elevates the research by means of literary device instead of the merits of the results. It also diminishes the weight of opposition by casting critics as obstacles in the way of knowledge rather than conscientious scholars with genuine and well-founded concerns about what they see as the inappropriate and unnecessary extension of the concept of shamanism.

The volume is weakest and least successful in setting this body of research in the context of the history of archaeology and the philosophy of science. Unfortunately this constitutes the largest part of the book. It is another lengthy addition to a very long and seemingly endless series of published discussions concerning whether archaeology is or should be a science, the proper role of analogy, the influence of logical positivism, and the relative characteristics and merits of processual versus post-processual approaches to archaeology. Discussion of these topics in this book is almost entirely derivative, very repetitive, and generally unnecessary. It also rests on caricatures of archaeological theory and practice that would find few adherents at any time in the past or present, and exaggerates the extent to which issues of ideology and spiritual beliefs are ignored in archaeology. Although belief systems have been excluded from consideration by some archaeologists, especially in North America, this was never generally true of archaeology. The full extent of renewed interest in cultural conceptions and of recent cognitive approaches in archaeology, beyond rock art and debates about shamanism, is also never addressed in this book.

In the end, Shamanism and the Ancient Mind is not the clear and useful synthesis of innovative rock art research or the balanced evaluation of the shamanism debate it could have been. It is also not the herald of the research by means of literary device instead of the merits of the results. It also diminishes the weight of opposition by casting critics as obstacles in the way of knowledge rather than conscientious scholars with genuine and well-founded concerns about what they see as the inappropriate and unnecessary extension of the concept of shamanism.

The book is organized chronologically. Beginning with Lewis-Williams’ work as a young student and scholar, he struggles to revitalize a field of rock art research essentially abandoned by fellow archaeologists (not unlike the situation with rock art studies here on the Northwest Coast). Frustrated by the limitations of quantitative approaches and neuropsychological visions, termed entoptic phenomena. Its weaknesses are its semi-popularized and exaggerated polemical style and repetitiousness. I would recommend it to anyone who has never encountered the shamanistic interpretation of rock art in other sources, though readers are likely to find the works of the original researchers just as interesting and more informative. I could also recommend the book to those who may still enjoy the somewhat overused heroic story of the research process. I would not recommend it to anyone interested in understanding the historical development and philosophical implications of cognitive approaches to archaeology.

Aubrey Cannon

Aubrey Cannon (BA SFU 1979, PhD Cambridge 1987) is an archaeologist and Associate Professor at McMaster University. He has been involved in BC archaeology since 1977, and continues to conduct research on the central coast of BC.

A Cosmos in Stone: Interpreting Religion and Society Through Rock Art
by J. David Lewis-Williams
Altamira Press, Walnut Creek, 2002.

David Lewis-Williams’ most recent publication is a collection of articles and essays, written over the course of his prolific career, that focus on inquiry into San rock art and its meaning(s). The author calls this work a “personal journey,” one charted through his encounters with complex issues pertinent to South African rock art specifically, and the broader historical contexts of rock art research generally. It is a rich and satisfying read.

The book is organized chronologically. Beginning with Lewis-Williams’ work as a young student and scholar, he struggles to revitalize a field of rock art research essentially abandoned by fellow archaeologists (not unlike the situation with rock art studies here on the Northwest Coast). Frustrated by the limitations of quantitative approaches and

Beaufort N.C. - Archaeologists are investigating whether a burned shipwreck off the North Carolina coast is the remains of the last ship captured by the pirate Blackbeard. Officials with Surface Interval Diving Company have said the wreckage could also be that of a Civil War-era vessel burned by retreating Confederate officers in 1861. But the location of the wreckage makes the Blackbeard theory plausible. Historical documents show that Blackbeard captured two ships in August 1718 off Bermuda, one carrying sugar and the other nearly empty. Blackbeard allowed the ships’ crews to take the empty vessel, but he kept the full one. He brought the vessel back to Ocracoke Island where he stripped it of its valuables.

Baclar, Mexico - Mexican archaeologists have unearthed what may be the resting place of dozens, perhaps hundreds, of victims, including the tiny vertebrae and clavicles of children massacred during North America’s last large-scale Indian war. The excavations in this Caribbean coast town have yielded a cautionary tale about the destructive power of rural conflict here. The dig at Bacalar’s old San
concomitant methodology, Lewis-Williams turned to the ethnographic record and oral tradition. His work matures into a well-crafted “cable argument” (after Wylie 1989). Weaving together three lines of independent evidence: ethnography, the painted imagery itself, and neuropsychology (entoptic phenomena), Lewis-Williams argues that San rock art is, fundamentally, shamanistic in nature. The first half of the book is devoted to arguments for this theory and these are indeed persuasive.

Lewis-Williams then begins to “build bridges” of interpretation towards the imagery found in the Upper Paleolithic painted caves of Western Europe. Working against the “tacit moratorium on explanation” that plagued such efforts in the post-Leroi-Gourhan era (i.e., structuralist theory), Lewis-Williams strives to apply his findings - germane to San rock art - to those of the Paleolithic period. Despite the significant spatial and temporal distances (which he acknowledges), he insists that such connections are worthwhile, compelling and, ultimately, full of potential.

What must be appreciated in this book are the laudable attempts made by the author to say something about the production and purpose of rock art in both South Africa and Western Europe. Too often, rock art studies are both badly neglected and avoided as a result of seemingly insurmountable interpretive obstacles.

Lewis-Williams’ theory of shamanistic rock art (paintings and engravings produced in an “altered state of consciousness”) has, however, stirred sizable debate in the archaeological community. Resistance has been grounded in fears of “monolithic” explanation - a uniform raison d’etre for all rock art produced in hunter-gatherer societies. And although Lewis-Williams argues that shamanistic explanation provides only an important point of departure - an opening up of “limitless possibilities” - this book leaves the reader with the uncomfortable feeling that shamanism should be understood as a universal common denominator or motive for all rock art. One even begins to sense a tone of impatience in Lewis-Williams’ later writings.

The book, however, on the whole is a valuable one. The use of ethnography and other processes of investigation into rock art panels provide many useful examples for research that ought be undertaken in North America. Moreover, the book is beautifully written. Individuals with an interest in the extensive rock art found on the Northwest Coast should consider A Cosmos in Stone indispensable. Above all else, it is inspiring.

Amanda Adams
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Arthur J. Ray, Jim Miller, and Frank Tough borrow their title, Bounty and Benevolence, from the official government texts of the numbered treaties. They employ this phrase to highlight the Crown’s empty promise of riches to be shared through treaty-making that is at the heart of First Nations’ disappointment with these historic agreements. Through their careful analysis of government documents detailing the negotiation and implementation of these treaties, and supplemented by informal correspondences, secondary sources, newspaper reports, and the oral history of treaty-making on the Prairies, the authors provide a necessary rejoinder to the traditional Canadian historiographic goal of “nation-making” which too often lends credence to the Crown’s exculpatory claim to have signed “fair and just” agreements with the Aboriginal peoples of Canada.

Ray, Miller, and Tough take as their starting point not the Saskatchewan numbered treaties themselves, but rather the history of Aboriginal/non-Aboriginal relations in Canada. They draw our attention to the interaction rituals performed in the context of fur trade negotiations, in which the Hudson’s Bay Company (HBC) and the various Indian tribes with whom they dealt sought to communicate principles of trust and mutual respect through sacred acts such as the smoking of the pipe. Although each party negotiated hard to achieve their own best interests, the reality of their interdependence led on many occasions to arrangements that met the needs of both parties. Based on these fur trade negotiations, the authors suggest that the First Nations people of the Prairie region carried with them into treaty-making a certain set of expectations. One of these expectations was that the Crown would, like the HBC, forge a relationship with First Nations that was predicated more upon the evolving needs of both parties than rigid definitions contained within written contracts. In this respect, First Nations often demanded that treaties be “living” agreements that adapt to the vicissitudes of securing their livelihoods - livelihoods threatened by encroaching settlers, transportation networks, and resource developers.

In contrast, the Crown entered these negotiations with the experience of the Robinson Treaties (1850) fresh in its mind. The twin achievements of the Robinson Treaties that were subsequently brought to bear upon the numbered treaties were the creation of reserves and the payment of annuities. The objective of these distributions was to guarantee the expansion of the dominion while at the same time assuaging the Indians so as to avoid conflict.

The Aboriginal leaders who met with