STRATA

Where will you be on Oct 24, 25, 26 2014?

How about at the Holiday Inn in Peterborough, where the Peterborough Chapter of the OAS will be hosting the annual OAS Symposium.

The theme for this year’s conference is “The Land Between” and preparations are already well underway.

In this issue of STRATA, members of the planning committee offer you a sneak preview of what to expect. As you will see from their reports this promises to be a very special conference. Be sure to keep the last week in October open. You don’t want to miss this one!

FEATURE ARTICLE: GRAVE REMINISCENCES

A presentation last month to Dr. Jocelyn Williams’ third year Human Bioarchaeology class at Trent University concerning the legal aspects of unmarked grave investigation provided me with an opportunity to review not only modern Ontario statutes and regulations, but also notes concerning my activities during the 70’s and 80’s, while employed as a Provincial archaeologist.

(con’t p.7)
A FEW WORDS FROM THE SYMPOSIUM CO-CHAIR: TOM MOHR

As Symposium Co-chair with OAS Vice President and POAS member Sheryl Smith, my duties have been varied and interesting.

First and foremost has been the creation of an enthusiastic organization committee to share the workload.

We've nailed down the dates and location for the event. A theme, The Land Between, has been established and clearances secured from the organization of that name.

Well-known First Nations playwright and humorist Drew Hayden Taylor has been booked as our Banquet Speaker. We have commissioned a symposium logo to be created in a competition among young artists at Curve Lake First Nations.

Lots of details, large and small, are being weighed and considered...from the nature of the associated public events to the field trip to Petroglyphs Provincial Park. The more we can nail down in the months leading up to the event, the better the potential for a seamless weekend and a great visitor experience for participants.

Making this Symposium special are the partnership we have created with Trent University, the City of Peterborough, the Canadian Conservation Institute, Sir Sandford Fleming College, Peterborough Museum and Archives, The Peterborough Historical Society and our First Nations Community. With more to come - we expect OAS 2014 to be a memorable occasion!

A Few Words From the Other Symposium Co-chair: Sheryl Smith

One of the highlights of each Symposium is the Awards Banquet. The OAS re-vamped its awards program several years ago and we now have nine different categories for which recognition can be given. Awards run the gamut from lifetime achievement in avocational and professional categories to excellence in publishing and public archaeology. The Executive Board through the Director of Member Services, Dr. Lindsay Foreman, selects from those nominated at its July meeting and the certificates, mementos or medals, along with 25 year membership pins, are handed out at the Banquet on Saturday evening. This is a special time to honour those who have devoted significant time and effort to the ethical pursuit of archaeology in Ontario. If you know someone who might be deserving of an OAS Award, please check the article in the March/April issue of Arch Notes, or visit the OAS website to learn more.

COMING EVENTS

On May 27 at 7:00 p.m. Executive Meeting at St. Paul’s Presbyterian Church.
The program is coming together well, with two sessions already under development, chaired by Shari Prowse (MTCS) on the relationship between the CRM industry and Academe and by Susan Dermarkar (U of T) on Wendat occupation sites north of the Lake Ontario shore.

I will be contacting Trent students again to create a session presenting their thesis research, and have invited Eva MacDonald (ASI) to develop a session concerning 19th century site archaeology.

The concurrent Trent 50 archaeology session is also proceeding well, with the recent receipt by Dr. Jocelyn Williams (TUARC) of a $3,000 Vice-President grant in support of speaker travel costs. Dr. Paul Healy has drafted a potential speaker list representing research by tenured Trent graduates in a variety of geographic areas, and invitations will be going out shortly. Additional university funding is also expected in support of this timely initiative.

---

Exciting Announcement from Morgan Tamplin

The Canadian Conservation Institute (CCI) has awarded one of its 2014-15 Regional Workshops to the OAS as part of our 2014 Annual Symposium.

The two-day workshop, on Archaeological Conservation Field Techniques, will be held October 22-23 before the Symposium, at Sir Sandford Fleming College Brealey Campus Conservation Labs.

The session is intended for professional archaeologists and conservators or students in these disciplines. It will be limited to 20 participants with 10 from each professional and student category. Experienced avocational archaeologists may also apply.

In addition to hands-on instruction, participants will receive a course manual and given tours of local heritage facilities. The course content can be found at:


---

COMING EVENTS

At 7:00 p.m. on June 17 at St. Paul’s Presbyterian the photographer, Christopher Manson, will be giving a special presentation on The Nine Rivers City Project.

As always, we are grateful to the City of Peterborough for our Community Project Grant that enables us to offer these events to the general public at no charge.
FOLLOWING THE MONEY

BY HARRY JOHNSON, CHAPTER TREASURER

When we started talking about the possibility of hosting the 2014 Symposium, my concern, as treasurer, was that we didn’t have enough money to take on such a huge project. Quickly, the other members of the chapter’s executive put my mind at rest. The OAS provides funding and takes all of the financial risks.

We do the main work, but we also get a share of any profit.

First, we had to set up a new bank account specifically for the symposium. The OAS gave us the numbers for each of the symposiums going back to 2006. This proved to be extremely useful. I could see what needed to be kept track of and set up new Quickbook accounts.

Next, we produced a budget and presented it in a conference call to the OAS executive. After a few adjustments, they approved it.

If you are planning to attend, it is worthwhile to pay in advance. Advanced registrations fees for members is $50, non-members pay $60, students pay $30. Later fees will go up by $10 each, except for students.

Advanced banquet registrations are $55 for members, $65 for non-members, and $30 for students. Wine is included! Those who don’t pay in advance will be charged $70.

So... register early!

ABOUT AUCTIONS AND BOOKS

by Deb Mohr

Plans are coming together quite nicely for this portion of the Symposium. Ellen Blaubergs and I are beginning to contact potential book vendors, and are about to contact all of last year’s participants about participating again this year.

As a reminder to all members, we are welcoming contributions of items for the silent auction. If you have an item that you would like to donate, please contact me at debmohr@live.ca, to make arrangements to have it picked up. If you have an item you would like to donate but are not sure whether it is appropriate for our use, please feel free to email me for input.

Again this year, we are asking each chapter to put together a silent auction basket. I am also accepting items for this from our chapter members and will be putting together our chapter’s basket by mid-October, well ahead of time for the Symposium.

We also hope to have a few surprises... new vendors which should be of interest to everyone.

And finally, anyone wishing to volunteer for a couple of hours in the auction and book room or elsewhere at the Symposium, please contact me to have your name added to our volunteer list.

Peterborough Chapter President, Tom Mohr, sends a special kudo to Katie Hull and the rest of the crew from Archaeological Services Inc. for taking part in the Whitby Doors Open Event of May 3. They did a fine job of flying the archaeological flag to an enthusiastic audience of both kids and grownups.
WHAT IS THE LAND BETWEEN?  BY LEORA BURMAN, CEO OF THE LAND BETWEEN

When traveling in Ontario, you will encounter large ecosystems such as the St. Lawrence Lowlands and the Canadian Shield. But what lies between these areas? The Land Between is an ecotone - a region between the Shield and Lowlands stretching across south-central Ontario from Georgian Bay to the Frontenac Arch. It runs parallel to, but just north of Highway #7. This landscape is less rugged than the near-north, but not as flat and arable as the south. Look further and see the landscape undulating in patterns of low to high and wet to dry. What you are seeing is The Land Between! The Land Between is diverse with numerous species and habitats. Rare alvars and savannahs, fens and meadow marshes are found here. It is a meeting ground and at the northern limit home for many species.

The Land Between is also rich in culture and heritage as it is a meeting place of Great Nations of the Anishnaabeg, Wendat, and Haudenashaunee. Early European Settlers had to be creative to survive and thrive with limited spaces for agriculture. The Land Between includes part of a major historic and current navigation route: the Trent Severn Waterway. Therefore, the Land Between is an archaeological treasure.

Working Together

Curved Lake, Alderville, Hiawatha and Scugog First Nations have been very busy to complete an archaeological site (near Hagers) that we have been overseeing for approximately 3 years now. At times, tension has run high and world class diplomacy has been needed to ensure that everyone has had a voice and all issues have been addressed. All of the First Nations involved have worked through the difficult process of repatriating our Ancestors. We have established a very good working group to oversee any archaeological sites that may have a connection to the First Peoples in the surrounding area.

With the help of the Registrar of Cemeteries, Michael D’Mello and the graciousness of the land owner, we have been able to move forward in repatriating our Ancestor’s remains. We have established a tent; we rela;ionship with the municipality involved and with their assistance and cooperation we have funded the very arduous work ahead and laying our Ancestors to rest at last.

by Anne Taylor

None of this would have been possible without the incredible dedication of Dr. Lawrence Jackson and his field crew. Dr. Jackson has walked beside us through the difficulties and complexity of repatriating our Ancestor’s remains. Our involvement with archaeology is still in the early stages, but the relationships we have been able to build with OAS members and APA members are key to our efforts to ensure that our Ancestors are respected.

Editor’s Note: Anne Taylor is the cultural archivist at Curve Lake First Nation. She is also a member of the Symposium 2014 planning committee.
Of Chipmunks, Dogs, and Consultation
by Tom Mohr

It has been said that there are lies, damned lies, and statistics. The Peterborough OAS’s January 2014 meeting illuminated the process required to get past that maxim in a presentation whimsically entitled “Of Chipmunks and Dogs: A Zooarchaeological Analysis from Jacob’s Island, Peterborough County, Ontario.” Guest speaker, Kristen Csenkey, a graduate student from Trent University and recipient of the OAS’s Gordon and Margaret Watson Bursary, had conducted an examination of faunal remains from several radiocarbon-dated mortuary features found on site. Statistically, two species stood out in the sample... domesticated dog (Canis lupus familiaris) and chipmunk (Tamias striatus). Might the numbers indicate that the two very different species shared their interments based upon similar circumstances, i.e. resource extraction or ritual burial? Kristen’s comprehensive analysis dispelled us of any notion that late archaic hunter-gatherers might have dined upon, or even ceremonially buried chipmunks in the same capacity as they did their dogs. So much for statistics and Wirst impressions.

The well-wrought presentation prompted further questions from an engaged audience, some deserving of a wider consideration. Among the guests present was the familiar Wigure of Doug Williams, a respected elder from Curve Lake First Nation and the Director of Studies for the PhD program in Indigenous Studies at Trent University, who raised two points in particular. First, he asked if extra sensitivity had been allotted to the canine remains due to the presence of ochre staining that would indicate a ritual or spiritual aspect to their interment? Kristen responded that while she had not included ethnological considerations to the faunal material beyond the evidence of ochre and its appearance in proximity to human remains, it was a notion that she was ready to incorporate into her investigations.

In follow-up, Elder Williams expressed a need for the First Nations community to gain access to the sort of data being generated in such studies. He explained how Indigenous peoples are engaged in a process of rebuilding and rediscovering the stories of their ancestors upon the land. In this instance, knowledge of deliberate canine interment accompanied by the use of ochre, and any association with human remains, adds texture and complexity to a spiritual awareness that may currently be dependent only upon oral tradition.

Meeting organizers expressed their appreciation for all comments and noted that the consultation process functions best when it extends beyond the legislative requirements to address the spirit of the sharing of information as well. It was suggested that the topic be addressed at the upcoming OAS Symposium in Peterborough.

Altogether, the meeting proved to be a perfect example of that which we strive to achieve at the OAS. An opportunity was given to a graduate student to present the results of her studies. We had attracted an audience representing students; the interested public, including guests from the First Nations community; and a variety of archaeologists from the academic, CRM and avocational Wields. New work was illuminated and thought-provoking questions were given voice. All on a bitterly cold winter’s night that left us yearning for the next Wield season.

Tom thanks Kristen and presents the ‘much coveted’ chapter mug to her. (She is clearly very pleased.)
In her talk Prof. Munson provided an overview of the content of the book. The first half, she explained, provides an update of current knowledge about the major periods of Ontario Archaeology. The second half consists of archaeological ‘stories’ told by experts in their areas of specialization such as ceramics, housing, lithics, paleobotany, faunal analysis, beliefs, social and political organization, diet, and mortuary practices.

Peterborough Chapter’s Vice-President, Bill Fox, contributed the chapter titled, “Stories in Stone and Metal,” in which he shows how the analysis of lithics can provide fascinating insights into ancient warfare, trade, travel, and inter-tribal relations.

Evidence of the wide spread interest in the archaeology of Ontario, she told her listeners, is the 800 to 1,000 new sites that are registered every year in our province.

Despite this whirlwind of activity, however, no book for the general public has been published since James Wright’s, in 1972.

Time, not only for an update as Prof. Jamieson, explained, but also for dispelling some long held archaeological myths such as: indigenous people were simple and isolated; their culture was monolithic; science is the only way to understand the past; and there is a disconnect between the past and contemporary First Nations.

The challenge facing archaeologists, Prof. Munson emphasized, is how to use these various stories to “understand people’s lives- our humanity.”

“What can we learn,” she asked, “from stains in the ground”, from “historical records”, and from “living cultures.”?

The importance of the latter, she emphasized, was stressed in the chapter contributed by Kris Nahrgang, chief of Kawartha Nishnawbe First Nation and a licensed archaeologist who wrote about the importance of cooperation among First Nations People, archaeologists and developers.

“If we don’t start working together,” Chief Nahrgang warned, “there won’t be anything left to protect.”

Her hope in writing the book Prof. Munson concluded, “is that people will not only learn from the past, but also how to preserve it.”

“And”, she added “get them excited about that.”
While I had considerable experience as a student in First Nations burial investigation, my first experience as a professional occurred in 1973, while employed as Northwestern Ontario Regional Archaeologist with the Ministry of Natural Resources (Fox 2013: 7 and 13-14). A visit to the “Federal Mound Reserve” on the Rainy River convinced me that something needed to be done to record the burial mounds within the reserve and downstream to the west. Consequently, a contour survey was undertaken and the Ministry was convinced to acquire the private lands to the west, which contained a series of Laurel and Blackduck mounds and associated habitation sites. It occurred to me that it would be appropriate to involve local First Nations in the investigation (survey and mapping) of sites on the new Provincial lands and hence, Anishinabe students from the nearby Manitou Rapids Reserve were hired as crew on the 1974 survey and subsequent projects (Fox 1989: 30). A decade later, the entire area (including 15 burial mounds) was declared a National Historic Site, a meeting/interpretive centre was constructed, and the site renamed Kay-Nah-Chi-Wah-Nung was turned over to the local First Nation.
I carried this First Nations experience with me to southwestern Ontario, during my transfer to London in 1976. When a young archaeology student proposed to investigate a red ochre cemetery site near Lake St. Clair, I encouraged him to consult with Dean Jacobs of Walpole Island Unceded Territory, which initiated a long-term positive working relationship between Ron Williamson and Dean. A Walpole Island student was a member of the crew, when they went into the field in 1977.

It was not long thereafter that a first experience with the former Cemeteries Act was thrust upon me. I received a call from Wilfrid Laurier University about the discovery of human remains in a small community north of town. The Waterloo Regional Police had contacted the university for advice concerning the antiquity of a femur recovered by a young boy playing in a back lot. When I arrived on site, I found a series of overgrown dump truck deposited piles of fill. Subsequent inquiries determined that the fill derived from a local separate school construction site. I continued my investigation in consultation with a local priest, who stated that financial constraints had required construction of the new school on their existing property (church yard), and that a rather unorthodox approach to exhumation and reinterment had been adopted. I pointed out that they had missed at least one of their elderly parishioners (19th century Irish woman – based on a recovered coffin name plate), and subsequently filed my report with the local coroner, medical officer of health, and police. So far as I am aware, no further action was taken; however, I did hear that the police spent some time searching the boy’s room for the femur, which he had hidden in his clothes drawer.

This was followed later that year by the Grimsby Historic Neutral cemetery salvage excavation involving Dr. Walter Kenyon of the Royal Ontario Museum, who was arrested by local police and fined $100 under the Cemeteries Act (Fox 1988: 61), as a result of charges laid by the Union of Ontario Indians. The Union was joined by Six Nations and the American Indian Movement in protesting this excavation, and the latter remained active in Native burial protests, including one at a 1977 archaeological assessment of the E.C. Row expressway route in Windsor.

As an aside, comic relief was provided during the tense Grimsby confrontation between First Nations and the practice of academic archaeology. There was the little matter of licensing under the new Ontario Heritage Act, and consequently, I was assigned responsibility to chauffeur a senior member of the Ontario Heritage Foundation, Archaeology Committee to the site. During the ride, I was informed that there was little sympathy for the perpetrator and that he would be “read the riot act”: Upon the arrival of a government vehicle, the accused retreated rapidly on crutches to his trailer and closed the door, as my passenger strode from the vehicle to the trailer. The minutes passed, without any sign of the volcanic confrontation threatened, until the trailer door finally opened, and the two reappeared – best of friends!
This was not the first such confrontation in Ontario. Six Nations Longhouse traditionalists had protested the excavation of the Tabor Hill ossuaries in suburban Toronto in 1956 (Churcher and Kenyon 1960). However, Grimsby proved to be the “final straw” for the R.O.M. administration, who subsequently issued a statement that the museum would not conduct any further excavations of Native graves without Native band consultation. Shortly thereafter, the National Museum of Man encountered burials on the Beckstead St. Lawrence Iroquois village, and came into conflict with the St. Regis Reserve Iroquois in 1977. These events galvanized both the government and the heritage community; as the Ministry of Culture and Recreation announced in 1978 that archaeological licenses did not permit Native burial excavation without Native community consultation and the Ontario Archaeological Society and Native Canadian Centre of Toronto co-hosted a Toronto conference during October of 1977 entitled “Unmarked Human Burials in Ontario”. The conference was a success to the extent that all parties were able to air their views and numerous proposals were documented concerning the way forward. These events essentially put a stop to research-oriented Native burial excavations in Ontario and initiated a lengthy dialogue between museums, universities and Native communities concerning the disposition of First Nations human remains held in academic collections.

My next personal experience involved unmarked Native graves on a Glen Meyer village site near Princeton. The Archaeological Conservation Program had just been initiated (Fox 2013: 18) and Charlie Nixon had been monitoring and surface collecting the Force site for a decade. He noticed signs of impending residential construction and arranged for a salvage excavation in 1978. The area exposed contained the remains of six overlapping thirteenth century (Fox 1980: 6) longhouses and two secondary burial pits. The latter were left undisturbed, pending approvals under the Cemeteries and Coroners Acts, and from the adjacent Six Nations Band Council Chief for their removal. This occasioned a two week delay in exhumation, which unfortunately resulted in shovel disturbance of one burial by a local looter. While all accidental discoveries of human remains had been subject to police investigation under the Coroners Act, due to potential forensic implications, the application of the Cemeteries Act to unmarked Native graves was not the norm; and remained so, when The Act to Revise the Cemeteries Act died on the floor of the legislature in 1979.
Above: A youthful Ron Williamson excavates a multiple bundle burial feature on the Force village site, under the watchful gaze of Six Nations Chief Renson Jamieson.

During the early ‘80’s, I continued to work with Ministry head office staff in our attempt to establish a “coherent provincial government policy pertaining to unmarked graves”, through the development of inter-Ministerial guidelines. In 1983 and ‘84, a number of meetings were held with Six Nations and the Council of Chiefs of Ontario to discuss our draft guidelines, leading up to a January, 1985 meeting of Assistant Deputy Ministers from Culture and Communications, Consumer and Commercial Relations, Health, and the Solicitor General. The ministry’s position was that:
1. Our staff should be brought into the investigation of unmarked graves as soon as they were reported.

2. Investigative staff from other agencies should not further disturb uncovered human remains prior to the arrival of an archaeologist.

3. Routine responses to Native burials should be adopted by other agencies –

   a. Coroner has no concerns.

   b. Medical Officer of Health provides immediate certification to our staff for the exhumation and transportation of human remains when requested.

4. A communications campaign should be initiated to familiarize provincial agency and municipal staff and private sector developers with these new procedures (Fox 1988: 64).

In tandem with bureaucratic initiatives and as the number of reported unmarked graves began to mount (Pfeiffer 1979, Spence 1979, 1982, a, 1984, a, b), in part due to the Ministry’s avocational Archaeological Conservation Program (Fox 1981: 5), I began to speak to the issue among academics and police organizations. A talk was presented at the University of Western Ontario in 1980 entitled “Native Burial Excavation in Ontario” and in 1984, I was invited to speak to the Michigan-Ontario Identification Association at their annual meeting in Toronto. This was a gathering of forensic investigators, to whom I described the benefits of an archaeological approach to data gathering at crime scenes; motivated by the experience of receiving human remains in green garbage bags, among other receptacles, from Ontario police forces acting under direction from coroners (including a 3,000 year old red ochre burial recovered from a “crime scene” by flashlight!). I followed up with a presentation on “Unmarked Graves and Archaeology in Ontario” at the 1985 annual provincial Medical Officers of Health meeting, in what turned out to be a successful attempt to elicit their support for our Ministry response to unmarked grave discoveries.

The number of reported unmarked grave discoveries peaked in 1985 (Fox 2000, Kenyon 1986, Molto et al. 1986, Spence 1985, a, b, c, d, e and 1992), but continued to demand my attention for the remainder of the decade (Fox 1990: 6-7). That same year, we were involved in the first prosecution under Part VI of the Ontario Heritage Act (Fox 1985), including investigation of the looted Historic Neutral Misner cemetery, in consultation with the elected chief of Six Nations. Subsequently, a slide illustrated presentation on “The Misner Cemetery Salvage Project” was made to the Six Nations band council in July. Wishing a more inclusive communication of our activities, Chief William Montour arranged for me to speak later that month at the Lower Cayuga Longhouse concerning “Unmarked Graves and Archaeology in Ontario”. While the latter experience was unique and somewhat awkward for all concerned, it seemed to be appreciated by the gathered Longhouse people.
In fact, my reception was considerably warmer than that later in the year at the Canadian Association of Physical Anthropologists meeting in Thunder Bay, where I announced in a presentation entitled "Unmarked Graves in Ontario: A Procedural Update" that those involved in research relating to Native remains had an ethical responsibility to consult the Native community. It appeared that those in attendance still stood by their 1978 Committee on the Disposition of Human Remains position of refusing Native community demands for the repatriation of remains curated by research institutions.

At this point and at the request of the Haudenosaunee (Iroquois) Longhouse traditionalists, I was participating in the reburial of Native remains from archaeological excavations on Iroquoian sites such as Middleport and Keffer with Elders from Six Nations. This evolving relationship between the Provincial government and First Nations communities was communicated in 1986 with a presentation on “Native Burials and Archaeology” to the Canadian Association of Provincial and Territorial Archaeologists at their annual meeting in Toronto (Fox 1988). During the Society for American Archaeology annual meetings in Toronto the following year, I spoke concerning “The Unmarked Grave Situation in Ontario” to the National Association of State Archaeologists.

The eighties were a time of major transition in the process of unmarked grave investigation; including both location and documentation techniques. When we began, forensic considerations were paramount, and human remains were routinely forwarded to the Chief Coroner’s lab in Toronto by police forces acting under local coroner direction. If the remains were not deemed to be modern, they were generally incinerated. The Cemeteries Act R.S.O. 1980 was in effect and managed by the Director of the Cemeteries Branch, Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations. Cemetery inspectors used dowsing rods to locate unmarked graves in unregistered cemeteries (with limited success!) and dump trucks sped away from construction sites with the remains of unreported burials (including half of “Peg Leg” Brown – Spence 1985). There was no specific consideration given to First Nations burials in this legislation, despite efforts to consult with First Nations and revise the statute.

By the end of the decade, the Cemeteries Act R.S.O. 1990 had been revised to consider due process following the discovery of “unmarked (often Native) burial sites”. A Registrar had been established, who could “cause an investigation to be made” of unmarked or “irregular” burial sites and was responsible for subsequent arbitration in support of the development of a site disposition agreement. These statutory changes moved the process forward in terms of Native unmarked grave response; however, projects such as the Moatfield ossuary rescue excavation (Williamson and Pfeiffer 2003) in 1997 further challenged “due process”. Subsequent consultation by the Ministry of Citizenship, Culture and Recreation with the First Nations Burial Committee of Toronto resulted in a refinement and clarification of roles during the discovery and disposition of human remains (Carruthers 1999).
The *Cemeteries Act* R.S.O. 1990 was repealed in July, 2012 and has been superseded by the *Funeral, Burial and Cremation Services Act*, 2002. Part XI speaks to “unmarked burial sites” and “investigation into origins of site”; while Ontario Regulation 30/11, pertaining to the new act, states that “If the registrar orders under section 96 of the Act that an investigation be made to determine the origin of a burial site, an archaeologist who holds a professional licence issued under Part VI of the *Ontario Heritage Act* shall conduct the investigation.” We have proceeded a long way forward from 1980 concerning legal due process; however, negotiations continue with First Nations regarding the mechanisms to be employed in consultation, unmarked grave investigative protocols, and site disposition (Martelle 2006).

Despite the day to day insanity of unmarked grave investigation during the 1980’s, there were moments of revelation, where I was privileged to witness special individuals and events of the past – a child messenger (Fox and Molto 1994), a powerful shaman (Fox and Molto 1994a), a tortured war party (Molto et al. 1986), a mortuary feast (Fox 1988, Fox and Salzer 1999, Spence 1988) and a wide range of mortuary traditions reflecting the religious beliefs of diverse cultures, both past and present (Fox 1982 and 1985, Spence and Fox 1992, Woodley 1992). During this tumultuous period, critical bioarchaeological analyses were provided by Drs. Pfeiffer (1979, 1987), Molto and Spence, and their students (Cook et al. 1985, Gibbs 1987). Salvage excavation of an unregistered cemetery exposed by residential construction activities could not have been accomplished without the volunteer assistance of faculty and students from the Department of Anthropology, Western University. Although we didn’t always “see eye to eye” philosophically, I wish to express my sincere appreciation to Dr. Michael Spence for his unstinting assistance over the years (witness the numerous reports listed below) – a steady and positive influence in the field of investigation.
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