is as Scoresby wrote it daily, with navigational details, changes of weather and ice, the occasional sighting of fish, and the few catches, as well as the difficulties he faced throughout. In many ways, it was the worst of his many voyages. The advantage of this facsimile is that it allows students to examine those parts of the story that are of special interest.

William Scoresby, Jr., became known for his scientific bent through his papers to the Wernerian Society and his Arctic Regions. Here, as they occurred, he observed rain, clouds, the effects of cold, crystals, refraction, the colour of the sea, natural history, and terrestrial magnetism. His Fellowship of the Royal Society was well earned, in a day when for some it was a social distinction.

The Whitby Literary and Philosophical Society have a mass of papers left by Scoresby on his death; they are fortunate in finding a publisher to make these two logs available to readers.


A Climate for Change is the product of work done from 1980-83 (funded by the Denner Canadian Foundation) by the Eastern Arctic Study Research Team, based at Queen’s University’s Centre for (mineral) Resource Studies. The purpose of the book is to “identify ongoing political forces” and to “avoid difficulties.” The book suffers from three major problems, which reduce its usefulness significantly. (1) If it is directed at a general audience, nonexperts, there are very important pieces of background that are missing but which are critical if the public is to interpret the document. (2) If it is for experts, there is not enough detail for adequate assessment. (3) Most damning is the explicit exclusion of the two most important factors influencing change in the North: the drive for provincial status and the question of aboriginal title.

The document should state more explicitly that it has a very definite perspective (or bias). It is written with the interests and the perspectives of the mining industry and the federal government in mind. There is very little critical analysis of the roles of the federal government or industry. The document states that it is “inconceivable” that the federal government would give up its ultimate authority concerning ownership of nonrenewable resource and industrial development. Local people (i.e., Northerners) are characterized as not essential and consistent participants, bystanders, and as being mistaken about consultation (i.e., they expect to play an active role). It is not clear whether these statements are descriptive or normative. It is not clear who made them and what they are based upon. There is not the analysis that such statements require. When it is noted that the original co-principal investigator moved from the Centre to assistant deputy minister in Energy, Mines and Resources, that another researcher moved to the National Energy Board, and that two other authors once worked for C.M. Drury, the possible source of the bias becomes clear. Only those who embrace the heartland/hinterland model, which relegates the “outer” provinces and territories to colonial status, could have produced this document. To them it is inconceivable that the federal government’s role would be reduced, but they are able to describe a scenario in which the federal government’s role would increase.

The federal government/mining industry bias and failure to address topics northerners should be concerned about is evident in the fact that environmental and social problems are only mentioned. The upheavals of the boom-and-bust nature of the mining industry never come up. Company officials and Ottawa bureaucrats suffer no personal trauma or financial loss when mining communities “die.” The report does note that local employment does not seem to reach expectations. It is northerners who will have to live with, or in, pollution left after miners leave.

The book has not addressed the thorny problems of the morality and effectiveness of decisions made in remote areas (i.e., Ottawa) or the issue of maintaining native culture and local values while development proceeds.

The centralist perspective that dominates the book will leave the naive reader from central Canada totally confused when the national news describes what is happening in the North. Citizens of the West or the North will likely be bewildered or enraged.

For the more informed reader the document is frustrating because of its vagueness or lack of attention to detail or to the requirements for an adequate technical report. Methodology is not adequately described. That “... results of the case studies and other analysis were circulated to interested individuals ...” is far too vague. A document dealing with sensitive and controversial issues that leaves untouched two crucial factors (provincial status and aboriginal title) must go much farther than this one in describing and justifying approach and methodology. Why were crucial factors ignored (citing “terms of reference” is not an adequate excuse), and can a useful document be produced under that constraint? Is it all realistic to include a scenario in which federal (central) power and control increase? Was this included to “balance” the analysis by giving the impression that all possibilities have an equal probability? The document does not display the rigour and objectivity necessary to assist the informed reader in identifying ongoing political forces and in avoiding difficulties.

The document may also do a disservice to its most sympathetic readers, the Centre’s clients. If the federal government and the mining industry believe what they read, their actions and attitudes will increase the distrust of Ottawa, and any communications will likely be acrimonious. If readers of this document are reinforced in their beliefs that colonial attitudes are acceptable in the ’80s in Canada, that “high grading” of the hinterland is really in the longer term interests of the country, and that some citizens are less equal than others, then tensions, distrust, acrimony, and divisiveness will continue to increase.

Unfortunately, this book will exacerbate rather than help correct the astigmatic myopia that plagues central Canada.


The objective of this volume is to provide a series of interdisciplinary papers relating to the 1982 excavations of a unique prehistoric arctic archaeological site with remarkable preservation of artifacts, features, and human remains. The site is described as a catastrophically terminated Inupiat winter house and is located at Barrow, Alaska (BAR-2). An ice override is forwarded as the most likely explanation for the disaster, which is interpreted to have occurred between A.D. 1850 and A.D. 1500. This event not only sealed and preserved organic cultural materials, but also trapped and killed five people within the structure. At the time of discovery, two of these individuals still possessed considerable amounts of soft tissues, preserved by the nearly constant frozen conditions. These tissues allowed
the addition of another dimension in the analysis and reconstruction of the events and people of the site: that of medical autopsy and microbiological assessment.

The volume consists of 12 symposium papers on various aspects of the research, including: the archaeology of the catastrophically terminated house; autopsy results on the five individuals trapped in the house; some craniofacial data on these individuals; various determinations of age and disease for the human remains (stereochemical and bone biology for age; hair, temporal bone, Harris line, and microbiological investigations for disease); diet determinations utilizing trace element analysis of the human bone; a discussion of the use of ethnohistoric data in archaeology; and the legal aspects arising from the investigation of this unusual site. An introduction sets the stage for the presentation of these 12 papers and describes the sequence of events preceding, during, and after the excavations. Two short concluding notes end the volume. Following are observations made on some of the contributions.

In the introductory note, Lobdell and Dekin (p. 1-4) describe the situation at the site, outlining the history of its discovery, the partial destruction of the house, and the subsequent controlled excavations. They clearly communicate the time limitations imposed on the project and the importance of the cooperation of the community and medical and legal authorities. Evident in the archaeologists' approach is the concern for the proper procedures relating to the respectful handling of the bodies, balanced by the need to collect biological samples and information important for interpreting the disaster and describing the people who lived there.

The next contribution (also the longest) is by Newell (p. 5-51) and is a detailed account of the archaeological excavations, including interpreting the process, identifying the preservation and deducing the familial relationships of the five trapped individuals. Newell's comparison of this site with 51 other catastrophically terminated sites from Thule and succeeding cultures underlines the importance of structures immediately terminated. At these sites the cultural information is suspended in time (often with excellent preservation) within a context unaffected by behaviour response to the disaster. Though Newell provides an artifact inventory, no detailed artifact descriptions are provided, nor are there any photographs of artifacts.

An unusual inclusion within any volume on archaeology is an autopsy report. In their report, Zimmerman and Auffereide (p. 53-64) indicate that the cause of death for the two preserved adult female individuals was crushing injuries to the chest. The older female had indications of atherosclerosis, signs of earlier pneumonia, and a heart infection. The medical examiners identified that she was lactating at the time of her death, though the child was not found among the deceased. Both females exhibited osteoporosis and anarchoasosis.

Silimperi et al. (p. 117-121) report on the microbiological investigations of the two preserved females. Though negative in their findings, the paper is important because it recommends strict procedures for the collection of biological specimens in future discoveries of this nature and underlines the need for preparedness and cooperation between researchers with varied backgrounds.

One of the preliminary papers in the volume is by Scott et al. (p. 65-76) on the craniology and dentition of the human remains. The lack of analysis of the post-cranial remains is not explained and is a major omission in the paper as well as the volume. Also, though the cranial metric and non-metric data is used to suggest affinities with other groups, the assessment of the two immature Barrow skulls is not convincing, nor can the frequency data for the non-metric traits provide any form of “distance” measure as implied on p. 68.

A general observation is the evident lack of communication among some of the authors. For example, Newell's paper on the archaeology of the site clearly indicates that a skull brought to the project by an unnamed “relic collector” cannot be associated positively with skeleton number 1, and yet in another report (Scott et al., on the craniology and dentition) the skull is analysed and (apparently) unquestionably accepted as representative of that individual. In their discussion of the hair analysis, Toribara and Muhs (p. 105) write: “The lead values for the Barrow bodies seems to be higher than those of the modern arctic inhabitants and comparable to the urban population of Canada,” a rather interesting and significant finding. They indicate that a search for possible lead utensils is in order.

But what I find most astonishing in this volume is the conflicting sex and age determinations for some of the individuals. The following table illustrates these inconsistencies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex and Age Information for the Five Individuals from Utqiagvik, as Presented in Some of the Symposium Papers. Listed by First Authors. (F=female; M=male)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>southern body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>northern body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skeleton 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skeleton 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skeleton 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Newell contributes five pages (p. 35-40) to a very interesting and detailed discussion of the possible social and demographic aspects of the remains. However, if there is some disagreement on ages for the remains (as there is), precision in interpreting social relationships is reduced; and if there is also disagreement regarding the sexes of some of the individuals (as there is), what confidence can we be left with?

The illustrations in the volume are reproduced acceptably, though some of the photographs of the site and of the human remains are confusing and unclear. Also, as mentioned above, there are no photographs or drawings of any of the artifacts beyond their depiction in schematic floor plans. Again, these papers represent a series of symposium contributions and therefore it may not be completely fair to expect final, detailed reports. However, given the singular nature of the site, more comprehensive reporting and analysis of all aspects of the project would have added considerable substance to the volume.

There is little doubt that the volume has some problems, though this observation does not suggest that the papers have no value. On the contrary, the interdisciplinary mix of papers is refreshing and indicative of a necessary (and welcome) direction that this form of archaeological must follow, and it is recommended on this basis. I hope that the complete, definitive report will appear soon.

Owen Beattie  
Assistant Professor  
Department of Anthropology  
University of Alberta  
Edmonton, Alberta, Canada  
T6G 2H4

REBELS, RASCALS & ROYALTY: THE COLOURFUL NORTH  

Rebels, Rascals & Royalty comprises the author's memoirs of an active 40-year association with northern Canada. Shortly before his death in 1978, Leonard Arthur Charles Orgar Hunt — or LACO Hunt, as everyone knew him — completed his recollections of his varied northern career as a Hudson's Bay Company apprentice, post