers to fill a single session. Things have changed. What goes around comes around, I guess, at least in this case to where we began. Many people who were here were founders but are no longer with us. I just made a brief list of some of the folks who were members: Dick Forbis, Bill Irving, Bill Taylor and, of course most recently, Jim Wright who just recently passed away.

When Leigh called me a month or so ago, he wanted me to talk about consulting archaeology. I said, "Well, that's really kind of boring," but I'll talk little bit about it, but there are other things I want to get off my chest, too. So today I'm going to talk to you briefly about consulting contract archaeology of the last forty years or so. We're going to talk, more importantly, about the crisis we have in archaeological and anthropological associations in North America. I'm past president of the Plains Anthropological Association and have been on the board, past and present, for the last six years, so I have some direct experience on this on a regional level. I'm going to talk a little bit about the curation crisis, the deaccessioning of collections and programs and a growing trend to not collecting things because there's no place to put them if you collect them, and a few little issues about repatriation. Following on George, I'm going to talk a little about interpreting the past, scientific worldviews, First Nations and others. I've brought a few props with me as well. Then I'll conclude with some looks at the roles of archaeology, ethnology, ethnohistory, and First Nation legal claims.

First, turning to consulting and contracting archaeology, in Canada, it's about thirty years old as an industry, and it's really a result of the various provincial legislation heritage acts that came about in the early nineteen seventies. Prior to that, of course, we only had the legislation in British Columbia, which dates back if I remember right to 1948? It defines ownership of the artifacts as residing within the nearest and closest First Nations, which is

both good and bad depending how you look at it. Prior to the early seventies, contracting was limited primarily to large projects on both the Federal and Provincial level. Parks Canada, for example, Department of National Defense, CFB Suffield, Department of Transportation, the Pickering Airport from the sixties, something thank God that never got built, MacKenzie Valley highway from the late sixties and early seventies, Dam Site C in B.C., James Bay etc. Most of that work was done by universities rather than private contractors, but with the introduction of legislation in Alberta, Ontario and elsewhere in the early seventies, there was a growth and perceived need to deal with consulting archaeology. My company was founded in 1972; it's had its ups and downs. Currently, just to give you an example, we're a medium sized company, we have 11 full time staff, 4 Ph.D.s, 3 Masters, 4 Bachelors and about 4000 square feet of space, and we work twelve months a year both in the States and in western Canada. In Alberta, probably there are 60 full time people in the consulting industry and probably rising to around 100 in the summer. I have no idea on how large it is across Canada.

Canada. One thing that's somewhat different from the States is that we're more regionalized or provincialized. Most archaeologists tend to work within the province or within the region, and that's good because we know our database best. I recall a contract issued by Parks Canada many years ago for Kootenay National Park in which the archaeologists who came to look for Precontact Kootenay sites were wandering around looking for shell middens. Ah, well, gee guys, the floodplains are less than 100 years old. Needless to say they didn't find any, but then it was given later to Wayne Choquette who found many sites in Kootenay National Park. You need to know your regional archaeology to do a good job whether you're a research archaeologist or a contract archaeologist. In contrast, in the US where federal legislation is paramount and state legislation is wishy washy at best in most states, you have more firms which are large regional firms or on the national level. So there is a difference. There is a big difference between Canada and the US regulations and the products that come out of it.

Today in Canada we're much of a mixed industry of freelancers, independent firms and archaeologists who are part of larger engineering firms. Now I don't know about Eastern Canada, I can only speak for the West, particularly Alberta and Saskatchewan. There has been a disturbing trend of large planning and engineering firms not only hiring and creating their own archaeological and heritage units within usually the environmental division but also acquiring independent firms. I find this disturbing because we work under different legislation and we should maintain an independent view. Once we get involved as part of a larger organization where you have conflicting regulatory frameworks and legal things you're working with, sometimes you have to compromise your ethics and values to meet the goals of your company and the client. I won't go into some examples of that from both Canada and the US where that has happened. So I think that we need to keep a good group of independent consulting archaeologists. There are lots of issues in it, one is that we have, in some of the provinces, professional associations and in others we don't. We probably should have a professional association or within the CAA; it's been talked about over the years at the national level. But then we don't have any meaningful federal legislation anyways so is

there really a need?

There are variations between regulatory agencies between the provinces and within. I was just talking to somebody last night, and they were saying about filling out site inventory forms for five different provinces or whatever, and nobody's gotten together on this, so we've had thirty years of it at least. I did a survey many years ago to find out what site inventory forms were like across Canada because I was designing a new one for the University of Calgary. This is before we had legislation, and one of the prominent Canadian archaeologists who's not here today sent me a piece of yellow foolscap. That was the amount that he recorded. Another one that's not here today told me, "Well I only fill out the forms for the sites I think that somebody else might like to dig. The ones I don't think are any good, I don't fill them out and the one's I want to dig, I won't fill out forms either." We need more and better guidelines by the regulatory agencies, and we need more uniformity by the regulatory agencies.

One of the main complaints is all the grey literature that is generated by consultants and how do you access it? It's not easy; most of it's on paper, but now with PDF and electronic files, for example, in Alberta we are now required to file a PDF file for all of our reports. Our companies website is being upgraded, and we're just going to post our useful reports on it and anybody can download them for free. This is common for a number of agencies and consultants in the United States to get the information out and let other people share it. In some of the contracts that I do in the United States, I am required to publish in a scientific journal and print off a 100 copies of the report as well and also attend a regional conference and give a paper. It's built into the contract and that's another way the information can get out. I assure you when your client withholds 25 percent of your contract until you've met your obligations, you do produce those sorts of things.

So over the last thirty years, we've employed a lot of people who would have otherwise left the discipline because the only opportunities have been either on the regulatory side or museum research or in universities and colleges. These have decreased, so there have been lots of people with bachelors and masters and increasingly doctors who have been employed with the consulting industry, and many without the postgraduate degrees would have gone elsewhere. Resulting, at least in Western Canada, that most of the substantive contributions to our knowledge over the last twenty years in particular have come from contract and consulting archaeologists, not institutional based researchers, because large excavation programs and inventory have been private sector contracts.

At the same time as there has been this growth, institutional based research has been cut back. We can look at the contributions of the Archaeological Survey of Canada made when it was first created. Everybody was out in the field, were getting lots of good fieldwork done, lots of publications done. Today there is not much hope that this unit will continue to exist after the current archaeologists retire out. There's no plan, there's no succession plan in place, and we can point to this in a number of government agencies, research agencies and museums. It's gone down as budgets have decreased, the priorities have changed, grants

have been cut back, staffing has changed resulting in a much less institutional based research than there used to be. As well, at the same time, there is an increasingly amount of research being done by Canadian archaeologists outside of Canada funded by our tax dollars. Well, I've complained a little bit over the years and I've been shown various reports of the committee of SSHRC showing that this is not in fact, the case. I'm afraid that it is the case. I find it a disturbing trend. I sat on those committees for some years when I was at the university and one overseas archaeologist said to me, "We all get together and we don't really attack each other in our review of our proposal of SSHRC so we tend to get our money." Whereas for some of the review committees that I've sat on, Canadian archaeologists trying to get grants to do some good research that is badly needed have been thoroughly trashed by some reviewers, none of whom are in the audience, I notice. Well, anonymous anyways, right? So those are some the trends that are affecting things.

I think the single biggest limit to growth in the consultancy field is that we are not part of NAFTA. We cannot enter the United States to practice archaeology without going through the whole process of getting that green card. It's unfortunate because that's where some real opportunities to export some very good archaeologists and very good archaeology down to the States, which continues there to expand in terms of contract archaeology. There's no opportunity now of being included. When I started contracting with US federal agencies, I looked into it. I got as far as some offices in Ottawa and Washington; we had a senator helping us from Montana. It's impossible; it would take us twenty years probably to get in, so that's unfortunate, but that's history.

Now I'm going to turn briefly to talk about archaeological and anthropological associations: what is our future? Continued success of consulting archaeologists, research archaeologists and all of us who are concerned with doing and practicing archaeology is really dependent upon strong associations at the provincial level, our avocational societies, and professional societies at the regional level and at the national level. There is a problem; memberships are declining, manuscript submissions are declining and fiscal outlook is not good. This, however, is not confined to our discipline; it's across the sciences. I've talked to people who are on the board of the Geological Association of America, the American Chemical Society and so on and so on. It's all across the disciplines. Basically, younger generations of scientists and scholars are not joining the organizations, attending meetings, or submitting manuscripts for the journals. Younger people are not getting involved. As I've mentioned, I've been working with the Plains Anthropological Association for some years, and when I became president I noticed that we had some disturbing trends. Over the last decade, we've lost twenty percent of our membership, and this is not institutional membership; the libraries are still subscribing, these are individuals. So we undertook a little review of who were members and who are members, and we found that this decline is not only in younger people, people not joining, but also a number of academics dropped their membership and let them lapse, but still going to conferences and giving papers, interestingly enough. Our editor for the Plains journal very barely gets enough manuscripts to fill four issues a year. We didn't want to cut back to three, so you see things in that journal that are a little marginal. But these journals have to keep going, because a lot of



people don't have opportunities to go to conferences every year depend on them; This is the same on the Plains, which run north-south, as it is for Canada, which runs east-west, they rely on the journals.

So there are issues there; why has this happened? I don't know. I've talked to some younger people including some of my employees and people that work for the government. I think it's largely because of that big evil thing called the computer, the wired society of internet and email. To some of my senior staff, I say, "Use the phone, don't send that guy an email." Well, "He won't answer his voice mail". I say, "Get on the phone, you'll finally get him." You know, not unlike many scholars, we tend to be introverts rather than extroverts and don't like to get on the phone and hassle somebody or talk to somebody when you can send them an email. Also there is the belief that the Internet has everything on it; you can download everything you want for free, right? No. If it's not in properly, you're not going to get it out properly.

Younger people don't recognize the value of personal networking; that's what these conferences are all about; not only about hearing papers and finding out what's going on but also meeting other people. There's also out there the increasing attitude about the 9 to 5 job. Weekends are for me or my family, but sometimes it's just me. Gee, "I can't go to this conference, I'm going skiing in Banff this week." "Well, I've got to go here; I've got to do this." Another thing that people I've talked to complain about, particularly in bureaucracies that they don't get paid to go to conferences, so why should they go? Or they don't get time off in lieu of. So these are issues and another one is job performance; not publishing or attending conferences is irrelevant to career advancement, and that's true, although, I do give my staff bonuses. A few years ago I thought it would be a good idea because we do some good work occasionally as consultants. So I took two of my senior staff and I sent them to the Plains conference when it was in St. Paul. I thought it was nice. They gave papers, they grunted about that and then I found out that they were really unhappy with me. I forked out two grand to send them down there to go to the conference but they didn't really want to go to a conference. I said, okay, thank you. One guy doesn't work for me anymore anyways. But they didn't want to be interactive and meet other people and say, "Gee, we're digging neat sites and we're doing this and doing that." Anyhow, these are all issues, and then we have the other thing that has been alluded to before, of course, the flagship conferences and flagship journals. They look good on your CVs, so are we going to go this one, or are we going to go to the SAA in Montreal. I understand there was a young undergraduate student from the University of Calgary who went to Montréal, gave a paper, and complained to her supervisor that there were no Plains people there. Well, gee, why would there be? It's a national conference, the Plains never had a large role within the SAAs anyways. So these are all issues that I think are important.

Conference timing is also critical. When we started the CAA here, we started in mid-January, then it sort of moved to February, then it sort of moved to the spring, which is great for field trips, but a lot of people can't come when they're in the industry. During the good weather my staff is out; well they're not out right now, our snow is mainly gone. But there

are probably twenty or thirty archaeologists out working in the field right now in Alberta and Saskatchewan. We work twelve months a year. The best time to have meetings is in the winter. That's why the Society for Historical Archaeology does well. It has its meeting right after New Years, not much else to do. It also has neat venues, too, which helps. I belong to the Rocky Mountain Anthropological Association; we have exactly the same problem. They decided to have it in September because we have great field trips. We get maybe a hundred and fifty people a year even though we're only thirty miles away from Denver this last year at Rocky Mountain National Park. We need to seriously look at what time you have the meetings.

Turning now to the curation crisis and the non-collection of artifacts. As we all know, there is less and less money going to collections management and curation; assets are being reduced with serious results. The Plains Anthropological Association has a curation committee. We have a very interesting report submitted, and we're having a full session on this at the meetings in Billings next fall. Any who are close by should come; some are being invited from Canada. It's a very serious problem. Institutions are deaccessioning collections and programs. Happening first in the United States. Examples: The Museum of the Rockies, a wonderful regional museum in Bozeman, Montana where my good friend Leslie Davis created the program in archaeology and anthropology, terminated the program and collections two years ago. Why? Because Jack Horner, some of you may know the name the famous dinosaur hunter, threatened to take his collection and build his own institute if he didn't get more space. So the board says dinosaurs are cool, we don't need anthropology or archaeology; out the door. Nebraska, University of Nebraska, collections are being terminated, program is being terminated. Colorado, you can't get a permit to do archaeology in the State unless you have a designated repository, and they're hard to find. That results in things such as the non-collection of artifacts.

At the Plains Conference there was a poster session there by a group of people who were from a University working in the Absaroke Mountains east of Yellowstone National Park. They're using the best GIS stuff that exists, beautiful stuff, you know, that I'd love to be able to afford. They're recording and casting all of these artifacts, and they're leaving them there. So imagine the cost of getting the GPS position down to like this, if that's significant, I don't think so, and then casting this point and leaving the point. I asked one of the presenters, "So how are you ever going to do a blood residue analysis, wear analysis, lithic type analysis?" "Oh, they replied we didn't think about that." We just have no place to put them." So it's costing them more money to non-collect than to have it curated. This is an issue, curation is a problem; we rely on the collections of the past.

I'm working on a major First Nations transborder court case, as expert witness, part of this involves reexamining Late Period artifact collections from last thousand years from Montana, Alberta, and Saskatchewan. Three critical sites to our case, one is the Bording School Bison Jump in Montana, excavated by Tom Kehoe, published as Plains Anthropologist memoir back in the sixties. The collection has either been stolen or thrown out of the BIA office in Browning because a certain person who will remain unnamed who had borrowed the collection and given it to his ex-wife. His ex-wife wouldn't give it back to

the museum because she didn't like the person that ran the museum. Gone. It's gone. I'm trying to find out who stole it or where it got sold to.

The Saamis site, the collection is in Ottawa, I looked at it last October. Wonderful collection, no catalogue. Some people say the catalogue went to Ottawa; Ian Dyck says he's never seen the catalogue in Ottawa. Fortunately, it doesn't have a lot of time depth, so I can analyze it. The Gull Lake site, a classic buffalo jump; catalogue is missing. Fortunately, Tom Kehoe wrote unit level numbers on all of the artifacts, so Dale Walde and I can take all of the artifacts and put them back where they were excavated. These are just some examples from my own experience.

The ownership of artifacts, sites, and intellectual property which you have eluded to earlier, these are real issues. First Nations on the reserves under the provincial act may own them, but they may not be theirs ethnically. So we're getting into conflict situations about these things, but it's theirs legally and they may not have any interests in preserving them anyways. In the States we have this bizarre thing, I've found recently. I was wanting to look at a major collection recovered on a pipeline excavation and they said, "Well, it's not in the BLM repository in Billings." So I called up the consultant archaeologist, "We gave it back to the landowner." Of course, here I'm used to Canada where things are owned by the state where in the States and its on the land you own it. That the general thing in the States and is increasingly becoming so because nobody wants to curate the stuff. They give them to the people whose land they excavated the site on, in this case the landowner. This was the largest Avonlea processing camp that's ever been excavated in the Plains. So I asked the landowners. They said "Oh, we gave it to the local museum." So I tried to find the local museum, and the person who lists heritage institutions for the State Historic Preservation Office in Montana said, "Oh, couldn't find it." So it may be gone.

Those sorts of things are real issues. NAGPRA and access to information. We talked about intellectual property rights; these are big issues. A couple of experiences of my own. I phoned up a very prominent museum in the U.S. Midwest and I said, "I would like to look at your photographs of the Arapaho, Cheyenne, and Blackfoot shields that you have." He says, "You'll have to get permission from each tribe to look at the photographs." "I can look up the photographs in the book." He says, "Sorry, if you want to look at our images at our institution you have to contact all three tribes." Recently, I was in Denver and I wanted to look at some drawings, by a fellow with the name of Renaud who was an archaeologist at the University of Denver back in the 1930s, of the Castle Garden Shields which are a fabulous set and over the last sixty seventy years are in very poor condition today. I just wanted to see the original drawings to see if they were different from what he published in 1933. I was informed by the University of Denver that I would have to get permission from the Wind River Shoshone tribe to look at the drawings in their collection. I can read the notes; they are posted on their web site but I couldn't look at the drawings. I can look at the drawings which are published and of course the Wind River Shoshone have now claimed that these belong to them because some Wyoming archaeologists say the Shoshone have been in Wyoming forever, where others say they're not. I am convinced that this particular set is in

fact Arapaho.

One final example and I'll move on. As part of my work in this court case, I want to look at the burial records for Montana because I'm very interested in evidence for conflict in the last thousand years and what kind of burial goods may be there, what evidence might we have of trauma, and violent deaths. I made, naively, an application to the Montana SHPO because I knew they had a burial file, which is locked up. He says, "Well if you want to look at the burial records you'll have to go before the Montana State Burial Board, and they haven't met yet." And I said, "Well my client would love to but my client who is a First Nation from Canada would have to make application to this board and would we ever get into it. I called up a good friend of mine, Tom Roll from Montana State University. I said, "Tom, what's the story?" He says, "We have no records. We have no information. We give it all to the State. Everything is repatriated; this information is lost." I'm not taking the perspective of an intellectual consulting archaeologist. It's lost to the First Nations. It's lost what it could tell them about my case at a particular time of conflict.

Next, interpreting the past. How am I doing? Three minutes. Alright, I'm covered. Just political correctness; we know what's going on in the Canadian Museum of Civilization the First Nations galleries, the Smithsonian Museum and Natural History in the States.

They have a policy now that they will no longer interpret American Indian archaeology. American Indian archaeology will now be interpreted by the National Museum of the American Indian. They are not going to interpret American archaeology. There will be no interpretation. Glenbow Museum, Blackfoot gallery; a wonderful gallery, but some very strange new age interpretation. I took some of my old Blackfoot friends, the elders, in, and I'm pointing this out to them and we translate it because they don't speak English. She shook her head and we walked away.

Indigenous science and pseudo science. Blackfoot Physics; how many of you read this book? How many of you actually know that it exists? Good, yeah. This is written by a guy who has a Ph.D. in theoretical physics worked for the National Research Council in Ottawa and who came west discovered Indian country. Went away and wrote a book, and we were interested to learn that the Blackfoot lived in earth lodge villages in the winter and they learnt how to jump buffalo from the Sioux. This book is now on the recommended reading course for native studies at the University of Lethbridge! Friend of mine, John Dormarr, a respected soil scientist and avocational archaeologist, who teaches a course at the Uof L was approached by a young woman, a Blood woman. "What do you think of this book, John?" He got the book and read it. These strange ideas and they are quite unusual in this one, I assure you, are being introduced into the curriculum. Medicine wheels, our favourite symbol; medicine wheels came from the Sioux. Most things seem to be coming from the Sioux these days. I told some of my old Blackfoot friends about that; they didn't appreciate it. But its all over the place, and before Gerry pulls me off I've got a couple of more things even better. This is in Human Ecology, 2003, December; it's called, "Driving Bison and Blackfoot Science." This is a refereed journal. It has six misinterpretations of fact and 10

misinterpretations of interpretation. We learn in this that the Blackfoot learned how to drive bison from observing the behaviour of the wolf. Anyhow, so there are many of these kinds of issues in interpreting the past. There's a bunch of different things involved, and we can also be naïve and politically incorrect.

Political correctness, just a couple of examples. Last fall, we had the meeting of the Rocky Mountain Anthropological Association in Estes Park next to Rocky Mountain National Park, and we had an opportunity for some Canadian archaeologists to go up and see Jim Benedict's game drive. Jack Ives was there, Ray LeBlanc and others. It was a rather cold and windy Saturday; but we saw the game drive. That Saturday night I was given a report by an archaeologist who was contracting with the park. I found, in reading the report that we'd walked right over a medicine wheel, Jack, and we never saw it! The next day I went out and took another look. It was quite a lovely day, and I had the report. I went back and I found this medicine wheel. It was four rocks; a southern Ute informant had informed the archaeologist that this was a medicine wheel. So this site is in the inventory as a traditional site. Another one they recorded is on top of Trail Ridge that is 10,500 feet in elevation. A Ute informant said that traditionally they buried their shamans in this very high country and they would open up the stones stripes and place the body inside. For those who work in the Arctic, you know what stone stripes are. Now none of this in ethnohistoric literature. There is none of this at all, but now this has been recorded as a traditional site. Stone nets and stone circles, periglacial phenomena, have been used to explain vision quest sites.

Marty's had his experience with Kopapelli and the Stony people saying, "Yup, we know those folks. We call them the snakes. We were here when they came all those years ago." I've been told by a former councilor of the Tsuu Tina Nation that the pictographs on the Big Rock, were made by aliens. I've been told by an Assiniboine that Head-Smashed-In is actually an Assiniboine buffalo jump and the Piegan came and took it away. The Blackfoot elders I work with find this very amusing. So there are all kinds of issues here and a lot of them arise now because of the growth, and rightful growth, of Native Studies. Increasing participation of Natives in studies in universities is becoming a part of the curriculum and this misinformation part of their world views.

Finally just to finish up, ethnohistory and legal land claims. There's been a big change in the last thirty years, particularly in Western Canada, which is our area of experience. For many years, First Nations politicians and lawyers did not see any value of archaeology and ethnohistory or ethnology to their legal claims land and otherwise. They still don't unless it's political. My experience had changed. I first appeared 1975 before the Berger hearings on the pipeline down on the MacKenzie. We may get it built this time; who knows. Archaeologically, I was kind of naïve then; I thought, "Whoa, you know these people, the Dene, are going to bring up the issue about the archaeological sites." We were talking about microblades and the Dene who we are still convinced made them and we're going to hear a paper from Marty on this today. This is a way they can say, we can say, "I as an archaeologist based on the archaeology, can say yes you've been in this valley for thousands of years." Not one mention of it! The only issue was that the lawyer for one of the

Dene groups asked me how I could identify sacred sites. I said, "Well I can't, unless you're willing to share that information with me." Twenty-five years later, in my experience, this has changed. I was involved in 2001 in a major hearing for a power project in Edmonton known as the "Rossdale Power Plant". This involved a site down in the river bottom and an old Hudson Bay fort and a Hudson Bay graveyard that was 150 yards away from the project. It became the focus and angst of the First Nation and Métis people and I endured eighteen hours of cross-examination on the stand. I think I set the record, for Alberta, at least Canada. I'm now officially recorded in the transcript as "the anti-Christ of Alberta archaeology" and various other names. But it pointed out to me not only the changes that have occurred and the need for those of us who get involved in this to be very, very well prepared. So we're entering an era now where archaeology is being used increasingly by the First Nations as part of their legal claims, land claims, and any other case where the courts will be involved, representing the different First Nations before the courts, for whoever is at the hearing, and will have difference of the evidence. So once you get into this area of evidence you have to be extremely careful not only as archaeologists but also as First Nations. One final example, a few years ago a Blood Indian took the Government of Canada to court arguing that he had the right to sell wheat to the United States without being subject to the Canadian Wheat Board. He hired some experts from the Native Studies program at the University of Lethbridge who claimed that in traditional times the Blackfoot Indians grew corn. Then the Blood elders got up on the stand and said, "No we never grew corn. You white men told us all to grow corn." That was the end of the case, but these experts had read one of these odd little books that I talked about earlier which actually did say they had. So I think that are that interesting issues and that these will continue in the future. Any of you younger people: get two degrees. Get one in law because you really need that law degree as well. You really do, and I know some people who have some degrees in anthropology and actually are First Nations lawyers. The combination of degrees, law and anthropology and native studies, really helps you out in doing that.

Finally in summary, I've just examined a few areas that I think are important; the associations, I think, and to the future. These are most important because our associations are what represent us, collections, curation crisis and all these are important. We'll have continued growth in the area of archaeology and land claims. I think in the future looks good, although we are uncertain in this country depending on how things go, and I think if we were to reflect back on this in 30 years we'd see a lot more changes and progress being made. Thank you.

## **Gerald Oetelaar:**

Thank you Barney, I would like to now call upon Ellen Lee and what we're going to try to do is to make hers the last before the coffee break. And if it's okay with you, William, we'll use you as sort of a stepping stone to get into the discussion, so Ellen.....

## Ellen Lee

Thank you Gerry. Good morning. I've entitled or given the subtitle this morning "Confessions of a Government Archaeologist." I find myself in an "interesting" position here on this panel, representing the perspective of "government archaeologist". I use the word "interesting" with some caution, as my 16-year-old daughter says it is the polite word I use when I can't think of anything positive to say about her artwork. So when I say "interesting", I refer to the fact of representing government on a panel like this. Government archaeology is not always perceived in a positive way by archaeologists outside government. And the label of "bureaucrat" is often seen to have negative connotations, especially these days with what's been going on in Ottawa. So, that is why I use the word "interesting" with some caution. I would like to use this opportunity to explore what I see as the challenges and obligations that come with being a government archaeologist. As many of you may know, there is a broad initiative underway called the Historic Places Initiative that, although it's led by the federal government, also involves the provinces and territories among other things, in the establishment of a National Register and Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places. It also proposes legislation to "get the federal house in order", which includes legislation to protect archaeological sites on federal land. I won't go into detail on the Historic Places Initiative this morning - you will have the opportunity to hear more detail about that at the Friday morning session chaired by Christophe Rivet of Parks Canada that's entitled: Guidelines for the Conservation of Archaeological Sites.

This morning, I want to talk about the role of government in archaeology, and the role of an archaeologist as a public servant. For me, that sets the context for how I see archaeology within the Historic Places Initiative and how this sets the scene for proposed legislation to protect archaeological resources on federal land.

First, a bit of background. For the first few of the thirty-something years that I have worked as an archaeologist for Parks Canada, (yes, I really am that old) I didn't ask myself the question relating to the role of government in archaeology or the role of a government archaeologist. I was just happy to have a job doing what I loved and traveling to exotic places like Fort Chipewyan, Fort St. James and Fort St. Joseph.

We were doing site development work - applied research to answer specific questions so that site interpretations could be authentic for the Canadian public. Other than the usual complaints of bad weather, biting insects and the occasional obnoxious crewmember, there really weren't any downsides. Gradually, in the mid to late 1980s, our focus shifted from site development to cultural resource management - inventorying and assessing the conditions of archaeological resources and conducting salvage work when the resources were threatened by development or by natural forces. In Parks Canada, we were essentially managing the cultural resources on land administered by Parks Canada within the context of a heritage mandate. In terms of the role of government, we had the easy part. Unlike provincial and territorial archaeologists, we did not have a regulatory role - simply a management role within a heritage mandate. And while we have often played an advisory role for other federal

land managers, as the expert federal department on archaeology under the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, it has been a discretionary role, in that federal departments are not obligated to ask our advice, nor to take it if they do not wish to.

So what I have just given you is a very superficial description of the evolution of the role of Parks Canada archaeologists over the last three decades. If the Historical Places Initiative moves ahead, and if legislation protecting archaeological resources on federal land is passed and implemented, our role will expand to include regulatory responsibilities. So this is where the potentially negative perceptions of being a government archaeologist come in. So recently, my thoughts have turned to what that will mean for us.

But first of all, I want to talk about the role of government in archaeology in Canada today. Obviously in doing that, I have to make some distinctions between the federal government and the provincial and territorial governments, given the nature of the division of powers between the different levels of jurisdiction in a federal state like Canada. The Constitution spells out that private property is primarily a provincial responsibility. Therefore, in most cases, provincial laws apply to both provincial crown land and to private land, whereas federal laws apply only to federal land. The second major difference is that all provinces and territories have laws or regulations providing for the protection of archaeological resources under their jurisdiction. The federal government has policies and some laws such as the National Parks Act and the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act that indirectly protect archaeological resources. But currently there is no federal law that directly and explicitly provides for the protection of resources on federal land. But I don't have to tell you that - we have all been striving to change that fact for more than a decade.

Now that I have mentioned the basic differences between federal and provincial government archaeology, I am going to ignore them and talk more generally about the role of government in archaeology.

The obvious answer to the question, why is archaeology a subject to be dealt with by government, is the public benefit of protecting, researching and presenting the common human history of all Canadians. The second question is: for what purposes is archaeology regulated? There are many reasons. Most of them have to do with the fact that, in addition to having heritage value as a public good, archaeological resources are irreplaceable and often subtle and hard to read. Most regulatory frameworks focus on preventing destruction, damage or looting, controlling research, salvaging what can not be protected in situ, and ensuring the appropriate management of collections and records.

Despite the fact that Parks Canada has not had the regulatory role that provincial and territorial archaeologists have had over the last few decades, we share many of the same challenges. These challenges are, in fact, shared outside by other sectors of the discipline both inside and outside Canada. While these challenges are often inextricably linked, for the purposes of discussion I have grouped them into three broad categories. These are:

- Legislative and regulatory challenges,



- Administrative and funding challenges, and
- Political and ethical challenges.

First I will briefly address the legislative and regulatory group of challenges. These include:

- Non-existent or weak legislation
- difficulties with enforcement, especially related to looting or trafficking, and
- pressure for professionalisation or formal accreditation of archaeologists, which Barney mentioned recently
- 

The challenges related to funding and administrative issues facing government archaeologists today appear almost overwhelming. I don't want to depress you too much, but here it is:

- Inadequate, over-crowded storage facilities,
- Inadequate or non-existent publications programs,
- Huge amounts of inaccessible gray literature,
- Un-catalogued, inaccessible collections,
- Accumulation of un-analyzed material of progressively questionable value,
- Deterioration of aging archaeological records,
- Incompatible databases,
- Lack of common or standardized terminology, and
- Natural or human threats which cannot be mitigated through the impact assessment process..

The political and ethical challenges which George and Barney have both mentioned earlier include:

- Relationships with descendant communities,
- Pressures for repatriation,
- Ownership questions
- Pressures for development,
- The balancing of conflicting values around archaeological resources
- Intellectual property issues
- The politicization of archaeology,
- The use of archaeological experts and evidence in legal cases, and

In general terms, the question how much is enough.

- How much is enough to salvage,
- How much is enough to record,
- How much is enough to collect,
- How much is enough to keep and/or conserve, and
- How much is enough to publish?

An additional challenge, which I found difficult to categorize, is the fact that, given our often front line relationships with Aboriginal communities, archaeologists often end up working beyond the scope of their archaeological training, in the areas of Aboriginal liaison, traditional use studies, and providing expert advice for community submissions for the commemoration of Aboriginal heritage sites. This is obviously both a challenge and an opportunity, but it really stretches us, I think.

I'm not going to go into any of these challenges in detail- each of these topics could be the subject of a whole conference or dissertation. But as you can see, the challenges come from different sources and can also be looked at from the perspective of the tensions between the different sets of obligations that archaeologists have.

We as archaeologists have obligations to:

- The discipline
- To the resources
- To Land owners or land managers
- To Descendant community(ies)
- The Canadian public
- To Future generations, and, lest we forget,
- Those who pay our salaries - in the case of government archaeologists, the taxpayers, and in the case of consulting archaeologists, our clients. You can be sure that these people will certainly be asking the questions about how much is enough.

So I have laid out the context in which we currently work and the climate/ environment we at the federal government level have to consider in "getting the federal house in order" with respect to archaeology. You will hear more about the archaeological aspects of the Standards and Guidelines in Christophe's session on Friday morning.

Because the draft legislation has not yet gone to cabinet, and we must respect cabinet confidentiality, I can't give you the details of what is proposed for the legislation protecting archaeological resources on federal land. I can tell you that it anticipates an impact assessment process, a federal permitting system, prohibitions on looting and disturbance and offences and penalties. It will be primarily a regulatory regime, which means that the specifics will be laid out in regulations. One of the benefits of that is that the process of developing regulations is an open process not only allowing, but requiring, consultation, so there will be significant opportunities to have input to the development of the regulations, and obviously we will be looking at the experiences of the provincial and territorial governments over the years with their regulatory regimes to try and sort of learn from their challenges and positive experiences as well. So in developing the regulations, this is where we will have to somehow try to address as much as possible the existing challenges that I outlined earlier and to try and balance the obligations we have. We will be anxious to make

sure we get the input we need to achieve a balance. But we also need to be realistic and recognize that with this new initiative, we can't solve all of the backlog problems that have built up over time. We can go forward and try to do a better job in the future.

I cannot predict the timing of when this draft legislation will be tabled or passed, particularly given the likelihood of the looming election, but I can say that we are hopeful that, with the momentum that has been created with the Historic Places Initiative and with general support, it will only be a matter of time.

In closing, I just want to refer back to my opening remarks concerning being in the "interesting" position of being a government archaeologist. I see the role of "government archaeologist" as not only positive, but also crucial to the need to ensure that archaeology continues to be seen as a public good. So in my books, being in an interesting position is a good thing. In this time of relentless government cutbacks, it is crucial that government, academic and consulting archaeologists work together from our various perspectives to achieve public good and work together as well with the communities of people for whom archaeology is important. It appears to me that the broader societal trend of public involvement in government decision-making processes is clearly influencing how archaeological work is being done today in Canada. I firmly believe that, for archaeology to be sustainable in the 21st century, we must embrace this trend while still somehow holding onto our ethical principles. To me, archaeologists in government in particular, although this may probably apply outside as well, are scientists, public servants, heritage experts, cross-cultural mediators or go-betweens, teachers and guardians. I'd like to thank Leigh Syms for inviting me to participate in this panel. Thank you.

## **Gerald Oetelaar:**

I see Byron has made it down from up north so the prospects are good. The roads are opening people are going to be coming. So I remind you one more time before we have a quick coffee break that we will reconvene at about 10:45. We'll hear Byron's talk, then William, but before you leave, please, those of you who are interested in the field trip to Lower Fort Garry, take the time during the coffee break or before noon to let your intentions be known because there is a minimum number of people that must take part in this particular trip for it to go. Folks, twenty dollars to get you to Lower Fort Garry, it's a deal by anybody's standards. And the weather, I promise ...I promise will be very good come Sunday. The forecast high is twelve. Leslie informs me that the scheduled trip is between eight to four, but they are willing to shorten the trip to three o'clock to allow some of you who may have a late flight out on Sunday to partake in the trip to Lower Fort Garry. So let's reconvene at 10:45 and listen to the last talks.

## **COFFEE BREAK**

## Gerald Oetelaar:

Welcome back to the second portion of the plenary session this morning. I would like now to introduce Byron Gislason who's going to be presenting a paper discussing the presentation of archaeological information using media. Byron....

## Byron Gislason

Sorry for being late. That's what happens when you live in Gimli but I'll learn someday. I'm not normally a public speaker, as I said before, unless I'm begging for funding from Telefilm or something, but I'm here because of a strange journey that began for me in 1998. I was in southern Saskatchewan near Grasslands Park, I was working on a wildlife documentary, and I was looking for a vantage point to film the vista of the plains below. A local historian told me about a site that I could go to where I could get a really nice shot, and that's all I need to hear, "nice shot", and I'm gone. I went to this vista, this knoll on the prairie, and I came across these stones. I sort of noticed that the stones had patterns, and as I walked with my gear, I noticed that there were more stones. The patterns became more apparent. I began to feel an energy that I couldn't explain. My adrenaline was pumping to get this shot while the light was right and it's 90 degrees Fahrenheit, and my audio guy's complaining. But there's something that just drew me, I was just wondering what was happening to me, what was I seeing. I had no knowledge at that time of sacred sites, or sacred circles. I had never heard of them. It was all new to me. After I got my shot (which turned out great), I went down to the park office in Valmarie and I talked to Colin Schmidt. I mentioned that I came across these stones, and he explained to me that these were indeed sacred circles and this was a sacred site not within the park boundary; it's actually on private land. When he mentioned that it was on private land there's something kind of ... I don't know, it bothered me. I went away from the shoot and came back to Winnipeg. Just the idea that I just walked away and left these stones... When Colin said that this was on private land I was thinking to myself, why would a site that is sacred, you know obviously to First Nations people first and foremost... Why? I just felt like I had abandoned them and was thinking of all of the time that went by where other people have felt the same way I did that they felt they had to abandon them for political reasons, social reasons. So I started doing some research, not on the Internet. I use the Internet minimally, but when I was working on this documentary, I just felt that it was important that I talk to elders, that I talk to archaeologists and you know, get their view, their knowledge of what these stones may be and "Are there a lot of them left?" I didn't know; for all I knew it was the only site there was, and in talking to elders and to archaeologists I realized that.

I just felt that I had to do it, make a documentary about these sites. Not about what they mean because to me it's not important what they mean to me. It's important that they are there, that they communicate, that the people who laid these stones down put those stones there for what they wanted to say, even though I may not know what they were saying. I do know they have communicated to me and to anyone else that I've talked to. It's that communication that sense of energy, that I get when I come to these sites, that I take back

with me, that inspires the people that I bring along to these sites and that is the first and foremost purpose of my documentary “Where the Grandfathers Walk”, which probably none of you saw the first time it aired because it aired during the Grey Cup game. It has aired subsequently, so I’m hoping some of you have seen it. We’ll be playing it tomorrow afternoon at 1 o’clock. But the first and foremost reason I wanted to do this documentary was to find out:

- Are these sites being preserved?
- If they are, in what manner?
- Are there sites that are not being preserved?
- How many sites are there?

When I first started on the documentary, I was told that there’s like 20 to 40 sites in western Canada, and of, course that’s not true, as I’ve found out through my documentary meeting with elders and archaeologists. I’ve visited dozens upon dozens of sites from Alberta to Manitoba to have a sense for myself of the stones and the places where they are.

I think, listening to the presentations this morning, I guess, in a way, I’m representing (I hate the word media), but I guess, you know, representing people the public, and the media, in a way, is supposed to be representing the public. I, in my journey in doing this documentary, have found out that well over 90 percent of the public have no knowledge of these sites and actually no awareness of these sites. As I said, I had knowledge of these sites myself. I’ve been through these sites, but I’m not saying that I know what they are, but am aware of them. I would like other people to be aware of them. I would like First Nations people to be aware of them and play a more active role in trying to find a way that we can preserve more of these sites in a way that First Nations groups feel comfortable in preserving them; For example, maybe the sites are only accessible by First Nations people in nearby communities. There are all sorts of forms that it can take. Again my concern is that they remain, that the stones do not disappear.

At this time there’s one special site that I go to every year (although I haven’t been to it this year yet) since 1998; it’s the very first site that I was at, and it’s special to me. I try to go there on a bit of a personal pilgrimage, and again it is on private land, and each time I go back there’s more stones missing. There have been stones that have been removed. You know it’s sad, really. Really what is sad about it is that you’ll go to communities, and I’m not knocking our “white heritage” of western Canada; obviously, I’m part of that. My family came over from Iceland in 1888 and settled in Gimli. They didn’t have to worry about the roads then like I do but they came to Gimli, and I’m proud of that heritage. But when I go to communities and I drive into the town and they have like a bronze plow saying that this was used in 1917 and was used by two generations of farmers, that’s fine. But what’s ironic is that three miles down the road, there will be an amazing site of sacred circle stone formations that are just like they don’t exist. It’s just like the bronze plow gets lights and shrubbery, and the stones remain as they were. If they remained as they were, that’s fine, but that is not what is happening. They are being destroyed.

In the course of the documentary, for every site that I went to, even every site that I didn't get to, I met with and spoke to the elders beforehand to get permission, to get their feedback and hopefully to get their blessing to go. Each site that we went to we offered tobacco and offered our prayers and each site that we went to was treated with respect. Again I know the one thing that came across in this documentary is that a lot of elders and a lot of archaeologists were concerned about a film crew prancing and dancing around, not knowing what may happen and what they may be up to. That is a real concern, you know, not all film crews really care either. So it's a very sensitive subject, it's a delicate balance of observation; it's something that I even struggle with to this day. I never acknowledge or said this site is thirteen miles this way, twelve miles the other way. I never gave locations, I just wanted people to be aware that these sites did exist, and if they wanted to learn more they could meet with elders and meet with archaeologists and hopefully with both. I think, just listening to what I've heard today so far, and with the material that I've read is, I see part of the direction that archaeology going in. I think that the digital age has arrived, and even for myself it's a scary proposition. It's there for all archaeologists to use to dramatize their work, and it's the dramatization that's going to bring the public in and create more support and create more funding opportunities. Because I think that even when I was putting the documentary together, the word "archaeology" to a lot of film people or media people, it's not a buzz word to them, to put it bluntly. It really should be because it is a buzzword to me and it's a buzzword to everyone who was involved with me on the project. All of the crew members who were with me were First Nations people and a lot of them, in fact all of my crew members, had never been to a sacred site. They had not experienced that, and for every one of them it changed them. One of my assistants in Alberta, Adrian Wolfleg, actually left his job and is concentrating on being with and teaching, young people about the culture and history and is taking visits out to sacred sites in southern Alberta. Taking young people out to these sites for ceremony, for prayer, for discussion, for communication, and, again, that's what the stones I feel are there for, is for communication. Is that for me, speaking personally; it's the fact that they are there and they spoke to me and they spoke to many other people, that makes them special and that's why I don't want to see them go. From the funding side, I think that I can see marriages between archaeology documentaries, between film people and archaeologists, between, you know, television networks and archaeological associations, First Nations people, First Nations communities. I'll tell you again; when I first approached people about doing it, they told me that I can't do it; that it cannot be done. It hasn't been done; you cannot do it. That is not right, and I couldn't understand it because when you are at these sites, which most of you I'm sure have been, they're beautiful. That's the key, they're beautiful and you can't be negative about something that's beautiful. Whether you're from the white community or from the First Nations community, that's really the connection: the beauty of the site itself, the location, the skies, the light, just as the people back then saw it, the rising sun, the setting sun, the moon, the clouds, the open skies, the open plains, the animals, the wind. They're all still there, they're for us to experience just like they did, and, because of those elements, I'm sure that's why a lot of the stones are placed the way they are. But, in my experience, that is where archaeology could go, to connect with, because you're all archaeologists and creative people, and all of the archaeologists I've met are; in fact, I envy most archaeologists being out in the

field there. I was out with Gary Adams a couple of years ago on the documentary out on the plains, and when I'm having a bad day I'm thinking, "Man, I wish I was out on the plains with Gary," you know. It's easy to find Gary out on the plains because you hear his laughter. So it's better than GPS or anything. But you know I can understand that there have been cutbacks and there are funding concerns and freezes, you know, all of the same things that go on in the film industry as well. But I think there is a real energy among people, among the public, that do want to know, that have a thirst to learn and be aware. The other reason why I'm interested in these sites, in the western Plains sites in particular is because they also represent some of the things that we're still dealing with as people together, as First Nations people and Non-First Nations people, is that there is still some misunderstanding. There are still some people that, I hate to say it, are narrow-minded. I had people actually say to me, "Who cares about a bunch of stones? They should all be plowed over like the other ones." There is that out there. I think that that's why the stones remain, because they act as a beacon for people that know better and want to make other people realize that there's other ways to think, there's other ways to believe and there's other ways to live.

I think that First Nations elders, in particular, in my documentary led me, they were my inspiration. If it weren't for them the documentary wouldn't have been done. What I loved about being with the elders is that they themselves would tell me that they don't really know what the sites truly mean. That they themselves go there to pray and go there with their families and young people to get a sense of what the people had to say and the stones that were there. Again, I find that exciting, for elders to have that within their grasp to acknowledge that there is more to learn and more to share. That just becomes more fulfilling for everyone else who has an interest in this. The digital workshop that's tomorrow, I think that it is important because in the description it says how to make your work, your sites, your work more accessible and "more interesting". That's really the key; it's not that they aren't interesting, but through video, through film, through documentaries, one can bring all of the work that everyone does here into the homes of everyone.

I was watching a documentary last night on the Maya. They found this Mayan temple, and it's larger than any pyramids in Egypt. In finding this temple, they've found that the people were around a lot longer than the archaeologists have first thought. I mean, forget about reality shows or "Survivor" or whatever; there's nothing more compelling than to learn about a generation of people that you didn't know existed before. It doesn't get more exciting than that. I think that something I'd like to see taken away from this conference is an excitement. I can hear all of the challenges that all of you are up against, but I think that there's some exciting opportunities as well. I find that in archaeology on the plains of Canada there's just so much opportunity. There are just so many stories and so many ways to dramatize them and for people to hear about them. I think I got the cut sign. I appreciate your time, and I'm really glad I made it. Thanks.

**Gerald Oetelaar:**

Thanks very much Byron. Now I'd like to call upon William to present the First Nations perspective on the issue of archaeology at the crossroads. William....

## William Dumas

Good morning. Like I said this morning, it's an honour to be with you. An honour to plan together with you for our future. First of all I'd like to start off with my sense of humour. Over the winter my friend tells me that there was a round dance in Saskatchewan, and lately there's been a lot of surveys on Aboriginal people. They meet the emcee for the round dance, "Make the announcement about one of the surveys that came out," and this is how the survey came out. He said, "It's true about what they say about how Aboriginal women walked with their men, the survey's come out. It's true that the Sioux people walked behind their men, it says so on the survey." "On the survey it also says the Ojibway women they walk beside their men, and the Cree women they walk all over their men."

I like that one. My presentation this morning goes a long way back. When I was little boy, the elders say that I was so cute. I come from a storytelling tradition. I was raised by my great grand parents - Thomas and Isabella Linklater. They were the patriarch and matriarch of South Indian Lake, which is where I'm from. For those of you who keep saying that I'm from Nelson House, stop lying, I'm from South Indian Lake; that's where I was born and raised. In that storytelling circle of great grand parents, I sat with people that lived to be over 100 years old. Some of them you'll see their pictures. As a little boy I sat and listened to the stories of Annie Moose and her husband Josie Moose. Annie lived to be over 100 years old like my great grand parents. I sat and I listened to Thomas and Maryann Moose, David and Adrian, that was my television when I was a child. That was my radio, that was my book. As a child, I was validated by my elders through their stories, I look into the past. "Kayas....." the stories would always start. *Kayas* is a word that means long ago. *Kayas* could be ten years to someone, it could be fifty, a hundred, a few thousand. I don't call them legends, I call them the mist of time stories, *Kayas*. There is no timeline to those stories because our language was Cree. I heard words like *pakamahaskewan*, *sisikwan*, *ospwakan*, *matotisan*... onwards. I never saw these words in physical form, I only knew about them through story, and the stories would go on, "Kayas..." listening to the history of the old people.

I'm a product of the residential school. When I received that education in the history books, it didn't do the spirit good, my spirit. I hung on to those old stories of the old people. The history books that hurt me as an Aboriginal child, there was a balance in remembering the stories of the people. When I came out of that system in the late 60's, I was a confused young man, young Aboriginal confused teenager. Around that time there was talk about flooding South Indian Lake. I met a strange young man about my age, always digging around the ground. At the time, I wasn't too interested in what he was digging around for. I was more interested in having a few beers with him. But while we were having those beers, he showed me a little piece of rock. I said "What's that bro?" He said, "This is pottery that your people made a long time ago." Fueled by a few beers I kinda looked at him and thought "BS"; never heard about those in those old people stories, never heard things like that, but I hung on to the words of that brother of mine. 1969, Dave [Riddle], 1969 and you woke up my head, my curiosity. And it was in the years to come that I began my healing journey in finding out who I am as an Aboriginal person in North America.



I looked for my history because, over and over again, I would hear the elders tell us the young people today they are lost because they do not know where they come from. If they do not know where they come from they will have a hard time knowing where they're at. Certainly, they will not be able to see the future. As an educator, still today nothing has changed that much in Aboriginal education. The latest statistics that came out show there is still a 70 percent attrition rate at the grade eight level. That's amazing. But the reality is this; when people become disconnected with their history, they need to get their history back again. When you validate people with their history, they will begin to see the past, they will see the present, and they will see the future. That is why for me, when I work in the education field, I value the traditional knowledge and I value the academic knowledge because those two must come together.

There is proof already how powerful that tool is. A few years ago I was teaching at Nelson House and through the influence of earlier contacts with people like Dave Riddle I saw the value of what archaeology could do for reclaiming history for the Aboriginal people. For the next eight years, Dr. Syms and Kevin Brownlee would come every year. There was an awakening in that community, not only for the children of the Nelson House education system but also for the elders and the parents. There were times when there was no seating room in my classroom when the elders and parents would come and listen. It was powerful because people could see there was a timeline in their history like me. "What's this bro?" "Oh, it's an atlatl head." "What the heck is an atlatl?" "This is what it is." Through that learning from other people, I started to see a timeline in my history. I started to see the positive part of what academic education when presented in a positive way can do to affect a whole community when the storytellers start to confirm what the archaeologists are saying, when the archaeologists start to confirm what the story tellers are saying.

A great awakening, when the display cases were brought in into Nelson House It became like shrine for them because this is about them, about their history. One day a little boy walked into my classroom. He said, "Mr. Dumas, can I leave this behind on the display cases?" It was Insano from the movie ... was it called Toys? Where they have all of those characters? Insano is one of them. Insano. I said, "Okay go ahead." Within the next few weeks, I believe there were close to a 100 of those plastic critters, the Mighty Hulk, you know, Wrestlers, Spiderman, Batman, over close to a 100, all over in my classroom. There were seven Insanos. I asked the children, "What is this about?" and they said, "When we leave here, these are the ones that look after our history." Wasn't that beautiful, Kevin [Brownlee]? When kids saw the power and the need to protect what was given to them.

That was a very powerful time when we start to see how powerful archaeology could be combined with the oral history. And the stories that came out, I told the kids I never saw *pakamahaskewan*. I've seen it; it's called a drum. I've never saw *sisikwan*. I've seen it; it's called a rattle. I've never seen *ospwakan*; it's called a pipe. History was starting to come alive in our community in a physical form. We were being validated, the parents and the students; the driving force that was there was incredible, the many offshoots that came out of it in

reclaiming our history.

We started reading other books to validate the history. A few years ago, this book was given to me it's called, "Anna and the Indians." I'm sure some of you have read it. On the opening page, it says discard. It's supposed to be thrown away. Somebody picked up and thought I'd be interested in it. I asked him why is this book being discarded? He said because there's lots of racism in it. Lot of good things in here. If one looks for positive things you will find them; if you look for negative things, they are there. I read this again coming down, just like the earlier part when people didn't know that they had pottery in their earlier times. Recently, I've been looking for willow basket makers to introduce into our education system. The word I got was us Crees never made those willow baskets. Anna says the people in Norway House, Cross Lake and Nelson House would bring things in willow baskets. It's here. So we cannot discard other peoples' thoughts just because we disagree with them. You will find positive things if you look for them and what's happening out that interest when we moved out of Nelson House.

I work as an Aboriginal Education Consultant in Thompson, Manitoba. In the past couple of years, we have started having conferences on oral history. Just this past year we had three so far. *Honekwe* [Dene for House of Stories], *Kaysisi*, UCN, what we're hearing, our elders, our academic and traditional people, the word corrective history keeps coming up. In the next month, we're having our fourth one, that's amazing when people get together and start seeing the need to record their history. It is now a time of recording oral history, it's starting to be agreed upon. Those areas that are going to be needed to support the oral history are very crucial points like archaeology to validate that information, the academic work that has been done in the past few years. It is now time, I believe, to plan for a future together. We are going to need each our own truth as Canadians, not necessarily separated but our history as Canadians. That is what I value because our history together has not been that pleasant, but, you know what folks, we cannot change the past. We cannot change it, but we can do something about it today because in the next few years according to statistics there's an incredible Aboriginal population increase coming; we must prepare for them. Because if people learn a history through anger and resentment and bitterness, what to do we create? We have to plan together create a partnership that we can plan a better future. There is a great need for it, because we're finding in Northern Manitoba is as the province starts to bring Aboriginal perspectives into the curriculum, we are finding that we have very little written material to put units into northern Manitoba history. We desperately need them. Yes, it's going to cost money. Probably lots of money, but it is a work that is very crucial to validate a whole region that they have a positive view of their history because that history that we have up there is beautiful. The land that we walk in, that's our cathedral because in that land now is the history of our people. You as archaeologists, you have that gift to take that future and show the people that don't have the skill to do it. It's a validation of what history is. It's in the land, very beautiful work that you have been given. Beautiful, because I've seen how powerful it can be with the children and with the parents. As we move on, we have to find ways of working with each other, ways of supporting one another because I am a parent, I am a grandfather and pretty soon I will be a great grandfather. I

want my family to have a good solid background in their history. Those students I have taught and made them proud of being Aboriginal, I want their children to have the same strength that I have now, and one can only get it by listening to each other, finding ways to cooperate with each other. It is not necessarily that my way is true and your way is not truth; it's just a way of seeing things, and we can see together. We'll get there and if the people with money are here, help! A cry from the north; I hope that you can hear it. Thank you very much.

## **Gerald Oetelaar:**

Okay, that concludes the presentation portion of the plenary session. What we would like now is to open it up to the floor and have you come to the microphones with questions. You can direct them to individuals on the panel here, you can bring up issues that have not been addressed in your estimation that are important and have not been touched upon by these plenary speakers. So don't all rush to the microphones at once folks! There's got to be some issues here that are important to each and every one of you. There have to be things that you can provide some commentary on the papers that have been presented so far. Thank you. Natasha.

## **Natasha Lyons – University of Calgary**

Hi, I'm Natasha Lyons from the University of Calgary. My question is about cultural appropriation. I've been listening to the various panelists talk about intellectual property rights and their different perspectives. There's a dialogue out there about PAR - participatory action research - which engages the idea of partnerships between social scientists, cultural institutions, and First Nations groups, and which recognizes that funding for all of us is going "down.... down..... down," as we've been hearing in this plenary session. One of things that the PAR literature endorses is the use of cultural symbols in a commodified way. I'm not necessarily taking a position on this view, but am instead interested in the panelists' perspectives on this direction. As our funding pool become smaller and smaller in the social sciences, I wonder what the panelists see as solutions for funding options in the future? I think that partnerships are one important direction, and I am interested in perspectives on the using of indigenous symbols as commodities to fund research? I've mostly read about this approach in the context of northern Canada, where the Arctic Institute of North America has used this model in a range of different partnerships. So I guess there are a couple of different questions there. First, what are your views on the future of funding? Second, what do you think of appropriation in this way, if it's fully endorsed by the indigenous community? I'll leave my question there, thanks.

## **Gerald Oetelaar:**

George you want to...

**George Nicholas:**

I've just a brief comment on that. The first is the issue of ownership. Just that whose symbols are these? I think that is the bottom line—if indigenous peoples are willing to share these symbols or to promote them themselves, that's where we have to start. Your mention of northern Canada is certainly an apt one. There are currently over a hundred applications or appropriations of Inukshuk. These are being used as logos for everything from brokerage firms to promoting medicines for erectile dysfunctions. I know that many northern First Nations are looking askew at some of these uses because they are being done without permission.

**Gerald Oetelaar:**

Anyone else on the panel? Barney?

**Barney Reeves:**

We're getting into copyright issues here too. I think that you mention a very good point, I think. I find that my experiences among the Nitsitapi, the Blackfoot, these symbols do not belong to the tribe, they belong to individuals, so you have to ask individual whether you can use them or not. They do not represent the tribe. The elders I have the opportunity to work with get very incensed if you don't ask the individual who has that particular teepee design whether you can use it or not. It's none of the tribes business at all, as far as they're concerned.

**Gerald Oetelaar:**

That's for teepee designs but what about a larger symbol such as the Majorville cairn do you think that belongs to a particular individual or is that more representative of a broader group? I think and the inukshuk I'm wondering in which category does that particular one fit?

**Barney Reeves:**

I guess, Gerry, you get to the point where you have to ask permission from the Anglican church to use St. Paul's Cathedral on a cover of a CD. I mean, these are big issues, and they are transcultural as to where one has to draw the line with getting copyright permission.

**George Nicholas:**

Another point here is that you can't make assumptions here as to who owns these. I mean in some cases it may be families, it may be clans, it may be the larger communities or nations. So, anyone who is seeking to use these items, some of these symbols, or whatever, cannot simply say I can talk to one individual in the community and I absolved of any

responsibilities. I mean, it may be that one individual is all you need to do, the one family, but you can't make assumptions on this.

**Gerald Oetelaar:**

William, what's your perspective on this? As an individual who you know would be dealing with these?

**William Dumas:**

Okay, my personal viewpoints are mine; they do not represent the whole Rocky Cree Nation. Cultural appropriation, for me the way I interpret it, my interpretation might be different the way you interpret it. We need to sit down and compromise and say what is cultural appropriation. Clear ethical guidelines; this is cultural appropriation. To me that's where I'm at. Does that bring a viewpoint? Yes, it does because I need to understand what people's definition of cultural appropriation is and whether they're coming from a defensive or an open perspective. This is still an area that needs to be closely examined but done in a way that it benefits people. Because cultural appropriation, the way it's often interpreted, can have a very negative connotation to Aboriginal people, but there are some areas I think that can prove positive. We must always be open for discussion. I hope that answers; that's my personal viewpoint. I'm very open for discussions, and I do it in an open way and sometimes being open gets me into a little bit of trouble, but what the heck, lets go forward.

**Gerald Oetelaar:**

Barney?

**Barney Reeves:**

We should ask Roy Carlson if he has any comment.

**Gerald Oetelaar:**

Roy? Now do you have anything that you would add to that?

**Roy Carlson – Simon Fraser University**

Cultural appropriation?

**Gerald Oetelaar:**

And the symbols.

**Roy Carlson:**

My question is what about these things that were part of societies that are no longer in existence? What do you do about them? They may be appropriated by many kinds of contemporary societies, Aboriginal, Western or whatever. So, for symbols that belong to extinct societies, I don't know that there is anything that one can or should try to do about them. The past should belong to everyone and not be the exclusive property of anyone.

**Gerald Oetelaar:**

Good point, which is sort of the issue that was brought up in the recent Kennewick man debate and the most recent ruling on that particular topic as well. So we are talking about two different types of cultural property and one of the issues that I was reading in the SAA record is how far back in time can one trace history. Is there some time in history at which it becomes the property of a population more generally? Any other questions?

**Roy Carlson:**

Well of course this comes up in the point that George Nicholas brought up. Is time linear? As scientists, we view it as linear.

**Gerald Oetelaar:**

So how do we deal with another culture that sees time in a different perspective? I think that William was trying to say that he sees the benefit to a timeline as opposed to a more cyclical perspective of time, but how do we address the two?

**Natasha Lyons:**

The way I phrased my question was not so much in regards to redressing the past but in regards to communities that are working today to try to get funding for cultural heritage initiatives, First Nations education programs within their own communities, and the like. Part of the PAR (Participatory Action Research) model is that it is the people themselves that are using their own symbols—whether it's from their past or present—as commodities, in partnership with academics or government institutions or other research bodies. The central idea is that they are empowering themselves through the use of their own symbols, and they may have thus made the decision not to keep certain symbols sacred. But it is the community's own decision, knowing full well that funding opportunities may flow from this commodification. In some examples in the Canadian North, this meant producing t-shirts, websites, artworks, or other goods and services. It's this model that I'm asking panelists (and

other participants) to respond to, in the context of being an avenue for funding directions and partnering relationships.

## **Gerald Oetelaar:**

If I may add, I believe from my discussions with Aboriginal communities and also with small communities throughout western Canada about heritage tourism, a lot of people see it as their way to keep the young people in the communities. Part of that heritage tourism involves presenting your culture, your history, to the people, to attract them to come to the community to spend some money and to keep the communities alive. I don't know whether that's what comes into play or not. I'm uncertain. Anybody?

## **Ellen Lee:**

I think the key principle to any kind of exercise like that is respect. That is, the people that have the cultural connection with the symbol or the commodity see that their wishes are treated with respect and that they use respect themselves in how they choose to do something with that particular symbol. Once that's done, I think the other issues will be much easier to deal with in terms of funding or commercialization or anything else.

## **George Nicholas:**

I'd like to get back to a point that was raised, and it's an excellent one. Where do we start with this? The topic of intellectual property rights is a real stinker. I don't want my intellectual output being curtailed or censored in any way, but I also respect the fact that I'm dealing with other people's cultures. And we need to be very careful in this. What we're seeing in other disciplines, ethnobotany in particular, is that these issues are coming to the forefront, and they are influencing what people can and cannot do in terms of the products of their research and how they're getting their information. Bioprospecting is a very contentious topic.

What I think is going to happen is that in archaeology, where we're dealing with material culture and intellectual property—however it's defined—as being represented in archaeological sites, not only including the artifacts but also the symbols that may be present in those artifacts, stakeholders must agree on who owns the products of the archaeological research? Is it the people that excavate and interpret those sites? Or to what degree do the descendant communities have rights?; what role do they have in defining their intellectual property rights? We need to be very careful here.

I think that the topic of intellectual property rights is going to become the reburial and repatriation issue of the coming decades. Unless we look at this carefully, unless we take a proactive stance, we will be finding things imposed upon us because we have not bothered to address these issues. That's what has happened with reburial and repatriation; that's why

NAGPRA came into effect—because archaeologists were so complacent about such things, and we're simply letting things be as they have been for centuries as skeletal material accumulated in museums. So this is what I'm promoting; that is, these are issues we don't want to address, these are terribly hard issues to talk about and to configure, and unless we address them now we will suffer the consequences later on of our complacency.

## **Bill Allen - Central Ontario**

I'm Bill Allen from Central Ontario. I'm concerned about massive pot hunting in Ontario, southwestern Ontario in particular. Again, I think we need a definition of what cultural heritage is because cultural heritage is being interpreted in some quarters where there are some clubs that have monthly meetings with best find of the month, best relic of the month prize. These are very large events that have corporate sponsors, including hotels, for the promotion of what's considered cultural heritage that are extremely damaging to the cultural landscape. I'm wondering Ellen what we have in the upcoming regulations with regards to enforcement. And I'm wondering if this organization is willing to take a look at how big an issue this is and take a very public stand against it.

## **Ellen Lee:**

In terms of regulations, I don't want to pass the buck, but I can only speak for regulations that would affect looting on public land, and it's certainly an issue that we're concerned with. If it's sites in particular in Ontario, then the provincial heritage legislation is what would come into effect. We certainly recognize that enforcement, even if there are regulations against looting, is a very difficult. I understand that they have a very strong piece of legislation in the US, the Archaeological Resource Protection Act, which only applies to federal land. They have a fairly strong enforcement regime but the complications of building the evidence for a case and successfully prosecuting it are significant. I'm not sure that I can really answer your question. I know that there was a study done a couple of years ago by the Department of Canadian Heritage, trying to get some sense of the scale of the problem of looting. I think that it's been very difficult for them to even establish a baseline because first of all, we don't have a good inventory of what archaeological sites exist across the country. There are individual inventories in the different provinces, and we have some information about what is on federal land but it is not a complete list. Secondly, we don't have the resources to establish a baseline for each of the sites; what do we know about it now and how will we actually know that it's been looted? That's the kind of thing that we would need to have to establish what the scale of the problem really is. Right now, all we have is anecdotal information. I'm sure that's not a very satisfying answer to your question, but I'm not sure what else I can add.

## **Gerald Oetelaar:**

Any other com....



## **Byron Gislason:**

I'm just going to make a point. As we speak there are videos playing on CMT that, there's a Keith Urban video that's been airing for a while now that features a medicine wheel, and he's standing on the cairn playing guitar and aerial shots of him jumping over the spokes. And, you know, there's a Sheryl Crow video where she's in the pueblos, and Brooks and Dunn. I could go on and on. And Billy Ray Cyrus. It's been going on for several years now where there's this almost open visual desecration of what I would think would be quite special sites of both spiritual and archaeological importance, and they're on the airwaves everyday. Actually the Keith Urban video in particular, I was just shocked that, it was just after I came off the road after completing the filming of my documentary, and knowing all of the respect all of us on both sites of the camera put into the documentary, and I flick on the TV at home and there's Keith Urban doing a Sammy Haggard on a cairn. It's already happening, and it's happening more and more, to the point where I don't know how it can be stopped.

## **Gerald Oetelaar:**

Gary Coupland, what is the perspective of the CAA on looting? I'm asking you as incoming president. I don't see Dean Knight in the audience here. Is Dean here?

## **Gerald Oetelaar:**

William?

## **William Dumas:**

I just wanted to bring up a point and maybe you can go into her question about, I guess, the rules of respect and disrespect. They come into play here when we look at history, but we must also realize it's not just the white people are doing it. We have to be honest, it happens on both sides. Case in history. In northern Manitoba, you guys that have worked in northern Manitoba have seen this happen, prior to the archaeologists coming to northern Manitoba. Many like myself, we didn't know we could access our history through archaeology, and I said I'm speaking from my personal viewpoint; I'm not representing northern Manitoba. That was cool, eh? Being able to find my history in archaeology? But a lot of Aboriginal people found that out, now we've developed amateur archaeologists in a span of 20 to thirty years and you find a lot of that stuff people taking. What is the rule here? Do we have to make individual arrangements, like when I find these things. I've made a personal commitment to turn them over archaeology and have them catalogued, photographed and even dated. So that's another area that needs to be looked at. What do you do about those amateur archaeologists? Wherever you go you're opening up new territory, folks? What is the rulebook here? If there is no rulebook or guideline, you're going to have a lot of history going down the drains. You have to look at that too; it just doesn't

happen on one side because that history needs to be preserved. It's nice to have a 3000 year old atlatl head around your neck, but it's also nice to have it catalogued so that it doesn't get lost. That is my concern, my personal concern. Yes, you've done some good stuff, but what is the rulebook for amateur archaeologists that you've developed in northern Manitoba.

**Gerald Oetelaar:**

Ellen?

**Ellen Lee:**

I think that enforcement by itself is very difficult. Enforcement is not the entire solution; it's only a small part of it. It is the last resort when nothing else works. Awareness raising and training are crucial elements of the solution. I'm hopeful that when we put a regime in place at the federal level, there will be a major effort that goes along with that to train the federal custodians regarding their responsibilities for heritage. It will also be important to raise awareness amongst the people with responsibilities in those areas and also to raise awareness in the public. If they don't understand what the value of these resources really is, how can we expect them to treat our history with respect. So I think that there's huge job to do, and it can't be done by any one organization alone to raise the awareness or importance of these things. Awareness raising and training will have a far greater effect, in the long run, than catching people looting. It will prevent it, hopefully. There will always be people who do it willfully, who know that they are not supposed to do it, but will do it anyway. But at least if you can build greater basic support in the general population you'll reduce the number of people removing artifacts from sites, who do it not knowing it's the wrong thing to do.

**William Dumas:**

Just want to point out. The language that we use, we have to also be very careful of it. I'm Aboriginal and if you put enforcements on me, no can do. I've stood my ground; we have to negotiate now, so the words that we use in these conversations, you know, even the language we use it's negotiating. How do we handle these sacred objects? I'm willing to do it as an individual, and I've done it as an individual. Negotiate, but don't put an enforcement word on my person because it's not going to be there, but I think that most people who are conscientious are willing to negotiate in good faith. I am, anyway, just to point that out and we don't loot we find.

**Gerald Oetelaar:**

I'd like to sort of keep on, but there are people waiting. Yes.

## **Gary Wowchuck – Avocational archaeologist - Manitoba**

Hi, my name is Gary, I'm an avocational archaeologist. It feels good to get that out. You know for as long as I know I've had an interest in archaeology. I can remember five years old finding my first arrowhead. I took a course in university, I did a field school and the whole works, but now I'm back in the other community working in a sawmill, but I still have this interest. I see people all around me with that same interest, and you're never going to stop people from finding things. The reason I started the way I did is because I feel as an avocational archaeologist more and more shut out of the mainstream archaeology. Twenty years ago that wasn't true. We were apart of that mainstream, and I see that more and more. As long as there's a place, a river that erodes, as long as there's a field that blows and roads being built, things are going to be coming up, and I think that the contribution that we've made in the past is the same type of contribution we can make in the future, and I hope that people realize that. I look at this At a Crossroads, but its not just two roads crossing; they have a number roads crossing. It's got many spokes, and if we break that spoke of avocationalists off what happens? You don't nurture them; you don't direct them, and they become looters. You can't stop it; people are going to find things and people are going to collect things. It's a matter of helping people to do it the right way. It's a comment, and it's also along the lines of discussion, but it's a couple of things I had on my mind. Thanks.

## **Gerald Oetelaar:**

Any comments on Gary?

## **Gary Adams – Parks Canada**

Gary Adams. I'd like to change the topic a bit here. A few years back I had the distinct pleasure of attending the other CAA [Computer Applications in Archaeology] and was absolutely stunned at how distinctly Canadian the issue of national archaeological support is. Canada has probably the lowest number of government-sponsored archaeologists of any industrialized country and probably has the least amount of investment in archaeology. Certainly, as a country, it produces less effort than any other country in trying to get archaeological interpretations out to the people. I witnessed several project presentations at that international conference where the funding for a single project probably exceeded the provincial archaeological funding for the entire province in a year. It led me to reflect that, as I work exclusively in National Parks and National Historic Sites, the archaeological resources should be significant to all Canadians at some level. But if I'm working in Ivvavik National Park, they know nothing, care less, and are totally unwilling to invest in a threatened site in York Factory, Manitoba. If I am in Grasslands National Park, they care less of what is going on in Ivvavik. Many of you touched upon this question, but nobody addressed it directly. What causes the lack of awareness, of commitment, and of involvement by Canadians - as a country and as a people - in our shared national heritage? I don't understand how we got here, and I don't know how we could get out. But I am interested to hear other perspectives on this very large national issue.

**Gerald Oetelaar:**

Any comments?

**Byron Gislason**

I'm just going to say from the media side or the public side again in my presentation earlier there is an awareness problem. The public at large are just not aware, just like I was 6 (I'm terrible at math) 6 years ago, I had no knowledge of sacred sites out on the plains, and yet, when I got a taste of it, I wanted to learn more, and other people around me wanted to learn more. I think that from that side of it, not being an archaeologist, that's what I see. I think if people were more aware to get that taste for learning. I think that those kinds of problems, Gary, would go away. I don't know about go away, but certainly it would be improved upon. I ask myself that; when I was working on it, why did this happen? Why did this happen in the first place? Why did it take so long?

**Gary Adams:**

My point, I agree with you 100 percent Byron. Awareness is a big issue, but how do you get there? It takes investment to get awareness and it takes people to say they're willing to invest in it on some level or another, and I don't see that happening in this country.

**Byron Gislason:**

Well, I think that's where we're at though again this theme, being at the Crossroads, as I mentioned earlier, there's an opportunity to involve the media, which in turn will involve government funding organizations. The more interest that can be realized through documentary or various public affairs programs, the public will take more of an interest and the government has to take more of an interest, and I think that more funding can be made available, and that there could be more cooperative effort between archaeologists, First Nations people and the media.

**Gerald Oetelaar:**

Barney?

**Barney Reeves:**

Just one quick one. The root of the problem lies in the education system. If you think of how many Aboriginal or even Canadian archaeology components there are in the Canadian secondary or primary education system, I bet we can lay them out on two fingers.

Except in special areas. For example, Jack would tell us Alberta had a program for grade five back in the seventies and in cooperation with the Cree, Piegan, Blackfoot and others, put out a whole series of really good books, and it was in the system. It's gone. Unless the public knows about it and appreciates the value of the Aboriginal and White multicultural heritage of our country, they're not going to support initiatives to increase funding. Contrast that to the environment where we've come in the last thirty years in environmental awareness. Look at the science teachers, the outdoor education programs that have been going on. So contrast the two.

## **Gary Adams:**

A big part of the environmental movement's success is a very strong open multidisciplinary lobbying force; agencies, NGOs, all kinds of things, going back to your issue of associations. Is that a problem?

## **Barney Reeves:**

That's right, not lobbying enough NGOs. We don't have a strong voice. I don't know if we even have a voice.

## **William Dumas:**

Tomorrow I'm meeting with the assistant deputy minister of education. One of my areas right now is developing a curriculum with the province with the Aboriginal perspectives coming in. Going to give them a draft on one of the curricula on Aboriginal perspectives. Part of it that I have is on archaeology because out there, there is very little awareness on how powerful a tool archaeology can be in restoration and corrective history. My dream as an educator, not just as an Aboriginal educator but as an educator for northern Manitoba, my dream is that within archaeology there can be cases developed information developed that would travel from school to school. If people do not see the importance, it's because they don't know how powerful it can be. I need to make not only the education system see how useful a tool it is, but they have to be aware and educated on archaeology. Archaeologists have to be in the communities and educate not only the schools but also the community as a whole in negotiating for a lot of ways. If people don't know how are they going to know how powerful a tool it is. If you do not have the money to travel back and forth into the communities, they will not be aware that it is a powerful thing. I think that, to me, is one of the crucial points for people to be in contact in the classroom and the community, but it is a really powerful tool. People need to understand it. If the media is not out there, if the information is not out there, they're not going to know. We need that cashbook.

## Gerald Oetelaar:

I' going to ask Susan; she was next in line, please. And then...

## Susan de Caen – University of Calgary

Hi, my name is Susan de Caen. I am the Coordinator of Public Programming for the Department of Archaeology at the University of Calgary. There are many points being made today that strike home with me.

At the U of C for the past two years I've been running a public education program for elementary schools in the Calgary area. In the 2002-2003 school year, the program reached over 1150 students. This year (2003-2004) we reached 1350. The program has been well and enthusiastically received by students, teachers, and parents. There is a definite (and growing) demand for the program, as archaeology fits well within the Alberta Learning prescribed curricula for kindergarten through grade 6.

I develop and deliver hands-on archaeological educational programs to Calgary and area elementary schools ([www.fp.ucalgary.ca/arkyeducation](http://www.fp.ucalgary.ca/arkyeducation)), I run an archaeological interpretive centre, I manage a small but efficient volunteer program, and I provide educational outreach to community groups. With an increased demand for public archaeological programming, the workload has reached capacity, but to overcome this issue, funding for the program is essential. We would like to grow the program to incorporate junior high and high school students and are actively seeking financial support for additional personnel to do so.

The initial education programs were developed and delivered using lottery funding. This is a fabulous way to instigate a program, but sustainability is essential. Without proactive programs such as ours, there will be less public understanding and appreciation of archaeology.

It is likely that the most effective historical resources awareness programs are those delivered to young children. If elementary school students learn the dos and don'ts of archaeology and gain an appreciation early in their lives of the importance of historical resources, they are more likely to take these lessons of site respect and protection with them into adulthood. The programs offered through the University of Calgary do just this. Educational outreach programs turn the general public into archaeological stewards with a desire to protect sites and an understanding of how the past affects the future.

With respect to the educational programs themselves, I believe the resources we offer are essential to teachers and students alike. The accessibility of archaeological educational materials to the average teacher is limited. In the late 1980s the Alberta Government published a wonderful series of booklets addressing this need: *Prehistoric technology* (21 pages); *Dig and Discover*:

*Archaeological excavation for the classroom* (25 pages); *Archaeology as a career* (11 pages); *Alberta Archaeology in the classroom: A resource list for teachers* (18 pages). The documents are currently out of date, out of print, and hard to find, but the Alberta Government is striving to correct this and make resources such as these available to educators via the internet.

Updating these materials can come at no better time. As of 2005, the Alberta Learning curriculum for grades 4 and 5 Social Studies contains the key word *archaeology*. If educators do not understand the legalities and implications of archaeological research carried out without the appropriate permissions, and the damage said “research” can do, we are likely to have a great many enthusiastic, but misinformed educators on our hands. Let me illustrate.

Two months ago I was made aware of a situation in a small town just outside Calgary. The local school has an excellent reputation for bringing history to life, instilling in students excitement about the past, and making people aware of where they’ve come from and who their families are. (In this situation many older folks in the community can be linked directly back to the initial settlement of the area.) In an attempt to connect her students even more closely with local community history, an inspired teacher began excavations on school property (an area known to be the location of shacks associated with the 1940’s oil boom in the Millarville area).

I phoned up the teacher because I thought it was a great way to bring archaeology to life, and turn these students into archaeologists. I wanted to learn more about her project. My first question was, “So, who’s your permit holder?” “My what?” “Your permit holder.” “I don’t have a permit holder.” I then asked, “Who gave you permission to dig?” “Oh, the school board.” Of course, why would a teacher think that any higher-level authorization was required? In the fall of 2003, excavations were carried out by the teacher and her class.

Through the cooperation of recently graduated student and the president of the Calgary chapter of the Archaeological Society of Alberta, a truly positive outcome stemmed from an initially negative situation. Arrangements were made for legal excavations to take place in the spring of 2004, and the teacher and her class were introduced to officially permitted archeology. This project is associated with a wonderful program called the Galileo Project. Teachers exchange ideas and websites are developed (<http://www.galileo.org/schools/millarville/archaeology/>). Unfortunately, a misinformed website was in place before we stepped in – a site accessed by educators throughout Alberta; Edmonton school boards, Calgary school boards, and several rural areas. My fear is that before site was redesigned any number of elementary school teachers could have seen it and recognized it as an innovative teaching experience. Unless teachers are informed, we will have a really big problem once that word *archaeology* officially hits the education system.

Educational archaeological programs, and funding to sustain these programs, are key to protecting archaeological sites, and exposing the public to the varied and exciting world of

archaeology present in their own backyards. With the objective of instilling in people a sense of pride and wonder in the human history of Alberta and a deeper understanding of their public role in stewarding historical resources, public programs offered through the University of Calgary have been successful in doing just this.

**Gerald Oetelaar:**

Any comments? Panel?

**Brad Hyslop – Northwestern Ontario archaeologist**

Brad Hyslop. I'm an independent researcher from the Lac Seul area. I think we have to recognize as an organization because the shifting demographics in Canada has probably played against us. Whereas thirty or forty years ago we had all the funding through universities and the starting of all of these projects, now those dollars are being directed to health care in Canada. That's something we have to realize; we're competing against something like that. The other thing, I think we're victims of our own success because I know for myself the best protection that I have for a site I work on is to keep my mouth shut. If you hide the value, we're undervaluing. We haven't marketed ourselves properly. So how do we balance between marketing ourselves properly and avoiding those situations by, at the same time, protecting the sites. They're almost working at odds, and we don't want to see arrowheads being shown on the Antiques Roadshow. But at the same time we have to make people aware how do we balance that? How do we market archaeology as being sexy in the year 2000 to get the funding to get the work done right. So that's what I'm throwing out.

**Gerald Oetelaar:**

Comments from anyone in the panel?

**Byron Gislason:**

There are already arrowheads on the Antiques Roadshow. Again I'm just going to go again on that balance of protecting the sites, keeping them no so much a secret, but also putting the information out there as to what you can learn and what's available; that is a balancing act. Again from the public side and the media side of it, that's a very delicate balancing act, but again it's one that has to be undertaken. I think that's how archaeology becomes sexy again is through the media and the sense of excitement I can see through discovery. That is indeed a balancing act, for sure, to take on as a challenge.

**Gerald Oetelaar:**

Leigh?



## Leigh Syms – Associate Curator (Retired) – The Manitoba Museum

Leigh Syms. One of the reoccurring themes was how do we get the public to become aware of what we're doing. We in Manitoba know, of course, that by the year 2010, I think, one in four people applying for work will be Aboriginal. We have the largest growing Aboriginal population in ratio to the overall population anywhere in Canada. A number of levels of government have started to finally recognize that and say, "Do something about it", and they're sort of waiting for us to jump in and respond. For example, Winnipeg School Division Number 1 has passed a policy that all teachers must learn more about Aboriginal heritage. We had a fortunate event, in which staff at Laura Secord School, which is an elementary school, was discussing what to do for their professional development day, and it happened my wife was on staff there and she suggested that they go to the Museum. We set up a day. And the other thing that the Winnipeg Number 1 did was that they hired two Aboriginal consultants as full time staff to assemble materials for the teachers in that division. There is a tonne of materials if you pull it from across Canada and the USA. Anyway, they came to the Museum where they spent half of a day with the Aboriginal consultants and the rest of the afternoon with the curators of ethnology and archaeology. This is every teacher from kindergarten right through to grade 6. They certainly came away with a new respect for this Aboriginal awareness. If this idea, this kernel of idea, had not been suggested to them, they wouldn't have developed this initial success. We now already have one more school that is interested. The two consultants, the Aboriginal consultants, thought this Museum experience was fantastic, and they're encouraging many schools to do the same sort of thing. We've had many so school requests that I can foresee Kevin Brownlee spending every Monday for months with these schools.

So we now have teachers incorporating archaeological knowledge. We talk about what an exciting opportunity it is and they go through the galleries and we talk about the traditional ethnographic and archaeological materials. I think the opportunities are there; I think we haven't been taking advantage of them; we haven't been aggressive. I would leave you with some questions. How many people will have their papers out in PDF formats? How many people will be talking to media people they know about topics to take back? My impression is that I am one of only two people who were here thirty years ago, so I carry a bit of a time perspective here. My impression is that the CAA and the local archaeology associations have become less aggressive, less dynamic, less vibrant. We've all become older. As many of us have become older, we haven't passed the mantle on sufficiently so that the young people have that same aggressiveness of the seventies. We are going to have to be lobbying; we're going to have to take advantages such as this Winnipeg school division! We are going to have to be getting our information out! We have this phenomenal technological opportunity of taking every one of our papers and having them distributed widely for the discipline and to get them out to trigger excitement! I think we've got great potential, but, as I think George or Barney pointed out, we're going to have to do that on the weekends instead of going skiing. We're just going to have to have a major commitment from the young people, and perhaps some of us can provide suggestions. We need the energy of the people coming into it. I think it's there. I think it's doable, certainly as seen in the

developments we have here and our work with the First Nations.

You know, I think to some degree there are still some people in our area who are gun shy from the American Indian Movement of the 1970's. In fact, when you work closely with the elders, the possibilities of cooperation and working together are phenomenal! I have been very thankful and have had the honour of working with William and with other elders in the communities! But again, we have to go back to this. You know that in every Aboriginal group you deal with there's a phenomenal staff turnover, so don't assume that you've developed four years ago is still working. You have to constantly keep going at it. We have an Aboriginal TV channel. How many people have gone to those people on those programming committees and said, "Hey we've got a story for you"? There's a thousand stories sitting in this room, and I doubt that anybody has gone to the Aboriginal channel and said, "We've got a story for you." Never mind the general public; this is the Aboriginal heritage we're talking about. We've got phenomenal opportunities, and I think that we'd better get busy at our discussion over our beers and drinks tonight and during the general meeting. We can do it!

APPLAUSE

**William Dumas:**

"I'm right behind you, bro!"

**Gerald Oetelaar**

Yes.

**Gay Frederick – Malaspina University**

Gay Frederick speaking. I'd hop back to the last subject as well to a program that was in place in British Columbia concerning avocational archaeologists, and it was called the warden system. These were volunteer people who were interested in archaeology but were not necessarily professional archaeologists who kept an eye on the local sites to see if they were being looted and disturbed. Now when it was in place in British Columbia, this was run through the provincial archaeologists office. That's been disbanded now for I'm not quite sure how many decades, but it seems to me that it might be a program that the Canadian Archaeological Association might put their weight behind to involve people who are already interested in archaeology to be part of the system that protects that. Now that we have all the electronic ways of communicating, it's not such a burden in terms of money. People could easily email each other about what's going on. Now obviously that has to be followed up. I mean, if you know that a site's being looted, knowing isn't the end of the story. You have to be able to do something about that. In every province the laws are there. So I'm kind of saying how do we get to the point, even if you know they're being looted,

how do you get somebody out there to stop that, and part of it is the education aspect of it. As a teacher, I know that every student that comes into my archaeology class, very, very few of them, when they come in, even know that provincial legislation to protect sites even exists. And how many decades has that legislation been in place? Why don't they all know before they get to our classes? So I think that we have some real need to get that word out as an organization. I can leave you with that.

## **Gerald Oetelaar:**

I just want to share an experience that I had in terms of what Gay's talking about. When I became president of the CAA I was contacted by a former warden in the B.C. area who complained about a site that was being destroyed in Port Hardy, and you know your immediate reaction is, this is incredible. Fortunately from my perspective I knew a lot of the people with B.C. Heritage. I contacted them, and this issue had been going on between this individual and the local regulatory agency for years. One has to be careful in trying to get a national association to make a pronouncement, but they should always contact the appropriate local agencies first before they even try to make a pronouncement. I think of every case that I've been aware of, the battle has been going on between individuals or associations and the local regulatory agencies long before, and if we throw our weight behind (and believe me the CAA doesn't have much weight to throw behind any issue under these circumstances) it's always good or mindful to keep that in mind. Greg.

## **Greg Monks - University of Manitoba**

I've often been impressed by the situation in Japan. They have, in just one of their many prefectures, things like a hundred and thirty to one hundred and fifty projects going on at any one time on a constant basis. And the thing that strikes me as different between Japan, for example, and Canada is that in Japan this represents their history. They have sense of it; they are the descendant population, but in north America we have quite a different situation, or it's been constructed differently. Here, it's our heritage and their heritage, and this dichotomy is reflected in the nature of the federal government structures that look after and over see archaeology in Canada. It's an interesting the division of labour, if you will, between Parks Canada on one hand and the Archaeological Survey of Canada on the other. The situation has become so imbalanced, and it's very symbolic in terms of how the government ensures that it's essentially the agency that oversees the European or non-indigenous history that has grown and expanded at the expense of the Archaeological Survey of Canada that was the agency meant to look after or oversee the Aboriginal portion of Canadian archaeology. It is my opinion that the view of UNESCO and ICAHM really needs to be instilled in not only in our community but also in the Canadian public's mind; that is, heritage resources are world resources - heritage resources belong to the world. This is why we have world heritage sites, world heritage lists, and a world heritage fund. That's the view that will transcend, or hopefully replace, the view of our history vs. their prehistory. This viewpoint, the stewardship of universally valuable resources, is the one I think that the CAA

and we as individual practitioners should be promoting. That's what I'd like to see this association move forward with so as to become consistent with the international view of the value of resources.

The work by David Pokotylo on the surveys of attitudes towards archaeology has been mentioned here, and it should be, because the viewpoint of the public generally speaking was, "Yes this is great stuff; we should protect it; all those dinosaurs were very valuable and interesting." This kind of public misperception is one of the hills that we have to climb, but it's mighty steep. In order to take advantage of the good will that appears to exist on heritage matters, but also to create a correct awareness of what those things are from the point of view of Canadian archaeologists, is a very important task. That gets back to what was touched on by all members of panel. I believe that public awareness through dialogue and liaison between all of the participant communities and all of the interested communities is essential for Canadian archaeology. That is the key, and I think that is where the CAA needs to throw its weight. I have other viewpoints on how we can go about increasing that weight, but this is not the forum for it. So these are my comments. Thank you very much.

## **Gerald Oetelaar:**

Barney?

## **Barney Reeves:**

I'd just like to make a comment to your comment. Unfortunately it involves the Aboriginals and our history. Being a white Anglo Saxons (WASP) whose family came and moved here a long time ago is irrelevant to the increasing number of Canadians because their histories are in the Middle East or in Asia. That's going to have a tremendous influence on where, as voters, they see the dollar should go. And just to comment on Gary, Canadians don't really value the past. Example. Everybody's heard of Lewis and Clark; what's happening? Bicentennial. Big issue. Big deal in the States. How many here know David Thompson? Everybody? Much greater explorer than Lewis and Clark. I'm on the David Thompson Bicentennial Canadian National Committee and the international committee. We've had some meetings with Americans. Guess who's got it together? They've already got 125 grand appropriated this year and a half time coordinator to look after David Thompson in the Northwest. They have got programs going on, they've got school kids and David Thompson's trunk. We had to get some funding and support from Parks Canada, and I understand the initial decision of the National Executive Committee was that David Thompson was not significant enough to be celebrated. That was changed, I gather.

How many history books do we ever see in school that talk about David Thompson or Peter Fidler or the great Indian chiefs or explorers. We just don't celebrate, and because of our shifting demographics in Canada with growing immigrant populations, they have no interest and connection with either ours or the Aboriginals.

**Gerald Oetelaar:**

Yes, Jeff

**Jeff Seibert - University of Calgary**

I just want to make a quick comment. I think the comment that Dr. Monks made regarding the role of archaeology in promoting a world heritage in Canada and abroad is very important. I think that's something that we have to address and something that we have to consider when thinking about promoting this world heritage approach and related attitudes about the past. We have to try to avoid the notion of commodifying the past. The main reason why this is important is the commercial looting that takes place in certain parts of the world. In North America and central America, for example, as well on a really large scale, is that when the past is often commodified then it becomes something that you know is effectively for sale. I think that an important part of promoting this world heritage perspective, and this is a perspective that values the past and values the role of the past in creating the present, is to emphasize that the past is part of a coherent cultural package; it's not something that can be dissected and sold. The past is part of a cultural identity, and I think one of the problems in this day and age of post-modern capitalism is that it's becoming increasingly common for identity to be for sale - for the past to be for sale. Just, you know, look at Sotheby's or Christie's, for example. There are many pieces of looted art for sale there, and I think that this is a classic example of this notion of world heritage kind of going in the wrong direction through the commodification of the past. Material expressions of past (and present non-Western) cultural identities become prestige items, for sale to the highest bidder, with little regard for the original meanings of cultural items, and the value of these items to their creators' descendants. It's more of a comment than a real question, but I think that it's important for us to consider the potential ramifications of commodifying the past when promoting a world heritage perspective.

**Gerald Oetelaar:**

You have a comment on that Greg?

**Greg Monks:**

Yes, I agree with that assessment. Commodification is a bad word in my opinion, as it is in view of UNESCO and of Bill C-33, which regulates the illegal import and export of cultural property. To draw this back to the theme that's running through all of the discussions about public education, I think we have to recognize that it's a two edge sword. We think that if we tell the public about archaeology and how valuable it is, they all see our point of view and they'll all do it our way, but that's not exactly what's going to happen. There will probably be, in fact, more looting and more misappropriation of heritage

resources in terms of absolute numbers of things. But perhaps what we would get at the same time on the other edge of the sword is a greater awareness among people that such misappropriation ought not to be happening and that greater care must be taken for the resources that still exist. Maybe I'm a blind optimist here, but I'd like to think that even though there are dangers to public education that the advantages will outweigh the dangers we face.

## **Gerald Oetelaar:**

Ellen?

## **Ellen Lee:**

I just wanted to go back to a comment that Greg made earlier about the comparison and the relationship between Parks Canada archaeology program and the Museum of Civilization. I don't think that it's an appropriate comparison to say that one has shrunk in comparison to the other.

- First of all I don't think that it's entirely accurate, although I haven't looked at the numbers.
- I think that it's more important to recognize that the two organizations have quite different mandates.

One organization, Parks Canada, is a land management organization and the other is a museum and research institution. With regard to precontact and historic archaeology being divided between the two organizations, there was what I would loosely call a gentlemen's agreement to that effect in the early 70s, but it's been a long time since that really had any meaning.

I would like to get back to Greg's larger point, focusing on the international perspective and the whole protection of resources and non-commodification, as I think it is really important. It is interesting, though, to draw together some of the other elements that have been discussed in relation to oral history. UNESCO is developing a new convention on intangible heritage; unfortunately, it is separate from the conventions that deal with tangible heritage. I think that is really unfortunate. The World Heritage Committee fortunately deals with natural and cultural heritage together, but still there is that intangible thing that is separating us. I think it's a really unfortunate thing that tangible and intangible heritage cannot come together.

**Gerald Oetelaar:**

Yes.

**Leo Pettipas – Manitoba archaeologist:**

My name is Leo Pettipas. I'd to speak a bit to this [public archaeological] awareness issue with you. I remember when I was in Grade 11 going to my school library and opening up this big picture book. It was called "The Epic of Man", and it presented a whole series of reconstructive paintings of past behaviour ranging from the Paleolithic to the Neolithic. To me, what was interesting about the book was not so much the artifacts, which were also shown as photographs adjacent to the "people" pictures, but rather the reconstructions of the past lifeways themselves.

When we talk about awareness, often what we make people aware of is artifacts ~ things that they can dig up. As a consequence, we put the wrong ideas in their heads and open up a can of worms for ourselves. So speaking for myself, I think maybe our strategy should be, when we go public, we should emphasize the *stories* behind the artifacts, rather than the artifacts themselves. "Paint" for the public (including school children) scenarios from the ancient past showing people doing things and making things, and get our readers' minds off artifacts that can be dug up and sold, or whatever; get them thinking about the underlying stories and themes and that sort of thing. I wonder if that wouldn't then solve two problems: it would make them aware of our interpretations about people in the past, and it would perhaps diminish the problem that may arise from making them aware that there are artifacts out there that can be dug up and carried off.

As archaeologists, of course, our stock and trade is physical material ~ artifacts and so on. But let's try to get away from that in the public arena. We've got to use these things to advantage: we've got a public trust to fulfill, and we've got to interpret our findings. That's where our stories come from, but when we go public, why not go with something else besides the stones and the bones themselves? What do you think?

APPLAUSE

**Gerald Oetelaar:**

William?

**William Dumas:**

I'd like to make a comment on what Leo said, but I want to go back just a little ways. Somebody made a comment that the history of Canada is valued by a minority. I'm

comfortable with that statement because I've always been in a minority situation, right from the time I was born in South Indian Lake. I was a minority. My Aboriginal name that most of the elders knew me by in South Indian Lake was ....\*\*\*\*, which means Little White Man. My grandfather was Scottish on one side, so I've always been comfortable coming from a minority situation. Coming from a minority situation, if you accept that you are a minority, you will stay there, but if you have a dream or a vision, it can become very big. Where I'm at in life right now, I'm riding a beautiful wave, and part of it is the historical fact where Leo says we need to tell the story out there. That story is an investment for the future. It's that not a minority issue. It's we have to make it a big issue. Your stories, our stories; it can be pretty big issues. We just need to have that dream and vision. I have it. It's a very powerful vision, and part of it is telling the whole story and using whatever I can to make that story valid. That's where I'm at. It's a good place to be. I'm with you Leo. I'm with a lot of you: the story needs to be told. And darn it if we're a minority, it's a good place to be, it's a good cause.

## **Gerald Oetelaar:**

Marty.

## **Marty Magne – Parks Canada**

Marty Magne. I think that some of the things we've heard lead to the answer being political, whether it's grass roots or higher levels. Of course, higher level politics often happen first at the grass roots level. You just see what happens in British Columbia where permit applications are now sent to all bands that have traditional territories where the project's happening. There's no law to that effect. First Nations asserted themselves, and it's essentially a common law that exists before any archaeology takes place, and First Nations know about it. It's not in the B.C. regulations that it has to happen, but it has to happen. I mean, save your head if you walk into doing archaeology in an area if you haven't contacted those First Nations. That's the way it is in B.C. But it is not that way in many other provinces. On the other hand, the archaeology that happens for the historic period doesn't exist in British Columbia because the law stops there. So from an archaeological perspective, that's a bad thing. So there's good and bad, as Leo said. Let's try to look at the positive; the politicians screwed up on the one hand, but First Nations did a good thing on the other hand. To me, the best thing that could happen is having an Aboriginal heritage minister in a rock video. You know? Imagine that happening, supporting that kind of awareness. Imagine that you had an Aboriginal rock star dancing on a medicine wheel; different story, different perspective. There's some white guy in a cowboy hat doing the same thing. Who appropriates? Who owns, you know, all of these things? It depends. This is very fluid, it's not a static thing. Everybody remember the Access to Archaeology program? Man, one of the best things to happen in Canadian archaeology. Planting all of these little seeds, whether it was an Aboriginal community or a non-Aboriginal community. There wasn't a lot of money, I don't even know what the total budget was, and it's planted all of these seeds, some of which are still alive and growing and some of which have died. It died. Why? Because the



political will that was there to get it going, the minister, said let's do this and then that minister's gone, toast. You know, this sort of stuff has to be generated, and I think that we'll see it happening from an Aboriginal perspective, as people have mentioned, with those populations growing, where that population will lead to political leaders who want to do this, who want to work with their history and make it a real part of Canadian life, and that's what we need.

## **William Dumas:**

But I think overall, too, you have to realize there's been a good seed that's been planted in a lot of the Aboriginal communities. It's how the archaeologists go into the communities. In Northern Manitoba, when people come into our territory, usually you're adopted or you're not, and if you're not adopted you're an orphan in our territory. In this room, starting from many years ago, when we talk about Dave Riddle nobody says Dave Riddle; they say brother Dave. We know who brother Dave is, we know who brother Kevin is, we know brother Leigh, the good doctor, our brother the good doctor. We know who Brian Smith is; we've adopted them and the work they've done. When you adopt someone as a brother, and you know that, those of you that have been adopted, it means that we've made a commitment to stand beside you. So I think that the seed has been sown, now how do you take advantage of making something? There are opportunities out there folks. It's an emotional need, I know, for me, but it's there. I think the seed has been planted already, and it's a good seed. Let's make those flowers grow out of it and there's much that can be done. There are a lot of areas that can be worked at in that field.

## **Gerald Oetelaar:**

Got to get rid of the snow first before the flowers will grow.

**END OF SESSION**