



Ontario Archaeological Society

Arch Notes

New Series Volume 24 Issue 4

ISSN 0048-1742

October/December 2019



The room was filled to overflowing with attendees to the 2019 OAS Symposium who wanted to hear former judge of the Ontario Court of Appeal and member of the Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation, Justice Harry LaForme's, presentation on reconciliation.

OAS News

- 3. President's Message
- 6. The Charlie Garrad Avocational Archaeological Collections Fund
- 15. Update on the 2019-2024 Strategic Plan
- 17. OAS 2019 Award Winners

Articles

- 7. Is it Time to Rename the Earliest Period of Human Occupation in Ontario
- 8. Archaeological Nomenclature and Indigenous Consultation
- 10. Thoughts on Naming
- 11. Troublesome Terminology: It is a Time (Period) for Change in Ontario

Visit us on the Web at www.ontarioarchaeology.org

ONTARIO ARCHAEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

President

Alicia Hawkins
president@ontarioarchaeology.org

President-Elect

Jim Sherratt
preselect@ontarioarchaeology.org

Treasurer

Debbie Steiss
treasurer@ontarioarchaeology.org

Vice-President/Secretary

Rob Pihl
vicepres@ontarioarchaeology.org

Director of Chapter Services

Amy St. John
chapters@ontarioarchaeology.org

Director of Heritage Advocacy

Abbey Flower
heritageadvoc@ontarioarchaeology.org

Director of Member Recruitment

Dana Millson
membership@ontarioarchaeology.org

Director of Member Services

Bill Ross
memberservices@ontarioarchaeology.org

Director of Publications

James Conolly
publications@ontarioarchaeology.org

Director of Public Outreach

Kaitlyn Malleau
outreach@ontarioarchaeology.org

APPOINTMENTS

Editor, Ontario Archaeology

Chris Ellis

Editors, Arch Notes

Sheryl Smith & Carole Stimmell

Symposium Liaison:

Dana Millson

Moderator – Ontario Archaeological Society Listserve (OAS-L)

<http://tech.groups.yahoo.com/group/OAS-L/>
Vito Vaccarelli

Contact Information

PO Box 62066
Victoria Terrace Post Office
Toronto, Ontario M4A 2W1
(416) 406-5959
info@ontarioarchaeology.org
www.ontarioarchaeology.org

The Ontario Archaeological Society gratefully acknowledges funding from the Ministry of Tourism and Culture through the Provincial Heritage Organization Operating Grant Program.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

RELINQUISHING AUTHORITY

"... decolonization is not accountable to settlers or settler futurity. Decolonization is accountable to Indigenous sovereignty and futurity."

Tuck and Yang 2012: 35.

How commonplace the terms 'reconciliation', 'decolonization', and 'unsettling' have become in our everyday language. And as this has happened, they have perhaps become a little less 'unsettling'.

At the most recent symposium, the OAS was honoured to have Justice Harry LaForme speak on reconciliation. In his inspiring talk, Justice LaForme pointed out how colonial governments have reneged on treaty agreements and he mentioned some of the impacts that this had had on Indigenous peoples in Canada.

These things ought not to have been surprising to anyone in the room. His talk, however, was also a hopeful one, as he pointed out that Canadians generally want to do the right thing. Citing the example of same sex marriage, he noted that while it was thought before his historic ruling on this¹, that the idea of same sex marriage would be rejected by most Canadians. In fact, after the ruling 80% of Canadians were found to support it. And so, while reconciliation will result in a realignment of power, it is something that most Canadians appear to be ready to work on.

As I have been travelling through Ontario during the last few years, describing to groups of non-archaeologists how the process of archaeology works here, I have become thoroughly convinced that our system, as it now exists, must be decolonized.

What I mean by this is that we have a

system that, on paper is meant to protect the archaeological record in Ontario – here I refer to everything from legislation (the Ontario Heritage Act R.S.O 1990), to policy (the Provincial Policy Statement (2014), the Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (2011)), to licensing, to report review, to university education, and the Cultural Resource Management industry. Yet, in reality, it mainly seems to protect the ability of a relatively small group of (primarily non-Indigenous) people to practice archaeology. We have a complicated system, with diverse players in many different roles. However, I think it can be argued that Indigenous people, whose cultural heritage is responsible for the majority of the archaeology in the province, have been systematically excluded from participating in this system.

There are exceptions, and I will get to these below, but there are also many areas with potential for positive change. To do so, we must commit to and be willing to change our current practice. We might consider this to be part of the process of reconciliation with which we are now so concerned.

How do we learn about archaeology? Who are our role models and mentors? How do we overcome historical distrust of anthropologists? There are only a small number of tenured teaching university professors in Ontario who focus on the archaeology of the province. To my knowledge none of these people identify as Indigenous. With several impending retirements within this group, we have an opportunity to argue for the hiring of Indigenous archaeologists². This assumes that there are people to fill such positions: if there are not, we need to

think about what we can do to encourage Indigenous students to pursue graduate studies. Now. Universities, including my own, have recognized the importance of building the Indigenous faculty complement through initiatives such as hiring people while they are still completing their PhDs, and recognizing traditional knowledge as a different, but important form of knowing.

If we are not in a position to hire new faculty, what can we in universities do to make our subject material more appealing to Indigenous students? A quick internet survey of programs across the province shows only two courses (and one Special Topics course) entitled Indigenous Archaeology. It may be that non-Indigenous faculty feel that teaching such courses might be seen as a form of cultural appropriation, but there are ways in which it is possible to bring Indigenous voices about archaeology into the classroom, even for non-Indigenous people such as myself. There are a number of excellent texts available, segments from APTN's *Wild Archaeology*, and guest speakers all spring to mind.

In my experience, Indigenous students are justifiably wary of archaeology and anthropology as subjects of study. This arises from the fact that Indigenous people have been treated as objects of study for centuries and this practice continues in different guises today (Reardon and Tallbear 2012). As non-Indigenous faculty members we need to acknowledge that our understanding of the Indigenous past on Turtle Island is only one understanding, we need to be open to challenging and revising the terms that we use (see other contributions in this issue of *Arch Notes*), and we need to

1. *Halpern v. Canada (Attorney General)*, 2002 CanLII 42749 (ON SCDC).

<https://www.canlii.org/en/on/onscdc/doc/2002/2002canlii42749/2002canlii42749.html>

2. In response to the question "What are some of the things that you think need to change if we are to decolonize universities in Ontario and Canada?" Tanya Talaga replies "There needs to be more Indigenous faculty hired at all universities and colleges. And the faculty that are hired have to be fairly compensated and treated just like the non-Indigenous faculty." Talaga 2019: 4.

make our course material relevant to Indigenous students. Collaboration with Indigenous colleagues on research questions of interest to community may be a first step.

How to we govern archaeology? In government we face a number of the same challenges present in academe. Just as curriculum and textbooks are written by non-Indigenous professors, laws and policies have been written and are enforced by non-Indigenous law-makers and bureaucrats. The Ontario Heritage Act (R.S.O. 1990) was opened for revision this past year, but none of the changes pertained specifically to archaeology or addressed Indigenous people's rights to manage their own cultural heritage (as per UNDRIP, Article 11).

We have been informed that a review is forthcoming of the archaeology program that will examine licensing, collections, the Standards and Guidelines, and PastPortal. Here we have an opportunity to make some significant changes that could help to shift some of the power that now resides in the hands of colonial government to Indigenous governments.

1. Standards and Guidelines (and the related document *Engaging Aboriginal Communities in Archaeology* (2011)) – Let's argue for engagement of Indigenous communities from before Stage 1. As one community member put it to me – as soon as you have the beginning of an idea that you might be undertaking development, you should begin the engagement process. If the oft-cited statistic that 80% of the registered archaeological sites in Ontario are Indigenous is true, then it should be easy to argue for this. The earlier the engagement, the higher the probability that Indigenous communities and proponents can come to a solution that respects Aboriginal and treaty rights. Let's also strongly support the adherence of archaeologists to standards and guidelines developed by specific First Nations to guide the practice of archaeology within their treaty territories³.

2. Licensing – Let's look at the requirements for obtaining a license and ask how we can remove structural barriers that pre-

vent experienced Indigenous archaeologists from obtaining licenses. While the proportion of Indigenous students enrolled in university is roughly equal to the proportion of Indigenous people in Canada, there remains a gap in graduates (Smith and Bray 2019: 14). And a B.A. is required to obtain a research licence.

3. Collections – As I understand it, there is not now any requirement that CRM firms build into their estimates the cost of caring for collections in perpetuity. But as we all know, there are costs. So archaeologists blithely agree to the terms and conditions of their licenses, stating that they will “hold in safekeeping all artifacts and records of archaeological fieldwork carried out under ... licence.” And we hope that some ‘public institution’ will elect to take on these costs for us. We are aware of unfortunate events that have led to accidental destruction of archaeological collections and we tell ourselves that our collections are cared for better. But are they? We reserve a higher standard for Indigenous communities that might wish to hold collections from sites within their territories, as these are considered public institutions, so transfers must be approved by the Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries (MHSTCI). If we claim to aspire to Nation to Nation relationships, why don't we look at this a different way? If Indigenous communities are willing to accept archaeological collections with funding from archaeologists to help with their care in perpetuity (similar to that box fee that Sustainable Archaeology charges), why don't we treat these First Nations as partners and allow them to determine what best practices are in terms of care?

4. Past Portal – At this time, Indigenous communities who request a list of Project Information Forms (PIF) for work in their territory can have this issued monthly. If Past Portal is to be overhauled, would it not be possible to send to each First Nation any request for a PIF as it comes in? Right now, First Nations that want to find out about archaeological sites in the archaeological site

registry must sign a data sharing agreement with the government of Ontario. Why can't we give First Nations access to information about sites within their territory in the same way that we allow all licenced archaeologists access to this information? I.e., through searching in Past Portal?

In addition to these suggestions, there are so many more that could be made. But first and foremost we might want to ask why there are no Indigenous staff working in the Archaeology Program Unit at the MHSTCI. Are there systemic barriers that make it difficult and/or unattractive as a potential workplace?

Who does archaeology? As we all know, most archaeological work in this province is undertaken in the context of CRM. I don't work in this field, and so my knowledge of it comes from talking to friends, colleagues and former students, and I freely admit that I may get it wrong here. I think that again, however, we are seeing some of the same issues in CRM that we see in academe and government. While I am told that there are more Indigenous people hired by CRM firms than in other contexts, at a monitor training session this summer one of our volunteer presenters was asked if there are Indigenous people holding positions in the lab? Or as project managers? Or other positions in the office? Right now, for whatever reason, Indigenous people working in CRM rarely fill positions more advanced than field technicians. How can Indigenous monitors and technicians be mentored so that they have a diverse knowledge of archaeological practice and opportunities in the province? This seems to me another to be another structural barrier that needs to be deconstructed.

There are a few recent development projects that I am aware of in which the contract was awarded to a First Nation, who then subcontracted to an archaeological firm. Perhaps this is not the solution to all of the issues that arise in CRM, but there are some significant differences, from the get-go in how these contracts play out. First of all, the First Nation oversees cultural training

3. For example, the *Standards and Guidelines of the Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation* (<http://mncfn.ca/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/MNCFN-SGs-for-Archaeology.pdf>) and the *Curve Lake First Nation Archaeological Protocol* (<https://www.curvelakefirstnation.ca/download/curve-lake-first-nation-archaeological-protocol/>).

for anyone who participates in the project, from archaeologists to the people that drive around those large machines. It is the First Nation that sets the bar. Secondly, the people employed to do a range of activities related to archaeology can be from the First Nation – so the role of First Nations employees doesn't stop at shovel bum or monitor, but can include lab work and more advanced field roles. The reporting is a collaborative endeavor. Indeed, the community decides the extent and nature of the archaeology to be done. As the contractor, the First Nation is responsible for ensuring the quality of the archaeology. What is not to like here?

As you read through this, if you have lasted this long, some of you are probably

thinking “all nice and good, but who are all of these Indigenous people who are going to fill these roles?” And I would argue that you should look again. They are probably people you have been working with or who have been working for you. Every year we see more Indigenous people participating in the OAS symposium. Let's look at how we can strengthen our relationships and move forward with sharing knowledge. And that means that non-Indigenous archaeologists like me will need to stop being the experts, relinquish authority, and let it be known that we have things to learn.

REFERENCES

- Reardon, J. and K. Tallbear
2012 “Your DNA is Our History” Ge-

nomics, Anthropology and the Construction of Whiteness and Property. *Current Anthropology* 52 Supplement 5: S233-S245.

Smith, Malinda S. and Nancy Bray
2019. The Indigenous Diversity Gap. *Academic Matters*. Spring 2019: 14-15.

Tuck, Eve and K. Wayne Yang
2012 Decolonization is not a metaphor. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education and Society*. 1: 1-40.

Talaga, Tanya
2019 Bringing Indigenous viewpoints to higher education. *Academic Matters* Spring 2019: 3-6.

Alicia Hawkins



The OAS was honoured to have a presentation on reconciliation by Justice Harry LaForme, former judge of the Ontario Court of Appeal and member of the Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation at this year's symposium. We thank the Honourable Justice LaForme for sharing insightful comments with the attendees at the symposium. The very well attended session was a highlight for many conference participants.

THE CHARLIE GARRAD AVOCATIONAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL COLLECTIONS FUND

For Giving Tuesday 2019 (November 26th), the OAS encouraged everyone with an interest in archaeology to contribute to the Charlie Garrad Avocational Archaeological Collections Fund. The fund is named in honour of our long-serving former president and executive director, who was himself an avocational archaeologist, and who, through decades of study, contributed enormously to the archaeology of the Petun.

This new OAS fund recognizes the need to support avocational archaeologists with

the preparation of their collections for transfer to a public institution. We have a generous offer – from an anonymous donor – to match all funds raised, to a maximum of \$5,000. To-date, we have raised over \$4400.

Many of us have a story (or several) of going to an amateur or avocational archaeologist's home to view their collection. Some are quite small, but most are quite extensive, from years of spending their free time looking for and documenting archaeological sites. We have stories of watching

as they search through their records for their fieldnotes and maps or information about where a site may be located based on information they have gathered from people they have talked to about their passion – Ontario archaeology. These collections and archives are extremely valuable to the archaeological community – particularly when they are accessible.

As we all know, the ethical practice of archaeology comes with the responsibility for care of the artifacts recovered, and the associated records that are generated. For those in CRM or academia, the cost of that care is not strictly a personal responsibility. For the avocational or amateur archaeologist, the cost is a personal responsibility for the preparation of the collection for long term care and the storage. And then there is the cost of preparing these collections for transfer to a public institution. Since in Ontario the direction of a collection to a public institution is provided by the minister responsible for the Ontario Heritage Act, many feel that it is the government's responsibility to assist with the financial costs associated with doing so. As we also know, this is not the reality.

Your donation will be used to help avocational archaeologists prepare their collections for transfer. It could be used for a project to create a digital copy of fieldnotes, or boxes and curatorial materials required prior to a transfer to a public institution. Imagine going into Past Portal and having access to a digital copy of Art Howie's notes? Or a hand drawn map by Charlie? And being able to access these collections in a public institution? These are the types of projects this fund hopes to support. Please give generously. The opportunity is open until the end of 2019 (for matching money) and all donors receive a tax receipt.



Ella Garrad and her granddaughter Kayley at the remembrance service held for Charlie during the Friday night symposium reception held at Fort York.

IS IT TIME TO RENAME THE EARLIEST PERIOD OF HUMAN OCCUPATION IN ONTARIO?

By Jim Sherratt

As the OAS (and the archaeological profession more generally) move forward with Truth and Reconciliation (<http://nctr.ca/reports.php>) and adopting UN-DRIP (https://www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/documents/DRIPS_en.pdf), is it time we renamed the earliest period of human occupation in Ontario? As a profession we have moved away from the use of the term that forms the last half of the current name for the time period, so why have we not moved on to a new name for the time period as well?

Terminology changes over time. We have moved from the original term through to a series of terms to describe Indigenous peoples (https://www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/documents/5session_factsheet1.pdf) – Native, First Peoples and Aboriginal – yet, all the while the term for the earliest known group continued unchanged. In Ontario we continue to use the name to describe the earliest inhabitants of the area, despite it being an echo of colonialism and the institutional racism upon which our profession was founded. What has made this term so sacrosanct that while others have changed, it remains? Terminology changes as we understand more about a particular time period or as a reflection of what is happening within the discipline itself (Williamson and Watts 1999), so why not change to respond to external influences, including Truth and Reconciliation?

The practice of using traditional language to name archaeological sites (Allen 2010) has gradually increased over the last few years. The Indigenous names given to archaeological sites are often carefully selected and imbued with meaning (Basso 1996) describing the geographic location (Poulton 2013) or an experience (TMHC 2018). This practice has even extended to renaming sites such as Thonnakona (<http://anishinabeknews.ca/2013/05/28/huron-remains-to-be-reburied/>, accessed July 26, 2019) which was originally investigated in 1970 as the Kleinburg Ossuary.

Archaeologists, particularly those working in cultural resource management, are moving towards names used to reference present day communities (i.e. Aamjiwnaang First Nation), past communities (i.e. Tionontati) or groups (i.e. Michi Saagiing, Migizi and Kapyrka 2015). They are doing so in reaction to the assertions of rights by Indigenous peoples, but also for reasons such as respect for names communities chose for themselves, or historical accuracy to use names to which they may have been referred to by contemporary neighbouring communities.

While it is easy to critique the use of the term, it is much harder to offer an alternative that is both representative and re-

spectful. In the United States, the term Paleoamericans has begun to appear. In academic papers there is a growing tendency to refer to the geological epoch – Late Pleistocene and Early, Middle and Late Holocene, but the date ranges for the geology do not neatly fit with temporal boundaries that have been constructed for the cultural traditions.

The answer to the question is not whether it is time for a name change. This process has already taken hold for the naming of archaeological sites and referencing communities. Rather, the question is, what will be the process that leads to a new name?

Perhaps the answer is not with us as archaeologists, but in what the Canadian Institute of Planners has called cultural humility (<http://cip-icu.ca/getattachment/Topics-in-Planning/Indigenous-Planning/policy-indigenous-en-interactive.pdf.aspx>). As with so many other things, we should ask and listen to Indigenous peoples about what they would like us to call their ancestors and the places they fished, hunted, gathered and lived.

REFERENCES

- Allen, William Arthur
2010 Anishinaabemowin: Traditional Language in the Naming of Archaeological Sites. *Arch Notes* 15(1):5-10.
- Basso, Keith
1996 *Wisdom Sits in Places: Landscape and Language Among the Western Apache*. University of New Mexico Press.
- Migizi, Gitiga and Julie Kapyrka
2015 Before, During, and After: Mississauga Presence in the Kawarthas. In *Peterborough Archaeology*. Dirk Verhulst, editor, pp.127-136. Peterborough, Ontario: Peterborough Chapter of the Ontario Archaeological Society.
- D.R. Poulton and Associates Inc.
2013 The 2012 Stage 1-3 Archaeological Assessment of the Proposed Wilkesport Meter Station, Part of Lot 15, Concession 13, Geographic Township of Sombra, The Corporation of the Township of St. Clair, Lambton County, Ontario. Report on file with the Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries.
- TMHC
2018 Stage 4 Archaeological Assessment, Aazhiwaagamiing Site (AfHo-18), Waterfront Park – Splash Pad Project, Village of Point Edward, Geographic Township of Sarnia, Lambton County, Ontario. Report on file with the Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism, and Culture Industries.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE AND INDIGENOUS CONSULTATION

By Sarah Hazell

“As the most studied peoples on the face of the earth, the American Indian is well acquainted with the ‘Indian Expert’ as found in the anthropological, archaeological, palaeopathological, physical anthropological associations” (Hammil and Cruz 1989, 196)

For over one hundred years, archaeologists and non-Indigenous scientists have controlled the ancestral domain of North American Indigenous peoples including, but not limited to, burials and sites, human and animal remains, collections and artifacts, documentation and production of archaeological knowledge, and classification systems and nomenclature. While collaborative ventures between archaeologists and descendant groups are growing, authority over the Indigenous past continues to be largely held, wielded, and benefited by ‘others’ to the detriment of First Peoples who identify as the rightful stewards of ancestral belongings and sites in North America.

To counter this imbalance, many archaeologists within the discipline are embracing a more inclusive approach by actively including Indigenous knowledge and perspectives, under the rhetoric of ‘decolonization’ and Indigenous archaeology (Atalay 2006, 2008 and 2012, Bruchac 2014, Sillman 2008, Smith and Wobst 2005). With this in mind, I propose that First Nations should be consulted concerning proposed nomenclature changes to the long-used misnomer ‘PalaeoIndian’. As demonstrated by Hinshelwood in his companion article, the term PalaeoIndian does not reflect a supportable relationship between source and subject. The question is, where do we go from here?

Respected Indigenous archaeologist Eldon Yellowhorn considered the PalaeoIndian problem and suggested that European classifications should be mapped onto North America groups based on technology to promote greater opportunity for global understandings of archaeological manifestations (i.e. PalaeoIndians = Upper Paleolithic, Archaic = Epipalaeolithic, Woodland = Neolithic) (2003). Unfortunately, this approach fails to take into consideration the ancestral relationship, beliefs, and understandings that First Nations people have with or to past groups that lived on their traditional territories (biological or otherwise). Indigenous people do not think of their ancestors in terms of the technologies they used or temporal periods they are assigned to by archaeologists.

When I asked an Anishinabek elder about the term PalaeoIndian, he said “That is a white man’s label. White man called us Cree, Dene, Eskimo but we are one people, even from the beginning. We are the original people from the lands. We are all one

people, we are one family” (personal communication, Terry Bouchard). The connection to the past for Indigenous peoples is contemporary and they rely on this worldview and understanding for their social, cultural, economic and political reproduction (Harris 2005; Million 2005; Nicholas 2005).

In the Arctic, the term Paleo-Eskimo, which designates all pre-Inuit and Thule-Inuit occupations, was replaced by the less contentious term Paleo-Inuit (Friesen 2015). The appellation Paleo-Inuit was adopted by the International Circumpolar Commission (ICC), a representative organization of the Inuit, Inuvialuit, Inupiat, and Yup’ik peoples occupying northern areas of modern-day Russia, the U.S., Canada, and Greenland. This name change is considered conservative and supported by northern archaeologists because “we can’t go around randomly changing the names of ancient cultures, or none of us will know what the other is talking about.” (Friesen 2015: iii). However, the re-application of terms like ‘Paleo’, which conforms to traditional archaeological classification systems, represents another wave of colonization or the recolonization of indigenous worldviews. Certainly, the initial occupants of Canada, in the north and the south, did not conceptualize themselves as deriving from ‘archaic’, ‘paleo’, or ‘Neolithic’ archaeological traditions. They were people. Consequently, keeping or applying the prefix Paleo to a new description or name, like Paleo-First Nations, is not recommended.

As supported by the United Nations Declaration on the Right of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) and echoed by the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC), Indigenous people have the “right to maintain, control, protect, and develop their cultural heritage” including intellectual property, in addition to being consulted to obtain their “free, prior, and informed consent” concerning projects that affect their resources (e.g. cultural heritage) (UNDRIP Articles 31 and 32). Archaeologists recognizing these inherent rights are working directly with indigenous communities to build capacity, so they are better equipped to steward and advocate for heritage resources on their traditional territories. I suggest these endeavours should also extend to nomenclature and classification systems. Archaeologists should work together with indigenous groups to accurately reflect their relationships to their ancestors and/or to previous occupants.

“Rather, archaeologists might take a more reflexive approach and contextualize the present situation by tracing archaeologists’ (and physical anthropologists’) current position of power to both colonization and the historical reality of the egregious acts that led to the collections held by museum, universities, and historical societies internationally. The colonial past is not distinct from today’s realities and practices, as the precedents that were set continue to define structures for heritage management practices

and have powerful continuing implications for Indigenous peoples in North America and elsewhere precisely because they disrupted the self-determination and sovereignty of Indigenous populations with respect to their abilities to govern and practice their own traditional forms of cultural resource management.” (Atalay 2006: 282).

These practices continue to occur marginalizing indigenous voices. For too long, the Indigenous past has been interpreted and reconstructed by the archaeologist or ‘Indian Expert’. An important step for decolonizing the practice should be to communicate directly with Indigenous groups (not just one) to determine culturally appropriate names and terms for the peoples with whom they continue to have immemorial and indisputable connections. This dialogue is an important step in recognizing the time is long overdue for the decolonization of the term PalaeoIndian. This issue will likely not be resolved quickly, but it is necessary to begin to listen to what Indigenous people are saying about the lands, people, and remains (ancestral or otherwise) that they stewarded in the past and continue to steward.

As an Indigenous person and archaeologist, I have considered potential nomenclature that could be amenable and sensitive to Indigenous people of this country while at the same time being conventional from an archaeological perspective. I think the term ‘First Ancestors’ would be a culturally appropriate designation for what currently stands for PalaeoIndians. ‘First Ancestors’ acknowledges both the distinct relationship that indigenous people have with past groups and mirrors current terminology of First Nations. Furthermore, First Ancestors can be combined with temporal and regional qualifiers for archaeological study (i.e. First Ancestors of southern Ontario or First Ancestors circa 10,000 BP of the Great Lakes Basin). Perhaps this could be extended even further to include more recent groups like the Woodland (i.e. First Ancestors of the Woodland) but renaming of the Archaic and Woodland is also entirely possible given the current trajectory of reconciliation and decolonization of the discipline.

I look forward to working with and on behalf of Indigenous communities to create much needed space for their voices, beliefs, and stories, in addition to working with archaeologists to find solutions for braiding Indigenous and western knowledge systems.

REFERENCES

- Atalay, S.
2006 Indigenous Archaeology as Decolonizing Practice. *American Indian Quarterly*, 30, no. 3-4: 280-310.
- 2008 Multivocality and Indigenous Archaeologies. In *Evaluating Multiple Narratives: Beyond Nationalist, Colonialist, and Imperialist Archaeologies*, edited by J. Habu, C. Fawcett, and J. Matsunaga, 29-44. Springer: New York.
- 2012 *Community-Based Archaeology*. University of Californian Press: Berkeley.
- Bruchac, M.
2014 Decolonization in Archaeological Theory. In *Encyclopedia of Global Archaeology* edited by C. Smith, 2069-2077. Springer: New York.
- Friesen, M.
2015 On the Naming of Arctic Archaeological Traditions: The Case for Paleo-Inuit. *Arctic*. Vol. 68. No. 3: iii-iv.
- Hammil, J., and R. Cruz.
1989 Statement of American Indians against Desecration before the World Archaeological Congress. In *Conflict in the Archaeology of Living Traditions*, edited by R. Layton. Unwin Hyman: London.
- Harris, H.
2005 Indigenous worldviews and ways of knowing as theoretical and methodological foundations for archaeological research. In *Indigenous Archaeologies: Decolonizing Theory and Practice*, edited by C. Smith and H. Martin Wobst, 33-41. London: Routledge.
- Million, T.
2005 Developing an Aboriginal archaeology: receiving gifts from White Buffalo Calf Woman. In *Indigenous Archaeologies: Decolonizing Theory and Practice*, edited by C. Smith and H. Martin Wobst, 43-55. London: Routledge.
- Nicholas, G.
2005 The persistence of memory; the politics of desire: archaeological impacts on Aboriginal peoples and their response. In *Indigenous Archaeologies: Decolonizing Theory and Practice*, edited by C. Smith and H. Martin Wobst, 81-103. London: Routledge.
- Sillman, S.
2008 Collaborating at the Trowel’s Edge: Teaching and Learning in Indigenous Archaeology. *Amerind Studies in Archaeology*. University of Arizona Press: Tucson.
- Smith, C., and H. Martin Wobst
2005 *Indigenous Archaeologies: Decolonizing Theory and Practice*. London: Routledge.
- Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada
2012 Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada interim report. Winnipeg: Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada.
- United Nations
2011 United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.
- Yellowhorn, E.
2003 Regarding the American Paleolithic. *Canadian Journal of Archaeology*. Vol. 27, No. 1: 62-73.

THOUGHTS ON NAMING

By Andrew Hinshelwood

Jim Sherratt has raised the question: should we persist in using the term palaeo-Indian for the earliest archaeological culture in the province? I would like to expand this discussion by addressing the use of the term as policy.

Typically, we believe that only government or large organizations have policy, and the rest of us don't. We have preferences instead. But what about the OAS, or the collective formed by archaeologists and their audience, or just licensed archaeologists? I submit that in terms of these less formally constituted groups, policy is expressed by our behaviour over time. Behaviour over time reveals the collective preference, and hence the policy of the group.

Let's start with the term: palaeo, which means 'ancient' or 'the oldest' seems harmless. But Indian is, inescapably, a racialized term that has been imposed upon a group of people. The term Indian, as we have all been taught, arises from one confused guy in 1492. His poor understanding of geography is a mistake that has been compounded by extension of the term to define many diverse groups occupying North and South America.

Yet, the term Indian persists in three contemporary usages. First, Indigenous people in Ontario may use the term among themselves. This is a usage that is laden with irony, in recognition that the term is ultimately derived from the Indian Act. This use recognizes that the term is loaded with centuries of power dynamics, abuse and oppression. This use is also exclusive. That is, hearing an Indigenous person use the term does not give someone from outside their community license to use it in the same way. Rap lyrics may be a useful heuristic for those in doubt here.

Second, there is the use of Indian as a legal term. Section 35 of the Constitution recognizes and affirms Aboriginal rights. Section 35(2) of the Constitution Act defines "aboriginal peoples of Canada" to include "Indian, Inuit and Métis peoples." Indian, as a legal term, derives from the Indian Act. This Act enables federal government control over Indigenous peoples from Treaty level engagement right down to who may be registered as Indian. The Indian Act established the administrative bureaucracy that gave us a variety of genocidal policies, most notably, the reserve system and residential schools. For those seeking more on this, there is an extensive literature, but Bob Joseph's *21 Things You May Not Know About the Indian Act* is a handy little volume.

The third usage of the term Indian is within archaeology. And this is the usage that should be the easiest to change. However, this change should come in tandem with serious efforts at decolonizing archaeology, and making archaeological work part of reconciliation.

A few thoughts here. The focus of our work as archaeolo-

gists is with the material remains, the physical traces of the technological, economic, and social practices enacted during a site's occupation. It is beneficial to remember that we are studying material remains, and not people. We do not interact with the people, but with their stuff.

Further, the people who are represented by the remains are, at the risk of sounding glib, not Indians either. That is, they did not fall under the authority of the Indian Act, and pre-date Columbus' confusion. They do, however, share an ancestral bond with contemporary Indigenous people, and this opens up avenues for both political challenges and fruitful cooperation.

The term Indian creates a false objectivity by denoting the people who had occupied these sites as 'other than us'. And while this allows some archaeologists to assume an objectivity in our work that arises from distance (distant in time, distant in culture and not related to our ancestors), others may not experience this luxury. They may find themselves in the position of working with collections that are at once subjective (derived from ancestors) and objective (the 'work' of archaeology). Tension, if there is to be tension in archaeological research, should come from practices of inquiry and decolonisation, not from the need to navigate between Western and Indigenous epistemologies. Robin Wall Kimmerer's *Braiding Sweetgrass* is an engaging description of working through this tension, and Linda Tuhiwai Smith's *Decolonizing Methodologies* provides some actionable approaches.

So, returning to the question of policy we need to ask: Is it our policy, as archaeologists, to reproduce and perpetuate the structural inequities inherent in the term Indian? Or are we willing to make a statement and move forward into reconciliation, replacing the term with something more appropriate to the focus of our work, the material remains of these ancient inhabitants of Ontario? And are we willing to share the work of this renaming with the descendant populations?

REFERENCES

- Wall Kimmerer, Robin
2015 *Braiding Sweetgrass*. Milkweed Editions.
- Tuhiwai Smith, Linda
1999 *Decolonizing Methodologies*. Zed Books. London.
- Joseph, Bob
2018 *21 Things You May Not Know About the Indian Act*. Raincoast Books. Vancouver

TROUBLESOME TERMINOLOGY: IT IS A TIME (PERIOD) FOR CHANGE IN ONTARIO

By Jill Taylor-Hollings

The OAS and many Canadian archaeologists have begun to address the Calls to Action for the National Truth and Reconciliation Commission (Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada 2015) and adopt the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (United Nations 2008). Similar to Sherratt's and Hinshelwood's (this issue) calls to revise archaeological terminology in Ontario, my colleagues and I have been discussing this idea in Northern Ontario and other parts of the boreal forest for years. On a national level, in 2017, I participated in a session called, "What's in a Name: Conventional Canadian Culture Histories" (organized by Scott Neilsen and Matthew Beaudoin), at the 50th Canadian Archaeological Association annual meeting in Ottawa/Gatineau to discuss these very ideas. What we determined is that all of the participants, from Newfoundland across to Manitoba, had decided to revise our terminology; this would change to more contemporary nomenclature that is hopefully not offensive to Indigenous people in Canada, with whom we work and whose cultures are the focus of many of our archaeological projects.

Background to Troublesome Terminology

As a person of mixed Indigenous and Settler backgrounds, I have never felt comfortable using the terms 'Palaeoindian' nor 'Archaic' periods during my career in archaeology, which has spanned over two decades. After moving to Thunder Bay in 2001, I started to work more directly with Indigenous communities and individuals there. It became even clearer to me that these archaeological terms needed to change after I had the opportunity to work with Anishinaabe people and wanted to explain our typical stacked chronology as a means of talking about archaeological evidence in their territories (Taylor-Hollings 2017). I was certainly not going to use the 'I' word to refer to the earliest occupants in their region nor speak of their ancestors as 'Archaic'! Thus, I found alternatives (Taylor-Hollings 2017). However, as Sherratt (this issue) discusses, what are the best terms to use?

Archaeological nomenclature for the major periods of culture history in Canada and the United States has undergone many changes through the 20th and 21st centuries. Exploring why the terms in current use came about may help to explain why some archaeologists are still using them. The earliest archaeologically defined Indigenous cultures have long been referred to by archaeologists as Palaeoindians, which is politically incorrect for Canada (see Hinshelwood this issue). "The term Paleoindian is still prevalent in the literature although Aboriginal people today find the term derogatory, feeling that it relegates them to fossils, so the term is not used here" as Playford (2015:26) explains.

This name was coined by early archaeologists for the pre-contact time frames of the Paleo- and Neo-Indian periods (Griffin 1946) in which the latter was divided into Woodland divisions of North American Indigenous occupations. The Meso-Indian period was also used by researchers for the time in between the earliest and latest. Although Palaeoindian and Woodland terms are still in widespread usage by many archaeologists, Meso- and Neo-Indian are not. It is perplexing why only Palaeo- persisted in usage while many researchers switched to the Archaic and Late Woodland/Plains/Plains Woodland. Some scholars in the United States are choosing to use the terms Palaeoamericans for the people they are discussing (e.g., Bonnicksen et al., eds. 2006) or Palaeo period, which are somewhat more appropriate than the older term. However, the former does not work for Canadian contexts and what would be paired for later times after Palaeo?

The 'Archaic Period' is Archaic

Willey and Phillips (1958) introduced the Lithic, Archaic, Formative, Classic and Postclassic Stages, which were historical developmental units for classifying similar assemblages and time frames in middle American archaeological contexts. Unfortunately, the term 'Archaic' has been retained from this taxonomy by many researchers across Canada and the United States for the time frame between the earliest and Woodland periods. Many researchers switched from using the earlier published term 'Meso-Indian' (Griffin 1946) to Archaic. The latter is a widely used in North American archaeological literature to refer to a period of the mid-Holocene epoch when cultures shared a series of new technological and socio-political traits that differentiate them from previous cultures. It was supposed to reflect the meaning of archaic as ancient or an earlier period. However, it is ironic that these dictionary (Collins 2019) entries explain alternate meanings of archaic as out of date, and extremely old or old-fashioned:

- belonging to or characteristic of a much earlier period; ancient out of date; antiquated (an archaic prison system)
- (of an idiom, vocabulary, etc.) characteristic of an earlier period of a language and not in ordinary use
- British English: archaic adjective
- Archaic: means extremely old or extremely old-fashioned (...archaic laws that are very seldom used).

So, why are archaeologists still using this out of date term? Adovasio and Carr (2009:521) suggested dropping the Palaeoindian and Early Archaic terms for different reasons:

"... the foregoing strongly suggests that, despite their hal- lowed place in North American archaeological literature, the very terms Paleoindian and Early Archaic (or, for that matter, any subdivision of them) need to be reexamined. As classifica- tory culturally historic constructs with specific sociotechnic be-

havioral implications, they may have outlived their usefulness. Indeed, retention of these terms seems to obfuscate, mask, or otherwise distort the very transitions in lifestyles they were intended to illuminate.”

These authors explain that there are limited startling changes evident between the Early period and beginnings of the Middle period, at least in the Northeast United States culture area in terms of technology and lifeway. They propose that changes within the Middle period are more striking (Adovasio and Carr 2009:521).

Wright’s (1972, 1981) pioneering work provided baseline taxonomic information for many researchers in the central Canadian boreal forest. He outlined the series of specific periods for that area including the Paleo-Indian, Shield Archaic, Initial Woodland (akin to Middle Woodland), and Terminal Woodland (equivalent to Late Woodland) (Wright 1981). The latter two periods were named since there were no evidence of Early Woodland occupations in central Canadian boreal forest sites, unlike those found in the adjacent northern United States (e.g., Arzigian 2008) and southern Ontario. He later changed his terminology to the Late Western Shield Culture (Laurel) and Northern Algonquian Culture and proposed a national classification system (Wright 1995, 1999); however, that does not seem to have been implemented by many researchers. Wright (1995) also changed his ‘Shield Archaic Culture’ to the Early Shield Culture related to Plano Culture (8,000 - 4,000 BC) and Middle Shield Culture (4,000 - 1,000 BC), which indicates his acknowledgement that Palaeoindian and Archaic were no longer correct terms for archaeologists to use for early Indigenous people in Ontario.

In summary, the most commonly used central Canadian boreal forest cultural-historical units result from a legacy of utilizing portions of many early iterations typically conceived for the United States (Taylor-Hollings 2017). I have adopted the more updated terms of Early, Middle, and Late (divided into Middle and Late Woodland) periods that have been used by others in British Columbia for decades (e.g., Carlson 1979) and more recently in Saskatchewan and Manitoba (e.g., Korejbo 2011; Mantey and Pettipas 1996; Playford 2015). These terms help archaeologists in Canada to avoid using the politically incorrect Palaeoindian term and Archaic period, which has so many alternate and potentially negative meanings other than ancient (Taylor-Hollings 2017). Clearly, Early, Middle, and Late periods would work for archaeologists across Canada, since many researchers have already adopted them or are in the process of doing so.

Of course, our next step in working towards reconciliation is to talk with local Indigenous groups to make sure that these terms are appropriate for representing their ancestors and ancient sites in a given area (I have discussed this with many Indigenous people). Also, it may be possible to work together and create regional, locally appropriate cultural-historical units (in Indigenous languages) that can be developed between descendent groups and archaeologists.

REFERENCES

- Adovasio, J.M., and Kurt M. Carr
2009 *Shades of Gray: The Paleoindian-Early Archaic “Transition” in the Northeast*. In *Sourcebook of Paleolithic Transitions: Methods, Theories, and Interpretations*, edited by Marta Camps and Parth R. Chauhan, pp. 503-525. Springer Science + Business Media, New York.
- Arzigian, Constance
2008 Minnesota Statewide Multiple Property Documentation Form for the Woodland Tradition: Final. Mn/DOT Agreement No. 89964, MVAC Report NO. 735, Mississippi Valley Archaeological Center at the University of Wisconsin - La Crosse, Wisconsin. Report submitted to the Minnesota Department of Transportation.
- Bonnichson, Robson, Bradley T. Lepper, Dennis Stanford, and Michael R. Waters (editors)
2006 *Paleoamerican Origins: Beyond Clovis*. Centre for the Study of the First Americans, Department of Anthropology, Texas A&M University Press, College Station, Texas.
- Carlson, Roy
1979 The Early Period on the Central Coast of British Columbia. *Canadian Journal of Archaeology* 3:211-228.
- Collins
2019 *Collins English Dictionary*. HarperCollins, Glasgow. Online document, <https://www.collinsdictionary.com/>, accessed November 16, 2019.
- Griffin, James B.
1946 Cultural Change and Continuity in Eastern United States Archaeology. In *Man in Northeastern North America*, edited by Frederick Johnson, pp. 37-95. Papers of the Robert S. Peabody Foundation for Archaeology, Vol. 3, Andover.
- Korejbo, Alan John
2011 An Archaeological Survey in the Clearwater River Provincial Park, Saskatchewan; Insights into the Archaeology of the Boreal Forest of Northwestern Saskatchewan. Unpublished Masters thesis, Department of Archaeology and Anthropology, University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon.
- Mantey, Jacquelynn, and Leo Pettipas
1996 An Overview of Western Algonkian Ceramic Traditions, with Special Reference to Manitoba. *Manitoba Archaeological Journal* 6(2):1-65.
- Playford, Tomasín
2015 An Examination of Species Diversity and Bison Processing Intensity Contextualized within an Aboriginal Seasonality Framework for Late Precontact Sites on the Canadian Northeastern Plains. Unpublished PhD dissertation, Natural Resources Institute, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg.
- Taylor-Hollings, Jill
2017 People Lived There a Long Time Ago: Archaeology, Ethnohistory, and Traditional Use of the Miskweyaabiziibee (Bloodvein

River) in Northwestern Ontario". Unpublished PhD thesis, Department of Anthropology, University of Alberta, Edmonton.

Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada

2015 Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada: Calls to Action. Winnipeg, Manitoba.

United Nations

2008 United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. United Nations.

Wiley, Gordon R., and Philip Phillips

1958 *Method and Theory in American Archaeology*. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Wright, J.V.

1972 *The Shield Archaic*. Bulletin No. 206, National Museum of Man, Ottawa.

1981 Prehistory of the Canadian Shield. In Subarctic, edited by June Helm, pp. 86-96. *Handbook of North American Indians*, Vol. 6, William C. Sturtevant general editor, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

1995 *A History of the Native People of Canada. Volume I (10,000 to 1,000 B.C.)*. Mercury Series, Archaeological Survey of Canada, Paper 152, Ottawa.

1999 *A History of the Native People of Canada. Volume II (1,000 B.C. to A.D. 500)*. Mercury Series, Archaeological Survey of Canada, Paper 152, Ottawa.

HAMILTON TO HOST 2020 OAS SYMPOSIUM

The Hamilton Chapter is proud to announce the 2020 OAS Symposium: Archaeologies of Resilience, taking place October 23rd to 25th at the Lincoln Alexander Centre in downtown

Hamilton. We will be exploring cross-cultural and intergenerational themes of resilience and resistance, and will be putting out an open call for sessions and papers in January of 2020.



ONTARIO ARCHAEOLOGICAL SOCIETY SYMPOSIUM 2019 SILENT AUCTION



Once again, our Annual Symposium Silent Auction was a resounding success and raised just over \$3,000. The first Silent Auction was held in 2008 at the symposium hosted by the Toronto Chapter and the Toronto & Region Conservation Authority's Archaeology Unit, at Black Creek Pioneer Village in Vaughan. Twelve years later, the auction continues to be a popular event. The generosity of our donors and bidders makes it worthwhile, despite the incredible amount of organization and labour required.

Thank you to the following Silent Auction volunteers who helped us in so many ways, including loading/unloading, unpacking, and assembling 106 (!)

donated items: Brian and Garnet Clarence, Sam MacLeod, Eric Beales, Janice Teichroeb, and Cassandra McMahon. Thank you, Sam, Eric, Janice, Tyla Beke, and Charvi Gupta for helping us pack up and contact winning bidders!

Among the items donated this year, were some incredible baskets (and one pail!) assembled by the OAS Grand River, Hamilton, Huronia, Ottawa, Peterborough, and Toronto Chapters. These one-of-a-kind creations were filled with items unique to their part of the province and/or Chapter. Thank you, Chapters, for continuing to support this great concept (the brainchild of Sheryl Smith in 2013)! We extend a very special note of appreciation to the Peterborough Chapter for their 14 baskets and two publications! We also urge you to consider a donation to the 2020 Silent Auction which the Hamilton Chapter will be organizing.

Christine Caroppo and Ellen Blaubergs, 2019 Silent Auction Coordinators

The generosity of the following OAS members and Chapters, good friends and family, businesses, craftspeople, not-for-profit organizations, and publishers is greatly appreciated:

- **AMS Laboratory, A.E. Lalonde**
- **Anonymous Donors – 4**
- **Matthew Beaudoin**
- **Balzac's Coffee Roasters, Ancaster**
- **Ellen & John Blaubergs**
- **Bone Clones, Inc., Chatsworth, California**
- **Marilyn Bolton**
- **Canadian Museum of History, Gatineau**
- **Chilly Moose Ltd., Schomberg**
- **Christine Caroppo**
- **Dr. Kate Cooper, Royal Ontario Museum**
- **Council for Northeast Historical Archaeology**
- **Garnet Clarence**
- **Louise Crawford**
- **Peter Davis**
- **Friends of The OPP Museum, Orillia**
- **OAS Grand River**

- **Chapter/Chris Dalton**
- **Neil Gray**
- **OAS Hamilton Chapter**
- **Sarah Hazell**
- **Hermit Woodworking, Ottawa**
- **OAS Huronia Chapter, Midland**
- **Chris Johnstone**
- **Kawartha Country Wines**
- **Fran Keery**
- **Kendra Kowolik**

- **Tim Laurin**
- **Looking Glass Adventures, Toronto**
- **Holly Martelle**
- **Museum of Ontario Archaeology, London**
- **George Muskats, Estate of**
- **OAS Ottawa Chapter**
- **OAS Peterborough Chapter**
- **Shari Prowse**
- **Publican House Brewery, Peterborough**

- **Karin Sotirakos**
- **Starbucks – c/o Amy Fox**
- **Janice Teichroeb**
- **Tesma (Division of Magna)**
- **Kristin Thor**
- **Total Fine Arts**
- **OAS Toronto Chapter**
- **Debbie Turbide**
- **Irene Verner**
- **Edda Whitten**



UPDATE ON THE 2019-2024 STRATEGIC PLAN

At regular intervals the OAS, like many other organizations, identifies key priorities for the organization and sets these out in a strategic plan. This guides the work of the board of directors, our employees, and our volunteers. The most recent strategic plan was presented at the 2018 ABM. The plan as it was presented may be found on our website. Below is a summary of the progress that we have made towards achieving the goals set out in the original plan. This was presented at the 2019 ABM.

ITEMS THAT HAVE BEEN ACCOMPLISHED:

Public Outreach

Making our *Arch Notes* newsletter available electronically at no cost

Reconciliation

Having a standing program for Field Liaison Representative (FLR) training and a roster of trainers

Fundraise for materials to support these training sessions

Leadership in the practice of archaeology

Developing a standing space within the symposium for skill development workshops for archaeologists, particularly field technicians

Service to members and other archaeologists

Reaching a threshold of a minimum of 10% of symposium presentations being from student researchers

Investigating indexing of *Ontario Archaeology* (OA) through JSTOR (JSTOR not interested at this time)

Reducing the number of issues of *Arch Notes* from six to four, while focussing on providing more in-depth content

Ensuring that temporary positions (Student Employment Program) provide archaeological experience to students and align with our strategic plan, and that opportunities are provided to students from across the province.

Improved internal management

Establishing two new liaison positions who will communicate with the Director of Membership Recruitment: one student liaison

and one field technician liaison

Establishing a standard response to address sale of artifacts by Kijiji, eBay and various auction houses

Provide space at the symposium to facilitate the exchange of ideas between chapters, so that chapters may learn about successful strategies from other chapters

Re-examine awards categories and criteria to ensure that there are potential awards for deserving people.

ITEMS THAT WE ARE ACTIVELY WORKING ON:

Public Outreach

Having a visible presence at public heritage events around the province

Developing an Archaeology Month program with 10 events highlighted in a month once per year

Having a mobile-friendly web page

Providing better support to chapters for their public events (brochures ready for printing)

Reconciliation

Examining all our policies and procedures to ensure that they are consistent with our Statement of Ethical Principles and having made necessary changes

Developing a subcommittee of the Reconciliation, Restitution and Reclamation Committee (below) to examine the current use of archaeological terminology and how this could be changed

Developing protocols for what happens when members do not abide by the Statement of Ethical Principles

Facilitating development of lasting relationships between First Nations and archaeologists and chapters that are locally based

Developing a reconciliation space on our web page that details reconciliation projects such as Field Liaison Representative (FLR) training and 'Mush Hole' type work and provides opportunities for involvement

Leadership in the practice of archaeology

Providing feedback to the provincial government with respect to the Standards and Guidelines through a series of white papers developed by subcommittees of the OAS

Service to members and other ar-

chaeologists

Offering a 'Green' subscription to *OA*

Revising the style guide for *OA* and publishing the updated version on the webpage

Improved internal management

Reducing the number of face-to-face board meetings from six per year to four per year, better allowing for regional representation and better use of Directors' time

Examining our financial expenditures and regularizing them, being mindful of the fact that we are a volunteer organization

Undertaking an operations study to determine if there is overlap in practices and streamlining practices

Establishing standard responses to agencies looking for input from the OAS on matters pertaining to development

Establish an improved system for submission of necessary paperwork from chapters (MOU, financial statements) that works for both the office and the chapters

Establishing, supporting and defining terms of reference for the following standing committees that will report to specific directors and informing the membership of these committees through social media and *Arch Notes*:

- Fundraising committee
- Grant writing committee
- Web committee à Public outreach committee
- Awards evaluation committee
- Reconciliation, Reclamation, Restitution à Informally constituted
- Human resources
- Best Practices – Chapter services (with membership from the professional chapter).

ITEMS THAT ARE ON THE SLATE FOR THE LATER YEARS OF THIS PLAN:

Reconciliation

Examining the Ontario Heritage Act for areas that need to be addressed in order to be consistent with UNDRIP and the TRC and lobbying the Ontario government to make these changes (maybe together with the Ontario Historical Society and other PHOs?)

Leadership in the practice of archaeology

Launching and funding a 'project of the

year' that supports increasing archaeological knowledge through analysis of existing collections, preferably to address a question of interest to Indigenous/descendant communities, possibly carried out in conjunction with students and or chapters

Improved internal management

Devising better ways to use our volunteer base (shift from efforts to find speakers for many, poorly attended talks, to service on committees and presence at public events? Encourage partnerships between chapters and universities to expand the number of talks)

Eliminating the structural deficit through expenditure reduction and/or increased revenue

Establishing a team of people (and resources to support them) who can respond

to requests for planners for presentations about protection of archaeological heritage.

ITEMS THAT WE AIMED TO ACCOMPLISH BY THIS TIME BUT HAVE NOT YET DONE:

Public Outreach

Coordinating with other Provincial Heritage Organizations and heritage organizations such as Save Ontario Shipwrecks, the Ontario Marine Heritage Committee, and Canadian Association of Heritage Professionals so that we are present at their events and we can work towards a coordinated unified voice for heritage preservation in Ontario

Reconciliation

Having formal alliances with Provincial and Territorial Organizations (PTOs) and independent First Nations

Leadership in the practice of archae-

ology

Establishing a professional chapter of the OAS with clearly articulated, measurable levels of archaeological practice (e.g., aiming at surpassing guidelines, not just making it over the standards threshold)

Service to members and other archaeologists

Increasing our membership base within the student and field technician sector through initiatives that are appealing to these groups

Career development pages on the web

Theme content in Arch Notes

Publishing theme issues in *Arch Notes* that deal with the practice of archaeology in the province (e.g. Environmentally sustainable archaeological field practice, Technology in the field, etc.).



THANKS TO EVERYONE WHO HELPED MAKE THE 2019 TORONTO SYMPOSIUM SUCH A SUCCESS



A number of companies, institutions and individuals contributed to the success of the 2019 Toronto Symposium.

The Symposium Organizing Committee:

Chair: Dena Doroszenko

Program Chair: Katherine Patton

Finance: Henry Van Lieshout, Sam MacLeod

Volunteer Coordinator: Amy Fox

Toronto Chapter Liaison: Carole Stimmell

Silent Auction Coordinator: Ellen Blaubergs

Vendor Fair Coordinator: Christine Caroppo

Indigenous Liaison: Janice Teichroeb

Photo Contest Coordinator: Neil Gray

Sponsors and Partners:

Lalonde AMS

Parslow Heritage Consulting Inc.

Past Recovery Archaeological Services Inc.

Scarlett Janusas Archaeology Inc.

Timmins Martelle Heritage Consultants

Fisher Archaeological Consulting

Thomas Arnold and Associates

Historic Horizon Inc.

Regal Tent Productions

Archaeological Services Inc.

Timmins Martelle Heritage Consultants

Archaeology Centre, University of Toronto

Paterson Group

Golder Associates Inc.

LiUNA

Ontario Black History Society

University of Toronto Archaeology Centre

Sheryl Smith, Debbie Steiss, Dena

Doroszenko

and, of course, all the students and members who volunteered their time and energy to make sure that everyone who attended had a great experience. Thank you all.

OAS AWARD WINNERS 2019

This year the OAS once again honoured a number of people who have contributed to the development of our organization and the discipline of archaeology in the province.

The 2019 OAS symposium featured a number of excellent student papers and posters, and the selection committee was hard pressed to select one winner of the student paper. That said, we would like to congratulate the winner of the Student Paper Prize, **Tiziana Gallo**, for her paper 'Ground Stone Celts of Ancestral and Historic Wendake'. Tiziana wins a year's free membership to the Society.

Christine Caroppo, former two-time president of the OAS (1987-1991 and 2002-2005) and an executive member of the Toronto chapter, was presented with the *Charles and Ella Garrad Award for Outstanding Service*. Through the years, Christine has shown incredible dedication to the OAS and its values. This year we



Christine Caroppo received her Charles and Ella Garrad Award for Outstanding Service from Dr. Mima Kapches and OAS President Alicia Hawkins



A new award was introduced this year. The Helen Devereux Award for Excellence in Archaeological Mentorship first recipient is Dean Knight. The award was presented by former OAS President Paul Racher and current OAS President Alicia Hawkins

were also lucky to have her as one of the organizers of the successful symposium silent auction.

The OAS launched a new award this year, and **Dr. Dean Knight** was its inaugural winner: *The Helen Devereux Award for Excellence in Archaeological Mentorship*. While Dean is known for his work at the Ball site, his Ph.D. was on the archaeology of the Montreal River, so it seems fitting that he should be the first winner of an award named after an archaeologist who spent much of her career in northern Ontario. One of the most touching moments at the award ceremony was seeing Dean surrounded by his former students.

The Kenyon awards have recently been reworked and we have once again combined these into one award, the *Ian and Tim Kenyon Award*. This award is presented to an archaeologist "who has made an exceptional contribution to the development of historical archaeology in Ontario." It felt particularly fitting that the first person to be presented this award in its new form was one of Ian Kenyon's former colleagues, **Dena Doroszenko**.



The newly revamped, Ian and Tim Kenyon Award, is awarded to archaeologist who has made a significant contribution to historic archaeology in Ontario. Dena Doroszenko certainly fits that bill. Presenting the award is Joanne Lea and OAS President Alicia Hawkins.

Dr. Mima Kapches was recognized for her 50 years of membership in the OAS. Presenting the award is OAS President Alicia Hawkins and OAS Director Dana Millson





Dr. Peter Ramsden was awarded the J.V. Wright Lifetime Achievement Award. It is presented to a professional archaeologist whose work has been of the highest standard. Congratulating him are OAS President Alicia Hawkins and Bruce Jamieson.

Dena has served as an incredibly dedicated advocate for historical archaeology and as a mentor for many of the people who now practice historical archaeology in the province.

The *J.V. Wright Lifetime Achievement Award* is presented to a professional archaeologist whose work has been of the highest standard. It was no surprise that this award should go to **Dr. Peter Ramsden**. Peter Ramsden, now retired from McMaster University, has contributed significantly to Ontario Iroquoian archaeology and to the archaeology of the Archaic, and continues to do so. In addition to his own publications, through Copetown Press he has made available the work of a number of his former students and colleagues. And if we weren't already choked up by seeing Dean with his students, the vision of former grad student office mates Dean and Peter arm-in-arm at the podium had us all a bit teary. Congratulations, Dr. Ramsden!

The OAS would like to thank all the people who contributed to this important annual ritual by collecting and submitting nominations. As a volunteer organization, we recognize the importance of individual contributions that members have made and continue to make to promoting ethical archaeology in Ontario.



Tiziana Gallo was the winner of the student paper competition.



The ONTARIO ARCHAEOLOGICAL SOCIETY Inc.

Grand River

chapter

President: Chris Dalton
Vice President: Chris Watts
Treasurer: Bonnie Glencross
Secretary: TBA
Meetings: 2nd Tuesday of each month Sept.-April
Psychology, Anthropology, Sociology building (PAS) 1241
(First Floor), University of Waterloo (South Campus)
Website: <https://sites.google.com/site/grandriveroas/home>

Hamilton

chapter

President: Emily Anson
Vice President: Jacqueline Fisher
Treasurer/Membership: Ruth Macdougall
Events Co-ordinator: TBA
E-mail: oashamiltonOAS@gmail.com
Web: <http://hamilton.ontarioarchaeology.org>
Mail: c/o Dr. Gary Warrick, Laurier Brantford,
73 George St. Brantford, ON N3T 2Y3
Phone: (866) 243-7028
Meetings: 3rd Thursday of the month, 7:30, Sept. to
May, Fieldcote Museum, 64 Sulphur Springs
Road, Ancaster
Membership: Individual \$11, Family \$18

Hurononia

chapter

President: John Raynor
Vice President: Dayle Elder
Secretary: Peter Davis
Treasurer: Jo-Ann Knicely
Member-at-Large: Jim Stuart
Meetings: Year Round at the Midland North Sports
and Recreation Centre
Membership: Individual \$15, Family \$18
Student \$10

London

chapter

President: Chris Ellis
Vice President: Darcy Fallon
Treasurer: Jim Keron
Secretary: Nicole Aszalos
Directors: Nancy Van Sas, Chris Watts, Shari Prowse
and Larry Nielsen
KEWA Editors: Christine Dodd,
Chris Ellis & Chris Watts
Web: www.ssc.uwo.ca/assoc/oas
Email: oaslondonchapter@gmail.com
Mail: Museum of Ontario Archaeology, 1600
Attawandaron Rd., London, ON N6G 3M6
Phone: (519) 473-1360 Fax (519) 473-1363
Meetings: 7:30 pm on 2nd Thursday of the month
except May–August; at MOA
Membership: Individual/Family \$18, Student,
\$15, Institutional \$21

Ottawa

chapter

President: André Miller
Vice President: Stacey Girling-Christie
Secretary: Karen Lochhead

Treasurer: Bill MacLennan
Directors at large: Bradley Drouin, Elizabeth
Imrie, Glenna Roberts, Sarah Taylor, Phil Trotter,
Mel Massey & Ben Mortimer
Ottawa Archaeologist Editor: Marian Clark
Web master: Yvon Riendeau
Peggy Armstrong Public Archaeology Award:
Lois King
Web: www.ottawaoas.ca
Email address: ottawaoas@gmail.com
Mail: PO Box 4939, Station E,
Ottawa ON K1S 5J1
Meetings: Every 2nd Thursday of the month
from Sept. to May; usually at Routhier
Community Centre, 172 Guigues Street,
Ottawa (in the Byward Market)
Membership: Individual \$20, Family \$25,
Student \$12

Peterborough

chapter

President: Sheryl Smith
Treasurer: Deb Mohr
Vice-President: Tom Mohr
Sec: Dirk Verhulst
Directors: Kate Dougherty, Julie Kapyrka, Jolyana
Saule and Morgan Tamplin.
Meetings: the fourth Tuesday of each month,
Membership: Individual \$12, Family \$15,
Student \$8
Strata Editor: Dirk Verhulst
Web: peterborough.ontarioarchaeology.org
Facebook: Peterborough Chapter Ontario
Archaeological Society

Thunder Bay

chapter

President: Clarence Surette
Vice-President: Dave Norris
Secretary/Treasurer: Tasha Hodgson
Director: Jill Taylor-Hollings
Newsletter Editor (Wanikan): Clarence Surette, Jill
Taylor-Hollings, and Scott Hamilton
Web Design/Photography: Chris McEvoy
E-mail: clarence.surette@lakeheadu.ca
<http://anthropology.lakeheadu.ca/?display=page&pageid=80>
Meetings: 7 pm on the last Friday of the month
in Room BB0017, Braun Building, Lakehead
University
Membership: \$5

Toronto

chapter

President: Carole Stimmell
Past President: Mima Kapches
Vice President: Christine Caroppo
Treasurer: Sam MacLoed
Secretary: Neil Gray
PROFILE Editor: Carole Stimmell
Web: <http://toronto.ontarioarchaeology.org>
Email: TorontoArchaeology@gmail.com
Meetings: 7:30 pm on the 3rd Wednesday

of the month, except June–August
in U of T Anthropology Building,
Room 246, 19 Russell St.
Membership: Individual \$12, Family \$14

Windsor

chapter

President: Amanda Black
Vice President: Rosemarie Denunzio
Secretary: Barbara Johnson
Treasurer: Michael McMaster
Student Outreach: Zach Hamm
Website/Newsletter Editor: Katherine Graham
Web: <http://sites.google.com/site/windsoroas>
Contact: oaswindsor@gmail.com
Membership: Individual \$15, Family \$20,
Students \$5

MEMBERSHIP

	Without OA / With OA
Individual	45 (65)* / 57 (77)*
Family	52 (72) / 64 (84)
Student	25 (45) / 34 (54)
Institutional	75 (includes OA)
Life	800 (includes OA)

* Effective 2017, the print version of *Arch Notes* will cost \$20 per year to mail. Those receiving the email version of *Arch Notes* pay the lower fee.

ARCHNOTES SUBMISSIONS

Contributor Deadlines:
February 15
May 15
August 15
November 15
Send Articles to:
aneditor@ontarioarchaeology.org
or
Arch Notes editor
PO Box 62066
Victoria Terrace Post Office
Toronto, Ontario M4A 2W1