Excavation underway at Lewis site — Sarah Jagelewski, Matt Perlanski and Loren Scott excavating stone foundation. Photography courtesy TRCA.
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President’s message

In mid-September I attended, along with about 25 others, a meeting in Kingston, organized by the Ministry of Culture. It was the Eastern Archaeology Regional Roundtable. By now, most licensed archaeologists in Ontario will have participated in similar regional discussion groups across the province, either in person or via teleconference. As an event, it will undoubtedly be repeated, and most in attendance seemed to agree that the opportunity of meeting and exchanging information was worthwhile.

For the Ministry and Neil Downs, in particular, this was an important chance to meet with the people in the trenches so to speak. Neil is new to archaeology and to the Culture Programs Unit that he manages (he joined them in 2007). He began the evening’s session by updating participants on the goings-on within the unit: issues surrounding staffing, the backlog of unreviewed reports, the report review process, Aboriginal engagement, the Draft Standards and Guidelines question, terms and conditions, PIF procedures, collections management issues and emergency reviews.

From his presentation, it is clear that he and his staff face some fairly daunting challenges, not the least of which is to clear the backlog of post-2005 reports. This presentation was followed by a lively and at times heated discussion of issues of interest to those present. A lot of debate surrounded the ways in which consultants reports are reviewed by the Ministry.

An interesting point to emerge was the way that the Ministry’s role in the archaeological process has undergone metamorphosis and continues to do so. The Ministry issues archaeological licences under the Ontario Heritage Act, a piece of legislation for which it is responsible. The Ministry reviews the reports in order to ensure that all the pieces are there: proper presentation, elements of content, etc. If they pass muster, then the reports are added to ‘the Register’: an ever-expanding collection of archaeological reports that can be consulted by the public (see section 65 or Part VI of the Ontario Heritage Act).

Much was made of this goal of adding reports to this register. But surprisingly, the Ministry no longer evaluates the intellectual content of the reports per se: ”we are not an approval agency.” That all-important responsibility is now apparently assumed by others, such as municipalities for example. And from what we heard at that meeting, and from what we hear from others elsewhere in Ontario, those approval agencies set the bar for heritage conservation in their part of Ontario. If a municipality has no ability (beware of boiler plates!). Less surprising, the Ministry no longer exercises from within that branch of the GTA, consultants are held to the new, but unapproved, Draft Standards and Guidelines, while elsewhere in the province, the old, now long-in-the-tooth Archaeological Assessment Technical Guidelines (1993) continue to be used.

Further, the approval agencies determine significance and standards. This is why, apparently, in the GTA, consultants are held to the new, but unapproved, Draft Standards and Guidelines, while elsewhere in the province, the old, now long-in-the-tooth Archaeological Assessment Technical Guidelines (1993) continue to be used.

It is an odd situation where there are no longer uniform yardsticks for assessing whether work has been properly done. Moreover, the ability of municipal planners to assess not only the form of consultants’ reports, but the intellectual contents of these, remains to be developed. This should be a cause for serious concern by OAS members. A checklist approach to evaluating the work of a consultant only reflects on the consultant’s report structuring ability (beware of boiler plates!). Less easily assessed by someone unfamiliar with archaeological ‘science’ is the logic behind the assessments or determinations of things like significance, potential and ultimately, the soundness of the recommendations which can either save a heritage site through mitigation or conservation, or consign it to the back of a dump truck and oblivion in a landfill or under a parking lot. Such expertise, it would seem to me, should be found within the Ministry of Culture and it should be exercised from within that branch of government. At present, this no longer seems to be the case. But I stand to be corrected.

This whole situation was echoed lately in Eastern Ontario, near the town of St. Isidore. Like elsewhere, the municipality there is anxious to attract new industries and see employment created within their region. One proposal would see the presumed location of an early XIXth century church and associated graveyard turned into one such new center of much needed jobs.

In theory, this should not be an issue. Archaeological assessment and mitigation should clear it, one way or another. It seems though, that the necessity of undertaking this additional expense is not broadly shared by local planners. Some local citizens are concerned that possible burials that now lie unmarked, will be disturbed without proper efforts taken to either protect them or move them. Moreover, the reception these citizens have received about their concerns have been less than encouraging. It has not been pleasant and it’s not over, but I naively thought the Heritage Act and the Cemeteries Act were clear on such matters, but local officials may not share that understanding or awareness.

As of this writing, a Stage 1 study has been requested. This is a good sign. Everyone should adopt a wait and see position before anything else is done. Certainly, many will be interested in the findings and recommendations.
New award honours Niagara archaeologist

Jon Jouppien has won his share of heritage awards. Now, he has an award named in his honour. Heritage Niagara Inc. recently created the J. K. Jouppien Award for built heritage in honour of the St. Catharines archaeologist.

“I was taken aback, but pleased,” said Jouppien, who learned of the award at a dinner held by the non-profit heritage group in June. “I’ve worked in this field for over 30 years. It’s nice to know my name will be remembered in that regard.”

The award will be presented to an individual or group that makes an “exemplary effort” to restore a heritage building, said Heritage Niagara chairwoman Christel Haeck. “It’s the sort of thing Jon has done for a long time as a heritage consultant,” she said. “But he’s also given of his time quite unselfishly to various groups trying to do heritage restorations. He deserves the credit.”

Jouppien has worked inside and outside the peninsula as a heritage consultant and archaeologist, at Brock University, Fort George and Dundurn Castle in Hamilton. Haeck said he’s known for his meticulous restoration work, including on old Mennonite homes in Jordan and his own heritage home, the Brown-Jouppien House. The Loyalist Georgian house on Pelham Road was built in 1810 and is thought to be one of the earliest homes in the area.

Jouppien was recently diagnosed with terminal cancer. His illness hasn’t slowed him down, however. He hopes to begin a dig in Lakeside Park later this summer to unearth the entrance to the first Welland Canal. The first J. K. Jouppien Award will be awarded next June.

Hamilton Chapter digs in at Reimer Site

Contributed by B. Bandow

In June of this year, Hamilton Chapter Members descended on the Reimer Site near Long Point, Ontario. The Reimer Site (AdHc-3) is a multi-component site discovered by Peter Ramsden in 1969. Since that time, no other work has been conducted on the site. The Hamilton Chapter has signed a Land Use Agreement with Ducks Unlimited Inc. to conduct long-term non-intrusive archaeological survey of the property. This 10-year study will explore the site’s history and nomenclature.

The opportunity to work on a ‘protected’ property, one not threatened with development, affords the Hamilton Chapter the opportunity to learn how much information can be obtained from survey alone. The project will track artifact migration due to seasonal ploughing. It will also use various geophysical survey methods at different resolutions to learn more about the subsurface features of the site. The 10-year duration of the project will make the Reimer Archaeological Survey Project one of the longest running projects of its kind.

Four members of the Hamilton Chapter attended the first visit. Participants relocated the site using GPS and pedestrian survey (Fig. 1). Two major artifact clusters were located and a magnetic datum, containing a metal identification plate, was installed well below the plough zone (Fig. 2). Some artifacts were located, recorded, labeled and returned to their findspot locations to be reprocessed should they be relocated in future surveys.

One point was recovered from cluster 2. In good Tom Arnold tradition, a beer was rewarded to the lucky finder (Fig. 3)! Congratulations to Jean Rosenfeld, “a newbie”, for the first projectile point of the survey.
Toronto Chapter visits the Lewis Site

By Sylvia Teaves

This past summer, members of the Toronto Chapter took part in a Public Archaeology Day organized by the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority. The event took place at the Lewis Site on the Bruce’s Mill Conservation Area (see also the article on the Lewis site by A. Pradzynski). This early 18th century dwelling has been well-known for some time, but recent excavations uncovered a previously unknown pottery kiln.

In the photograph, Toronto Chapter members help excavate a large pit next to the kiln. The pit contained large sherds of pottery that had broken during the firing process.

INTERESTED IN BECOMING THE OAS WEB EDITOR?

For several years now, under the guidance of several individuals including Nick Adams and Jean-Luc Pilon, the OAS has had a presence on the World Wide Web. While many of us remember the advent of the Web and all the hype about its potential, more and more of our members grew up using it. For them it is second nature. The expectations of both of these groups are markedly different, although there is significant overlap.

The OAS website is clearly a means of communication that will come to occupy more and more importance for the Society. It is now time that the OAS website take on a new look and contain new components that better reflect the more dynamic and diverse role it needs to assume for the Society.

The OAS Board of Directors recognizes the significance of the website and as such the person who will take over its destiny will be, like the editors of our newsletter Arch Notes and our peer-reviewed journal OA, appointed by the board and called upon to participate at the board table as the OAS Web Editor.

The Board of Directors is now searching for an individual who might be interested in the challenges that are presented by the revamping the OAS website.

Knowledge of the archaeology of Ontario and of the OAS is certainly required, along with website creation and maintenance skills. Good language skills in English and French are important. This is much more than a technical responsibility, as determining and organizing content for the OAS website, under the guidance of the Board of Directors, will form the perception that people will make of the OAS.

Like the other OAS editor positions, there is no remuneration for the OAS Web Editor. If you are interested, please send a letter of interest and an outline of your web experience to:

Jean-Luc Pilon
President
OAS
president@ontarioarchaeology.on.ca
Excavations at the Lewis Site

by Aleksandra Pradzynski

In the summer and fall of 2007, archaeologists from the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA) and students from the Boyd Archaeological Field School excavated a homestead dating from the 1800s. The multi-component Lewis site (AlGu-365) is located in the Bruce’s Mill Conservation Area near Stouffville Road in Whitchurch-Stouffville.

Thomas Lewis and his family, Pennsylvania Dutch settlers, were the longest-standing owners of this property. A small family-operated pottery business was located there. A 19th century photograph taken along Stouffville Road depicts several buildings (Figure 1). It is likely the main house with the attached structure shown in the photograph was the location of 2007 investigations.

The excavation revealed a number of features of archaeological interest. The most significant feature was the kiln, which was rectangular in shape, its foundation was made of fieldstones and the entire floor was covered with a red-fired soil (Figure 2).

A hole at the northeast end of the feature, possibly the exit or chimney, was approximately 6-7 metres deep. Significant amounts of fill containing brick rubble, fired clay pots and kiln wedges were excavated from the interior and exterior of the kiln.

During the period from ca. 1796 to 1974 more than 150 potteries operated in Ontario (Newlands, 1979). The period between 1846 and 1880 saw the highest development and the largest increase in the number of potteries.

Unfortunately, no intact kiln has been preserved and we must rely on archaeological excavations and historical research to provide information about construction techniques.

The settlement pattern also comprises a stone-lined well (Figure 3), a rectangular stone foundation of undetermined function, and the waster dump (Figure 4). The dump was adjacent to the kiln and contained the majority of the redware found on the site. All the misfired vessels were thrown here, likely out of a back door or against a wall.

In addition, the excavation resulted in the recovery of several coins, children’s toys, flint fire starters, faunal fragments and all kinds of ceramics and bottles.

Aboriginal artifacts include a Hi-Lo Point, an Archaic Point and a triangular Iroquoian Point. Several
flakes were located throughout the site. These artifacts represent a wide range of dates for the Aboriginal component.

The archaeological work on the site generated considerable local interest and attention of the media. The results of 2007 investigation have shown the complexity of the Lewis site, and although a lot of work has been done, much information still remains in the ground.
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Figure 3: The stone-lined well. Photograph courtesy TRCA.

Figure 4: Broken vessel fragments in the waster dump. Photograph courtesy TRCA.
One of the largest urban archaeological sites in Canada, Fort York National Historic Site in downtown Toronto, is receiving some welcome attention these days. Having survived more than two centuries, this 43-acre site will be revitalized over the next five years, as we approach the bicentennial of the War of 1812.

The City of Toronto, which owns and operates Fort York and Garrison Common, is leading the effort to raise the profile of this national historic site and park at the heart of the city. A new short history and beautifully illustrated guide to Fort York, written by its leading scholar, tells this story in a lively way (Benn 2007). It complements the more thorough book-length presentation of the fort’s history and its role not only in the defence of the city but also as a prime mover in its economic and cultural development throughout the 1800s (Benn 1993).

The site contains Canada’s only authentic War-of-1812 fort, including its trace (defensive ground plan); seven original buildings and defensive earthworks dating to this period; part of an 1813 battlefield; two military burying grounds containing the graves of soldiers and their families who died between 1793 and 1911; and archaeological remains associated with the military occupation and use of the site between its founding during the frontier crises of the 1790s and the Great War in the early twentieth century.

There are also remains associated with the Grand Trunk Railway, which ran along the south edge of the fort and dates to the 1850s (Parks Canada 2004) (Figure 1). The plan of revitalization includes a new visitor centre, restoration of existing historic buildings and landscape, and expansion of interpretation and programming. At the same time, the City of Toronto has adopted a motion to support the nomination of Fort York for inscription in the UNESCO list of World Heritage Sites.

**Archaeology at Fort York**

The archaeology of the site is particularly interesting and complex. It has been examined over decades. These investigations include resistivity survey by Larry Pavlish (as part of the joint physics and archaeology course at the...
University of Toronto) and excavations conducted in the 1970s by David Newlands of the Royal Ontario Museum. They include many CRM interventions conducted by David Spittal and Catherine Webb who, working for the City of Toronto, are responsible for directing most of the excavation and analysis that has occurred since the 1970s (see Vaccarelli 1997 for a list of reports). Excavation has resulted in the recovery of about 300,000 items by the mid-1990s (Vaccarelli 1997:85). Investigations are continuing into features related to the fort, the harbour and the Grand Trunk Railway in advance of condominium development that is taking place around the edges of the National Historic Site area (Robertson and Stewart 2008, Stewart 2007).

Previous research based on excavations within the fort is highlighted in two publications. The evolution of the land surface during phases of construction and leveling since 1793 are documented in Vaccarelli (1997). The diversity of ceramic assemblages recovered from distinct strata is analysed in Gerrard (1993). There remains tremendous research potential in the existing records and collections from Fort York as well as in the ground, which can be explored by geophysical techniques as well as by excavation.

One surface feature with archaeological research potential is a former ‘crater’ just outside the fort’s south ramparts (Figure 2). It was made by an explosion that occurred towards the end of the battle that took place in front of the fort during the U.S. invasion of York on April 27, 1813.

This feature started as a ravine cut into the Lake Ontario shoreline. On the day of the battle, it contained a stone and timber powder magazine that held about 74 tons of iron shot and shell and over 300 kegs of powder (Malcomson 2008). The British army set a fuse to the magazine during their retreat. When it exploded, rock, timber and iron debris rained down within a radius of about 400 m, killing 39 U.S. soldiers and wounding 224 others. It is possible that many of the dead were buried in a mass grave close to, or within, the crater (Otto 2005).

The subsequent, slow filling-in of the crater and burial of the original glacis below the fort’s southern ramparts adds another dimension of archaeological significance.

Other known features include the sub-surface remains of pre-War of 1812 buildings, one of which was the Lieutenant-Governor’s residence and office (Government House), built in 1800 and destroyed during the attack in 1813. They also include 10 buildings from the 1813-15 period, during the period of the present fort’s construction by the Royal Engineers immediately following the attack (Figure 2). Two batteries in the mouth of the Garrison Creek ravine, just east of the fort, were also built at this time (Figure 2).

Earthworks ordered by Major General Isaac Brock in 1811 and rebuilt following the attack also survive. Military buildings added later in the nineteenth century have since been removed. (Some are visible as outlines on the ground during dry weather in the summer.) Original plan and elevation drawings for Government House (Arthur 1974:16) and many of the other 1813-15 buildings exist (The Friends of Fort York and Garrison Common 2005:Appendix B).

Together, the architectural, archaeological and landscape assets of the fort relating to the War of 1812 period constitute the

Figure 2: Plan of Fort York, as built in 1813-15, by Surveyor J.-B. Duberger of the Royal Engineers (1816). Seven original buildings survive: South Soldiers’ Barracks (1); North Soldiers’ Barracks (2); Officers’ Brick Barracks and Mess Establishment (3); Blockhouse No. 2 (4); Blockhouse No. 1 (5); Brick Magazine (6); and Stone Magazine (7). The Grand Magazine explosion crater is shown on the southern embankment, south of the Stone Magazine. Ravine batteries are shown next to the mouth of Garrison Creek just east of the Southeast Bastion. (National Archives of Canada, NMC 23139).
primary reasons (Level 1 resources) for designation as a national historic site (Parks Canada 2004).

Significance of the Fort in the Inter-Cultural History of the Region

The scope of archaeological research at Fort York extends, also, to evidence of First Nations use of this area prior to 1793 and to their involvement in the life of the fort afterwards.

John Norton, war chief of the Grand River Six Nations and a key British ally in the War of 1812, visited General Sheaffe at Government House during April 1813, two weeks before the battle there (Malcomson 2008:159). Allied Mississauga warriors who met the U.S. invasion force on the shore at Humber Bay during the opening of the battle probably left scant material evidence at the sites of today’s fort and Garrison Common, if they were ever there. More promising, perhaps, is the possibility of finding the site of the Indian Department forge somewhere on Garrison Common that was intended to serve the needs of Mississauga treaty Indians (Lizars 1974:108).

The history of Fort York, beginning in 1793, spans an important transition in the relationship between Aboriginal and European people in the lower Great Lakes. Before the transition, international relations were multi-sided and complex, involving tribes, villages, confederacies south of the Great Lakes as well as the United States, Britain and a consideration of French and Spanish interests (White 1991).

John Graves Simcoe, Lieutenant-Governor of Upper Canada, who founded the garrison and settlement at York, involved himself in the politics of the old Northwest in an attempt to strengthen the position of the upper province, which was militarily weak (MacLeod 1972). The cultural milieu during this period before the War of 1812 was equally complex. People from very different backgrounds were integrated within the villages of the lower Great Lakes, especially in old Northwest Territory of the United States – e.g., along the Maumee and Auglaize Rivers in Ohio (Tanner 1978).

International relations were greatly simplified with the defeat of native peoples during the War of 1812. After the war, the interests of tribes and confederacies were no longer part of the international political equation of the region and efforts were directed towards assimilation of Aboriginal people and,
south of the border, removal. Rivalry now existed solely between Great Britain and the United States. Fort York was crucially sited at the centre of transportation for the reinforcement of frontier regions around the upper province during periods of tension, such as the years following the 1837 Upper Canada Rebellion and the U.S. Civil War (Benn 1993, Dean 1993).

The period represented by extant architecture at Fort York (1813-1816), represents precisely the moment of transition between this earlier and later period. The year 1813 is, in fact, that of Tecumseh’s death and the collapse of the Western Confederacy of tribes. The archaeological remains of earlier buildings within (and possibly outside) the fort, and the Garrison Common itself, help to anchor the fort within the social and political context of the earlier (pre-War of 1812) period.

**The Fort’s Legacy and Value**

Fort York is a remarkable survival of three aspects of heritage: buildings, archaeological site and landscape. A wealth of information derives from this unique combination of resources.

For example, military defensive strategy during the latter part of the War of 1812, and afterwards, can be understood in the relative positioning of surviving buildings and their relationship to the lakeshore and other landscape elements (Benn 1995). Documentary and archaeological evidence of the fort’s history is also a rich source of information about the development of the city and its society throughout the 1800s.

The media sometimes likes to emphasize the incongruity and anachronistic quality of the fort in its downtown setting – “hemmed in by railway tracks and...overshadowed by the Gardiner Expressway,” as a recent newspaper editorial put it (“New Life for Old Fort” Toronto Star, Sept. 29, 2008). Highlighting this contrast makes for a more dramatic story, of course. But pointing out the “oddness” of “old” in the modern city can be interpreted as saying that the fort does not belong here any more.

In 1958, both planners and politicians in the Metropolitan Toronto level of government (which no longer exists) argued that the fort buildings should be removed from their site and relocated to the contemporary lakeshore to make way for the Gardiner Expressway. They argued that removal would enhance authenticity. The fort’s setting was no longer (in 1958) authentic, according to them, because the fort had become isolated from the lake over time (Figure 3); its role in protecting the harbour no longer appreciable (Benn 1993:157).

**Figure 4: Blockhouse Number One at the top of sloped earthworks – part of Fort York, looking east towards the centre of the city it once helped to defend. (Photo by Andrew Stewart 2008).**
Of course, they chose not to acknowledge the authenticity of the fort’s original setting and the survival of original shoreline as an embankment along the fort’s southern edge. This original setting still, today, includes about 41 acres of land and contains what we now recognize as one of Canada’s largest urban archaeological sites. If nothing else, it suggests the slipperiness of the definition of “authentic.”

In a larger sense, the contrast between “old” and “new” lends a dynamic quality to both the site and to the part of the city that surrounds it. The proximity of new and old is one of the most important features of the site. This proximity conveys historical meaning in the sense that the Town of York that the fort was built to protect has now grown up all around it (Figure 4). The town/city would not have attracted so much capital and development in the mid-nineteenth century, perhaps, if the fort had not provided a safe environment.

Fort York is a vital reminder that archaeological sites are hidden long-term assets, the value of which often remains invisible in the absence of associated built heritage. The authenticity of Fort York is recognized today as its chief asset – the original 1813 buildings in their original context. Would the City of Toronto be considering the possibility of UNESCO recognition – with economic spinoffs for tourism and promotion – had it moved the buildings in 1958?

This case suggests that the value of archaeological assets in the ground compounds with time and can be unlocked (even, dare I say, leveraged) by efforts made to interpret and provide (or protect) a physical and imaginative context for them.
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Island of the Great Spirit: the Legacy of Manitoulin

Island of the Great Spirit is a feature length HD historical documentary about Manitoulin Island history produced by the Ontario Visual Heritage Project. This is one of a series of local Ontario history videos produced with the assistance of the Trillium Foundation funding, including four different regional projects on the Canadian Shield.

The opening premiere of Island of the Great Spirit was held on Oct, 4, 2008 at the M’Chigeeng Complex on Manitoulin and was attended and enthusiastically enjoyed by a large local crowd. The making of this series is supported by the Ontario Museum Association, which provided photographic and other archival information. Many of the local population were used as period actors in the excellent historical re-enactments. They included many stories and historical high-points ranging from the ancient past (paleoindian flint-knapping) to life during the fur trade and logging and fishing era, as well as more recent events. The historical re-enactments and perspective was well-balanced, showing the First-Nation’s views, as well as those of the French, English and Jesuit missionaries. Historians, native elders, archaeologists, museum personnel, as well as the fishermen, and tourist operators were interviewed.

A wide selection of historical photos provided a fascinating window on the past centuries of life on Manitoulin island, the largest island on a fresh water body in the world.

The series is developed for educational purposes, to teach local history in the secondary schools, but also provides a valuable resource for the Ontario heritage community.

This series would be very useful for archaeologists to learn more about the historical era in different regions of Ontario, as well as highschool and post-secondary instructors in history, museum studies and archaeology.

Information is available at www.visualheritage.ca/manitoulin.

Reviewed by Dr. Pat Julig, Anthropology Dept. Laurentian University

The Dr. Laurence Pavlish JPA Fund

Many members of the OAS are aware that Dr. Laurence A. Pavlish passed away in the late summer of 2007 after a hard-fought battle with cancer. From a young age, Larry was fascinated by the study of history and geology, two interests which dominated his academic life as an archaeometrist. Since the late 1970s, Larry was the principal lecturer and coordinator for the Joint Physics and Archaeology (JPA) courses at the University of Toronto. Through these courses and research activities Larry mentored many students, who affectionately came to be known as ‘former JPAers’.

The success of his teaching and research lay in Larry’s strong grounding in the fields of physics/geology and anthropology.

Since 1986, Larry was a Research Associate and Fellow of the IsoTrace Laboratory, University of Toronto. He was an active researcher who published on dating (TL and AMS), prospection (resistivity, magnetic, EM, and GPR surveying), analysis (INAA), and authenticity. He was also involved in experimental archaeology, geoarchaeological reconnaissance, and heat treatment of ancient stone tools.

One of Larry’s greatest assets was his ability to bring together different scientific methodologies and interpretive frameworks to solve archaeological problems. This quality was best expressed in his copper research project, where he orchestrated the investigations of a diverse group of scientists specialising in INAA, electron microprobe studies, thin-section analysis, AMS-dating, and PGE studies. This research examined trace elements in copper artefacts and 14C-dated associated copper-salt-preserved organics. The work has substantially increased our awareness of the antiquity of the Archaic Period Old Copper Culture in eastern North America and shown that copper was in use and being heat-worked by 7000 BP. This research also developed methods to chemically distinguish European smelted and North America native copper artefacts.

Larry was well-known to many Ontario archaeologists. In addition to work overseas, Larry carried out geophysical survey at many important sites in Ontario including Fort York, Ste. Marie, Bead Hill, and Ossossané village. He was also involved in archaeological materials research on copper, glass, chert and pottery from Ontario and adjacent regions (Hancock, et al. 2007).

The Larry Pavlish memorial fund at U of T was established in 2007 and it is growing well. It is now earmarked for an annual award for the student who achieves the highest grade
The OAS board of directors is pleased to announce the appointment of Lorie Harris to the position of Executive Director of the OAS. She begins immediately. Happily, Lorie was able to attend the annual symposium and met many of our members at that time.

Lorie brings to the position a background in working with not-for-profits, including the Native Canadian Centre of Toronto. She holds a B.A. in Anthropology, with a specialist in archaeology, and is a graduate of the Auger site fieldschool, directed by M. Latta. Lorie has undertaken anthropological research in northern Canadian communities. She has extensive experience co-ordinating volunteers and services for members.

The office hours of the OAS will be Tuesday through Thursday, from 9 to 5. The office remains in its current location at 1444 Queen St. E., Suite 102, Toronto, ON. The mailing address is still PO Box 62066, Victoria Terrace Post Office, Toronto, ON M4A 2W1 or you can reach her at 416-406-5959 or email her at oasociety@bellnet.ca.
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Figure 1. Larry Pavlish about to begin a magnetometer survey of the Iroquoian village Emmerson Springs in 2004.
Reminiscences of Ivan Kocsis 1933 – 2008

by Mima Kapches, Senior Curator, Royal Ontario Museum

I first met Ivan in 1981 when the ROM was designing the artwork for its Ontario Archaeology Gallery (1984-2005). I drove out to Hamilton to consult with him on the artwork that I was responsible for.

Ivan was Hungarian and very opinionated, perhaps that comes with being Hungarian but I think it just came with being Ivan. We developed a good work rapport, his familiarity with native artifacts was essential in determining the details of a painting. I could tell him that I wanted a drawing to be placed in pre-contact Pickering Iroquoian culture and he could put in the right artifacts. It made working with him easy. But he also needed a fair bit of direction and could make some artistic errors, like drawing the scene of men fishing at wooden fish weirs, and the making the water mirror flat so that it looked like the men were fishing from a plate glass window that bisected them. But his work could be artistically sensitive and quite dramatic. When commissioning the artwork for my part of the gallery I wanted all seasons represented. I asked him to do a winter scene of an Iroquoian village with the sky a bright pink and the snow freshly fallen. This winter scene is one of the most popular images that he made for the ROM. His fall scene at Serpent Mounds is also dramatic. At my request he even boldly painted a pregnant Iroquoian woman in the fields, but this image was too avant-garde for the ROM and has never been used in the public.

The paintings that he did for the ROM are still important pieces of art that are used frequently in many publications of native history.

I approached Ivan at the CAA Meetings in Hamilton many years ago about doing illustrations for the OAS and framing them into a poster. Ivan did the artwork and was also instrumental in the design of the still popular Ontario Archaeology poster.

I had lost touch with Ivan over the last few years. I knew he had retired and hadn’t done any art work in many years due to failing eyesight. We talked a couple of months ago when he wanted to sell his last large triptych, he sent me photographs of this magnum opus, it’s a depiction of the Feast of the Dead at Ossossané.

The ROM didn’t purchase this as we could never display it. It is really quite a brilliant and dramatic piece.

My last conversation was a typical Ivan chat, we talked about those days long ago when I used to visit him, and his love of illustrating native artifacts and native peoples. He asked me where he could get copies of some Wintemberg’s publications because he couldn’t find his and he wanted to do some research.

From the little information available it seems that Ivan was born in Ujpest Hungary in 1933 and he and his wife Julia came to Canada in 1957. Julia predeceased him many years ago.

by Dr. Dean Axelson, D.V.M.

Ivan was born in Budapest, Hungary in 1933 where he studied art at the Academy of Applied Arts and at private schools. He was an avid student of Amerindian archaeology and ethnology. This intense interest and deep knowledge of the subject led him to paint representations of the native people of Canada and their way of life in

Figure 1: Ontario Iroquoian artifacts dating from AD 700 to 1651 from the 'classic' OAS poster, by Ivan Kocsis.
For many years he has been involved in Institutional Commissions and the press and became known as one of Canada’s foremost painters of the Amerindians. Ivan incorporated information from historical records and archaeological research to present as accurately as possible scenes of native life. His work provides a significant dimension to the otherwise little known aspects of native history. Ivan’s work was technically accurate as well as dramatic.

Ivan’s work hangs in the galleries of many museums and institutions including the Huronia Museum, Sainte-Marie-among-the-Hurons, Simcoe County Museum, Mohawk College, University of Western Ontario, Museum of Ontario Archaeology, Brewerton Museum, Fort Michilimackinac, Cayuga Museum, Joseph Brant Museum, National Film Board of Canada, Woodland Cultural Centre, Royal Ontario Museum, Ontario Archaeological Society, Museum of Civilization, Canadian Heritage Magazine, as well as in the homes and businesses of many private collectors in various parts of the world.

Ivan arrived in Hamilton, Ontario in 1956 and lived in the Hamilton mountain area. He worked as a graphic artist for Superior Engravers in Hamilton and moved on to become the art director. His interest in native history was always strong. He became an amateur archaeologist and a historian and he collected thousands of artifacts and made hundreds of pages of drawings. Most of his work has been based on original research. He amassed sketch books of fine pen and ink line drawings of campsites, pipes, weapons, longhouses, etc. that revealed how well he understood graphic processes as well as his subject matter.

His collections eventually went to the Mohawk Institute in Brantford, Ontario. He visited the Six Nations Indian Reserve often and became friends with Chief Jacob Thomas and Walter Cooke at the Hamilton Regional Indian Centre who helped him gain entry to the people and customs of the Six Nations Reserve where he sketched and took photos of the native people that he incorporated into his paintings.

Ivan was made an Honourary Member of the Mohawk tribe.

Ivan also developed a great interest in the people and culture of Costa Rica. He even became quite fluent in Spanish.

I first met Ivan when I was president of the Ontario Archaeological Society (1966-1969) he soon became a good and valued friend. I acquired several of his paintings and prints over the years. His first wife Julie, and later his second wife Maryanne, supported him in his artistic life.

I am honoured to have been a friend of Ivan Kocsis and he will be sorely missed. Ivan died Oct, 20, 2008 after several years of ill health and heart problems.

by Charlie Garrad

I have just received the news that artist and long-time OAS member and friend Ivan Kocsis of Hamilton died on Oct. 20, 2008.

Ivan has possibly a world-wide reputation for his incredibly detailed artistic reconstructions of aboriginal life in Ontario. His work may be seen at the ROM, Crawford Lake Conservation Area, and on the original OAS poster.

I met Ivan nearly 40 years ago through the late Tim Kenyon, a fellow artist who also devoted much time to aiding the OAS. Ivan was not so productive in his later years because of arthritis in his fingers and constant pain, but he remained cheerful and always glad to talk. Another Beacon has been extinguished.

Our best to you on your journey, Ivan.
A question about the OAS Library

It is now some time since I was informed that the OAS Library was being moved from Richmond Hill to London, supposedly because it was not used in Richmond Hill. I assumed at the time that the move was to the London Chapter and that there would soon be forthcoming in ArchNotes an appropriate announcement of the move, the reasons for it, an explanation of why the members were not consulted, what alternatives were considered, the new location of the library, who was appointed the librarian, the hours and conditions of access, etc.

As yet, not one of these details has appeared. I enquired at this year’s Annual Business Meeting into which black hole of oblivion the OAS Library had disappeared. I was informed that an announcement had indeed been made sometime, somewhere, anywhere but in Arch Notes, the means by which members are informed, and that all sorts of wonders will appear at an unknown future time thanks to computerization.

None of the information I asked for was provided and I was disconcerted to learn that the library was not with the London Chapter, as I had assumed, but outside of the society.

I ask for assurance that removing the library from its known location in Richmond Hill into inaccessible obscurity in London for the supposed purpose of increasing its use has been successful, at least to a sufficient degree to compensate for the inconvenience caused to members in Toronto, such as myself, who have wished to consult the Library. Are there comparative usage figures available?

One of several rejected better options I could have suggested would be to copy the Ontario Genealogical Society, and place the care of the OAS Library in the reference department of a major public library system.

It could then be curated, housed and maintained by professional reference librarians, and the library would provide access 50 hours a week. Material would always be accessible to members throughout the province through Inter-Library Loan system. And this would be without any cost to the society.

Does the Province still fund the OAS annually based on assurances which include that the Society has an accessible library? Certainly to the members who joined the OAS because access to the library was featured as a benefit of membership, that access is not a benefit but a contractual right.

As I said at the meeting, I belong to a different era. Perhaps no-one else shares my concern for the library.

Would any other members care to comment?

Charles Garrad, October 19, 2008

What is the OAS library?

Charlie has kindly provided us with this description of the library from years past. There were four components of the library. The fourth, as described below, is now located in the Ontario Archives (http://www.archives.gov.on.ca/english/common/collections.htm) although the office still holds files.

• **Bound Volumes:** These were free-standing books on shelves, by author. It was in this area that the 1979 Index most quickly became out of date when entire library collections from deceased members were donated in their memory. These reflected a large range of subjects because of the eclectic interests of members. It is also led to duplicates and the possibility of income for the OAS by selling these at a later date.

• **Magazine files:** Publication exchange and donations agreements were made with every Canadian archaeological and anthropological society, and some American ones too, so in some cases we had unbroken runs of their publications. Anything published anywhere that was the work of an OAS member or relevant to Ontario archaeology were in these boxes, which also included some ArchNotes.

• **Small Publications:** Reprints, off-prints, pamphlets, manuscripts, and the like were kept in file folders organized by the name of the author.

• **Archives:** Not available for loan but to be consulted in the office, these included some ArchNotes, OAS correspondence, records, Treasurer’s Reports and material I would consider confidential to the Society and not for release outside. They also included field notes for various OAS digs and sites.

Editor’s note

The OAS library is held at the Museum of Ontario Archaeology where it is on long-term loan. The OAS collections are kept separately from the museum’s library collections. Please see the museum web site for hours (http://www.uwo.ca/museum/) or call 519-473-1360.

The Provincial Heritage Organization grant that the OAS receives from the Ontario government supports operating costs and is not conditional on the presence of a library in a particular location.

The OAS library was moved at the time that the OAS office moved to the Ashbridges Estate because the cost of renting enough space to house the collection was prohibitive.
Craigeith Heritage Depot blessed

by Charles Garrad

At a ceremony held on Oct. 20, Roger Noganosh of the Magnetawan First Nation, assisted by his wife Kate on a drum, held a sage smudge ceremony in the Craigeith Heritage Depot building to cleanse and bless the building and those present. Janith English, Principal Chief of the Wyandot Nation of Kansas, then sang a blessing in the Wyandot language.

The occasion was the return visit of Chief English to Craigeith at the invitation of the Town of the Blue Mountains and Depot Curator Suzanne Ferri so that Chief English could see the artifact displays from archaeological sites at Craigeith which are ancestral to her family. Roger and Kate Noganosh stated that the Magnetawan First Nation also has ancestral connections with the Blue Mountains. Mayor Ellen Anderson welcomed the visitors on behalf of the town and the Depot. In response, Chief English presented Mayor Anderson with a clay pot made by a modern Wyandot potter in an ancient style. Chief English affirmed she is a descendant of the two Wyandot villages that existed at Craigeith until 1650, and assured the Town of the Blue Mountains of the enthusiastic support of the Wyandot Nation of Kansas toward preserving the remains of these villages.

The Craigeith Heritage Depot officially opened Sept. 21 and is housed in a circa 1878 restored railway station at 113 Lakeshore Rd R.R.#3, Collingwood. It will function as both a museum and a tourist information center. The fall hours are 9 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. Wednesday and Friday, or by appointment. Admission is $2 for adults, children and seniors, $1 and a family pass is $6. Residents and visitors may now contact the Craigeith Heritage Depot by phone at 705-444-2601, by fax at 705-444-2793 or by email at sferri@thebluemountains.ca.
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