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 (entopic 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’être 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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Bounty and Benevolence:

A History of Saskatchewan Treaties

by Arthur J. Ray, Jim Miller, and Frank Tough


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
Although their study, commissioned by previous Aboriginal/non-Aboriginal affected the numbered treaties. Ray, Miller, and Tough describe them, they were attuned to the value of their land and were tough, competent negotiators. They were skeptical that the government’s promises would meet their future needs and pressed these representatives for promises that they would be able to maintain their livelihoods, that they would be permitted to hunt and fish in their traditional territories, that they would be helped in times of need or when they became too old or too ill to work for themselves, that they would receive the implements for and instruction in agriculture to grow their own crops, and that they would receive education and health care. While some of these demands found their way into the treaties, such as the promise of a “medicine chest” in Treaty 6 or the stipulation that on-reserve education would be made available in Treaties 5 and 6, other demands related to the livelihood and survival of First Nations people were left off the final ledger. In the end, the absence of these crucial promises would leave many First Nations feeling that governments had reneged on the treaty, deeply wounding their trust in their non-Aboriginal neighbors.

It is Ray, Miller, and Tough’s attempt to get behind the backdrop of treaty-making, to understand what motivated both Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal peoples to sign these documents, which is the most valuable aspect of their book. Their analysis situates the treaties in the political-economic context of the time, providing the reader with an understanding of the impact of the fur trade, the expansion of the nation, previous Aboriginal/non-Aboriginal interactions, and other such factors that affected the numbered treaties. Although their study, commissioned by the Office of the Treaty Commissioner in Saskatoon, focuses on those numbered treaties that cover the province of Saskatchewan, the insights the authors provide have far broader application. Indeed, as the practice of treaty-making continues to be the dominant means for establishing relationships between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal peoples, and as the Province of British Columbia is currently mired in one of the most ambitious projects of treaty-making this country has ever seen, Ray, Miller, and Tough offer us an opportunity to reflect on the origins of this practice and to examine how far we have come since the earliest treaties were signed. Certainly the language of treaty-making has become far more precise, with a battery of lawyers employed to mull over treaty documents that are now book-length documents. Moreover, the modern legal framework of treaty-making has changed whereby these documents need to address the issue of Aboriginal title, a topic often elided in these earlier documents. But the end goal of today’s treaty-making still has not steered too far from its original course. Even though the language of “cede, release and surrender,” which served to prevent First Nations from laying claims to lands beyond their reserves in these earlier treaties, may today be passé, the modern vernacular of “certainty” still acts as a tool for securing an exhaustive definition of Aboriginal rights, solidifying Aboriginal/non-Aboriginal relationships without leaving too much room for these relationships to “live” and “grow.”

Andrew Woolford
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Joaquin Church illustrates how, when Mexico allows land and ethnic conflicts to simmer, they eventually explode, often with astonishing violence.

A wooden boat left on a river bank in the Dark Ages has been lifted from mudflats near Portsmouth, England. Archaeologists hope the dug-out canoe and the sediments that preserved it for 1,500 years will shed light on past climate, sea levels and daily life in the south of England. “It’s most likely that the boat would have been used by people to go into the harbour to fish or hunt birds,” explained Gavin Stone, Assistant Archaeologist at the Hampshire and Wight Trust for Maritime Archaeology (HWTMA).

Radio-dating backs up biblical text: Siloam Tunnel located and dated to 700 BC. An ancient waterway, described in the Bible, has been located and radiocarbon-dated to around 700 BC. The half-kilometre Siloam Tunnel still carries water from the Gihon Spring into Jerusalem’s ancient city of David. According to verses in Kings 2 and Chronicles 2 2, it was built during the reign of the King Hezekiah - between 727 BC and 698 BC - to protect the city’s water supply against an imminent Assyrian siege. Geologist Amos Frumkin, of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, and colleagues looked at the decay of radioactive elements - such as carbon in plants and thorium in stalactites - in tunnel samples. The plaster lining the tunnel was laid down around 700 BC, says Frumkin’s team. A plant trapped inside the waterproof layer clocked in at 700-800 BC, whereas