

UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

ARCL 410 | PHIL 419: Evidential Reasoning in Archaeology
Winter 2021 – Term 2

COURSE POLICIES & GUIDELINES

Covid provisions

We will be meeting online for the first two weeks online and, hopefully, in person thereafter. Here are guidelines and recommendations for ensuring safe in-person seminars.

- You are **required to wear a mask** when in class, unless you have a documented exemption.
- UBC expectations for regular attendance in classes and seminars are set out in the [UBC Academic Calendar](#) however, under current conditions, be sure to **stay home if you feel sick**, whatever you suspect the cause may be.
- **Absences from class:** weekly reports on seminar discussions will be posted online so you can stay current with course business; if requested, and if everyone agrees, we can also audio recording and perhaps video capture for class meetings. We will discuss these arrangements at the first seminar meeting on September 13.

Academic Concessions

University of British Columbia policy recognizes several conditions under which you can request an academic concession: medical circumstances, compassionate grounds, and conflicting responsibilities. The options for an academic concession include **in-term concessions** – arrangements to allow you to make up incomplete coursework while the term is in session – as well as **deferred standing concessions** that grant you an extended deadline to complete final coursework or, under exceptional circumstances, late withdrawal from a course. The university-wide policy is outlined [in the UBC calendar](#), and you'll find the College of [Arts policy here](#).

If you are unable to attend class or complete graded assignments due to any of these circumstances get in touch with me as soon as you are aware that you may need an in-term concession. If the adverse circumstances result in you missing final requirement deadlines, contact me immediately so we can make arrangements for **standing deferred** (SD) or **late withdrawal**. See the [Graduate School "deferred standing" guidelines](#) for advice about how to request these concessions.

Grading policy

Assignments for this course will be assessed on the standard UBC [mark-to-grade conversion scheme](#).

Grading policies specific to this course: low stakes assignments – individual discussion posts – will be graded on a 5-point scale.

Percentage (%)	Letter Grade	Check / Check +/-
90-100	A+	√++ 95-100
85-89	A	
80-84	A-	√+ 85-90
76-79	B+	√ 75-85
72-75	B	
68-71	B-	√- 65-75
64-67	C+	
60-63	C	√-- 55-65
55-59	C-	
50-54	D	-

UBC POLICIES & RESOURCES

Academic Integrity

UBC campus-wide policy recognizes “academic honesty” as crucial to the functioning of the university and makes it the responsibility of students to inform themselves of the relevant standards for honest and responsible conduct as members of an academic community. This policy as well as guidelines and procedures related to it are set out in the [Academic Calendar](#). See also policies related to [student conduct and discipline](#).

Plagiarism

One form of academic honesty that is especially important in your role as a student is to ensure that what you turn in for all course assignments is your own original work. The UBC policy on plagiarism is as follows:

Plagiarism, which is intellectual theft, occurs where an individual submits or presents the oral or written work of another person as his or her own. Scholarship quite properly rests upon examining and referring to the thoughts and writings of others. However, when another person's words (i.e. phrases, sentences, or paragraphs), ideas, or entire works are used, the author must be acknowledged in the text, in footnotes, in endnotes, or in another accepted form of academic citation. Where direct quotations are made, they must be clearly delineated (for example, within quotation marks or separately indented). Failure to provide proper attribution is plagiarism because it represents someone else's work as one's own. Plagiarism should not occur in submitted drafts or final works. A student who seeks assistance from a tutor or other scholastic aids must ensure that the work submitted is the student's own. Students are responsible for ensuring that any work submitted does not constitute plagiarism. Students who are in any doubt as to what constitutes plagiarism should consult their instructor before handing in any assignments.

For the details, see the UBC campus-wide policy on [Academic Misconduct](#), where this statement about plagiarism is posted. For advice on avoiding plagiarism, citing sources, and respecting copyright, see the [Academic Integrity webpage on the UBC Learning Commons](#).

Freedom from harassment & discrimination

UBC provides resources to support student learning and to maintain healthy lifestyles but recognizes that sometimes crises arise and so there are additional resources to access including those for survivors of sexual violence. UBC values respect for the person and ideas of all members of the academic community. Harassment and discrimination are not tolerated nor is suppression of academic freedom. UBC provides appropriate accommodation for students with disabilities and for religious and cultural observances. UBC values academic honesty and students are expected to acknowledge the ideas generated by others and to uphold the highest academic standards in all of their actions.

Details of the policies and how to access support are available on the [Senate policies and resources webpage](#).

Accessibility

The University of British Columbia is committed to “removing barriers and providing opportunities to students with a disability, enabling them to access University services, programs and facilities and to be welcomed as participating members of the University community.” This campus-wide policy is posted on the [“academic accommodations”](#) page of the UBC Calendar. For further information or to request accommodation contact:

[Centre for Accessibility](#)
[Student Services – disability programs](#)

Concerns about a course, an instructor, or a grade

If you disagree with a grade you have received or have other concerns about a class, first discuss the matter with your instructor; come to office hours or make an appointment. If the issue is not resolved at that level, contact the head of the department and, beyond that, Arts Academic Advising or the Ombudsman for Students. Here are the relevant links:

Campus-wide policy on grade appeals: [senate guidelines](#)
 Arts Academic Advising: [academic conflict / disagreement with a professor](#)
 Office of the [Ombudsman for Students](#)

University of British Columbia

EVIDENTIAL REASONING IN ARCHAEOLOGY ARCL 410 | PHIL 419

Winter 2021, Term 2 – January-April 2022

Canvas course website: <https://canvas.ubc.ca/courses/88947>

Instructor: Professor Alison Wylie

Email: alison.wylie@ubc.ca

Class meetings: M/W 4:00-5:30 pm

Office hours: Tu 2:30-4:30 pm, [Canvas Zoom](#)

online: [Canvas Zoom](#) | in person: BUCH D-205

Office: BUCH E-276 | (604) 822-6574

Land Acknowledgement

UBC's Point Grey Campus is located on the traditional, ancestral, and unceded territory of the xwməθkwəyəm (Musqueam) people. The land on which it is situated has always been a place of learning for the Musqueam people, who for millennia have passed on their culture, history, and traditions from one generation to the next on this site.

COURSE OVERVIEW

What counts as evidence, and what are best practices for working with archaeological evidence? In this seminar we will focus on philosophical issues raised by archaeologists' reliance on "trace evidence" and by evolving traditions of collaborative and Indigenous-led archaeology. Some insist that a commitment to collaborative practice undermines the integrity of archaeological inquiry; we'll take a case-based approach to building a philosophical framework for understanding these practices and assessing such claims.

We begin with a selection of readings on the nature and status of trace evidence, analogical reasoning, and inference to the best explanation, juxtaposing philosophical and archaeological literature on these topics. Texts will include selections from *Evidential Reasoning in Archaeology* (Chapman & Wylie 2015) and *Rock, Bone and Ruin* (Currie 2018), as well as discussions of the positivist ambitions of the "New Archaeology" and representative examples of the philosophy of science that inspired them.

We then turn to critical histories of settler-colonial archaeology, and a selection of readings that represent ongoing debate about what's required to "decolonize" archaeology. They will include selections from *These Mysterious People: Shaping History and Archaeology in a Northwest Coast Community* (Roy 2016), *Transforming Archaeology: Activist Practices and Prospects* (Atalay, Clauss, McGuire & Welch 2014), and *A Global Dialogue on Collaborative Archaeology* (Clark & Horning 2019), as well as recent articles on the relationship between "traditional knowledge, archaeological evidence, and other ways of knowing," as Nicholas & Markey put it (2015).

Format: This course will be run as a seminar with the emphasis on in-class discussion. Requirements include regular reading response posts, presentations, and the option of writing a single research paper or two shorter essays. Students from archaeology, anthropology, CNERS, history, and any of the cognate fields of science studies are welcome. Graduate students who prefer to take this course for 500-level credit should contact the instructor to make the necessary arrangements before registration closes.

Prerequisites: There are no formal prerequisites for this seminar but it is recommended that you have at least one prior course in archaeology and/or in philosophy of science.

Texts: Assigned readings are available online through Canvas course files & Library Online Reserves.

Learning objectives: When you have completed this course you should be able to:

- Identify and assess philosophical assumptions about evidence that are influential in archaeology;
- Critically assess claims based on archaeological evidence;
- Constructively engage current debates about the need for Indigenous-led archaeology and the norms of practice that should inform community-based collaborative archaeology.

WEEKLY READING SCHEDULE

Background reading: these are optional, recommendations to pursue if you're interested in a particular topic, and useful background for essays and seminar presentations.

Required discussion post: these are responses to set questions in the second and final weeks of the term.

Reading key: ERA = R. Chapman and A. Wylie (2016) *Evidential Reasoning in Archaeology*

TA = S. Atalay, L. R. Clauss, R. H. McGuire & J. R. Welch, eds (2014) *Transforming Archaeology*

I. Introduction to the course

Week 1: January 10 and 12

Monday: Introductions

Wednesday: ERA, "The Paradox of Material Evidence" (pp. 1-14)

Background: Routledge (1995) "For the Sake of Argument" (pp. 41-49)

Simons, Martindale, and Wylie (2021) "Bearing Witness" (pp. 21-31)

II. Evidential reasoning: archaeological and philosophical perspectives

Week 2: January 17 and 19

Monday: Framing the issues in archaeological terms

- ERA, "Archaeological Evidence in Question" (pp. 15-53)

Background: Smith, M. A. (1955) "The Limitations of Inference in Archaeology" (pp. 1-7)

Binford, L. R. (1962) "Archaeology as Anthropology" (pp. 217-225)

Clarke, D. L. (1973) "Archaeology: The Loss of Innocence" (pp. 6-18)

Required discussion post: What's the most hotly debated issue about evidence/evidential reasoning that concerns you? What's at stake, and why does it matter?

Wednesday: A Kuhnian perspective on the "New Archaeology"

- Schuyler, R. L. (1971) "History of American Archaeology" (pp. 383-409)

- Flannery, K. V. (1967) "Culture History v. Cultural Process" (pp. 119-122)

Background: Wylie, A. (2002) "How New is the New Archaeology?" (pp. 25-41)

Meltzer (1979) "Paradigms and the Nature of Change in American Archaeology" (pp. 644-657)

Week 3: January 24 and 26

Monday: "Received View" philosophy of science

- Godfrey-Smith, P. (2003) *Theory and Reality*: "Logic Plus Empiricism," and "Induction, Deduction, Confirmation" (pp. 19-37 and 40-46)

Background: Hempel, C. G. (1942/1965) "The Function of General Laws in History" (pp. 231-243)

Wednesday: Counter-arguments

- Daston, L. (1992) "Objectivity and the Escape from Perspective" (pp. 597- 618)

Background: Toulmin, S. E. (1958) *The Uses of Argument*, "The Layout of Arguments" (pp. 87-118)

Week 4: January 31 and February 2

Monday: Rethinking philosophy of the historical sciences

- Currie, A. (2018) "Over and Under" and "Ripples" (pp. 85-136)

Wednesday: Inference to the best explanation

- Fogelin, L. (2007) "Inference to the Best Explanation" (603-625)

Background: Smith, B. D. (1977) "Archaeological Inference and Inductive Confirmation" (598-617)

Week 5: February 7 and 9

Monday: Capturing data

- Latour, B. (1999) *Pandora's Hope*, "Circulating Reference" (pp. 24-79)

Wednesday: Data as a relational construct

- Hodder, I. (1997) "Always Momentary, Fluid and Flexible" (pp. 691-700)

- ERA "Working With Old Evidence" (pp. 93-142)

Background: Leonelli (2015) "What Counts as Scientific Data? A Relational Framework" (pp. 810-821)

Chang, H. (2004) "Keeping the Fixed Points Fixed" (pp. 39-53)

Boozer, A. (2015) "The Tyranny of Typologies" (pp. 92-109)

Week 6: February 14 and 16

Monday: Triangulation and trading zones

- ERA, "External Resources: Archaeology as a Trading Zone" (pp. 143-201)
- Background:* Hacking, I. (1981), "Do We See Through a Microscope?" (pp. 305-322)

Wednesday: Analogical reasoning

- Currie, A. (2018) "Exquisite Corpse: Historicity and Analogy" (pp. 203-228)
- Background:* Wylie (2002) "The Reaction Against Analogy" (pp. 136-153)
- Bartha, P. (2010) *By Parallel Reasoning*, "Analogical Arguments" (pp. 1-33)

Reading week: February 21-25

III. Community-based collaborative practice

Week 7: February 28 and March 2

Monday: Reflexivity

- ERA, "Reflexivity Made Concrete" (pp. 201-215)
 - Kochan, J. (2015) "Objective Styles in Northern Field Science" (pp. 1-23)
- Background:* Nadasdy, P. 2005. "The Anti-Politics of TEK: The Institutionalization of Co-Management Discourse and Practice" (pp. 215-52)

Wednesday: Pluralism in theory and in practice

- Atalay (2006) "Indigenous Archaeology as Decolonizing Practice" (pp. 280-310)
- Background:* Wylie, A. (2015) "A Plurality of Pluralisms: Collaborative Practice" (pp. 189-210)

First short essay due: midnight, Friday, March 4

Week 8: March 7 and 9

Monday: Transforming Archaeology

- TA, Atalay, S., L. R. Clauss, R. H. McGuire & J. R. Welch "Transforming Archaeology" (pp. 7-28)

Wednesday: choose one of the following chapters in TA

- Atalay, S. (2014) "Positivism, Objectivism and Rigor in Activist Archaeology" (pp. 45-60)
- Welch, J. R. & N. Ferris (2014) "We Have Met the Enemy and It Is Us" (pp. 91-114)
- Ferguson, T.J. (2014) "Archaeologists as Activists, Advocates, Expert Witnesses" (pp. 239-254)

Week 9: March 14 and 16

Monday: Contention about community-based collaborative archaeology

- La Salle, M. & R. M. Hutchings (2016) "What Makes Us Squirm" (pp. 164-180)
- Martindale, A. *et al.* (2016) "Archaeology as Partnerships in Practice: A Reply" (pp. 181-204)

Wednesday: Appraisals

- Colwell-Chanthaphonh, C. & T.J. Ferguson (2008) "The Collaborative Continuum" (pp. 1-32)
- Background:* Wylie (2019) "Crossing a Threshold: Collaborative Archaeology" (pp. 570-587)

Long essay abstract due: midnight, Friday, March 18

Week 10: March 21 and 23

Monday: Contention about oral histories

- Henige, D. (2019) "Oral Narratives of the First Nations of British Columbia" (pp. 54-77)
- Menzies, C. and A. Martindale (2019) "Reply to David Henige" (pp. 78-107)

Wednesday: Genealogies of colonial practice in archaeology

- Roy, S. (2006) "Who Were These Mysterious People: C sna:m, the Marpole Midden, and the Dispossession of Aboriginal Lands in British Columbia" (67-95)

Background: Ritchie, P. M. & R. Hatoum (2020) "Creation and Legacy of Silences in Anthropological Traditions: Coast Salish Genealogy, Leadership, Territoriality" (pp. 1-26)

Week 11: March 28 and 30

Monday: Constructionism

- Raibmon, P. (2008) "Unmaking Native Space" (pp. 56-85)

Background: Hacking, I. (1999) *The Social Construction of What?*, "Why Ask What?" (pp. 1-14, 19-24)

Wednesday: What's at stake

- Tuck, E. and K. W. Yang (2012) "Decolonization is Not a Metaphor" (pp. 1-40)

Background: Coulthard (2014) *Red Skin, White Masks*, "Seeing Red" (pp. 105-130)

Week 12: April 4 and 6

Monday: The ethics and politics of knowledge claims

- Gauvreau, A, and D. McLaren (2016) "Stratigraphy and Storytelling" (pp. 303–25)

- Gero (2007) "Honoring Ambiguity/Problematizing Certitude" (pp. 311-327)

Background: Nicholas & Markey (2015) "Traditional Knowledge, Archaeological Evidence, Other Ways of Knowing" (pp. 287-307)

Havstad, J. (2021) "Sensational Science, Archaic Hominin Genetics, and Amplified Inductive Risk" (1-26)

Wednesday: Wrap-up

Required discussion post: Here are two questions for discussion in the final seminar meeting; focus on one or the other or consider how they're connected.

- Revisit your answer to the question posed at the beginning of terms: what do you now understand to be the crucial issue(s) raised by contention about evidence in archaeology or other historical science?
- What do you see as the most significant challenge(s) faced by advocates of collaborative practice in archaeology, and how are they best addressed?

Second short essay due: midnight, Friday, April 15

Final long essay due: midnight, Friday, April 22

REQUIREMENTS

This is a reading-intensive seminar. The requirements emphasize close analysis of the assigned readings and active engagement with them. In addition to reading responses and an in-class presentation, your major assignment for this course either a single thesis-driven final essay or two shorter essays. Detailed guidelines for each of these assignments will be posted on the Canvas course website; what follows is an overview of requirements and the grade distribution.

Seminar participation

Active, informed participation in seminar discussion is an essential component of the course.

- **10% of the final grade**

Seminar presentations

Presentation groups will be responsible for initiating seminar discussion in one class meeting a week, beginning in Week 3. Plan to give a 15-20 minute analytic (rather than descriptive) presentation on an issue raised by the assigned reading(s) that you would like to discuss with the seminar group as a whole. This is an opportunity to raise questions about key terms or concepts and about the context of debate to which authors are responding, as well as to assess the claims they make. It is also an opportunity to put these terms and concepts to work in the analysis of a concrete example drawn from your own areas of interest and/or expertise.

- The presentation schedule will be finalized in the second week of classes; sign yourself into a presentation group through the “people” tab on Canvas by **Friday, January 21**.
- Each presentation group is required to **pre-circulate a short handout of roughly one page** outlining the focal issues and example(s) you will discuss by **9:00 am on the morning of your presentation**.
- **20% of the final grade**

Reading Responses

Everyone is required to post at least **five reading responses** during the quarter. These should be roughly a page long, and should focus on a particular issue, concept, or argument in the assigned readings that you find intriguing, problematic, or in need of explication. As with the seminar presentations, raise questions and introduce examples you would like to discuss in the seminar.

- Everyone is required to post a response to set questions in Week 2 and Week 12.
- Choose **any three other weeks except the one in which you give your in-class presentation**.
- Posts are due by **9:00 am on the morning** of the seminar in which the reading(s) you choose will be discussed.
- Be sure to read one another’s posts and come to class prepared to discuss them; **online comments are welcome!**
- **25% of the final grade**

Term paper(s)

There are two essay-writing options for this course:

1) Two essay option: a short expository/analytic essay on a topic or theme central to each of the two major sections of the course.

- Your papers should each be **6 to 7 pages** long (1500-1750 words).
- They are due online by **midnight on March 4 and April 15**.
- **45% of the final grade:** 20% for the first essay and 25% for the second.

2) Single essay option: a thesis-driven essay in which you develop case-based analysis of what does or should count as norms for archaeological practice related to the focal themes of the course: evidential reasoning and/or collaborative practice.

- Your paper should be **12 to 15 pages** long (3000-3750 words).
- One-page **abstracts** are due online by **midnight on Friday, March 18**.
- Your final paper is due online by **midnight on Friday, April 22**.
- **45% of the final grade:** abstracts will count for 5%; final essays for 40%.

COURSE POLICIES AND GUIDELINES

Please see the “**UBC Policies and Course Guidelines**” page posted on Canvas for a more detailed summary of campus-wide policies on academic conduct and concessions, and course-specific policies on grading, along with links to relevant UBC offices and resources.

Mandatory syllabus statement about UBC’s values and policies

UBC provides resources to support student learning and to maintain healthy lifestyles but recognizes that sometimes crises arise and so there are additional resources to access including those for survivors of sexual violence. UBC values respect for the person and ideas of all members of the academic community. Harassment and discrimination are not tolerated nor is suppression of academic freedom. UBC provides appropriate accommodation for students with disabilities and for religious and cultural observances. UBC values academic honesty and students are expected to acknowledge the ideas generated by others and to uphold the highest academic standards in all of their actions.

Policies on late assignments and deferred standing.

- *Late assignments:* Please contact the instructor as soon as you know that you may be submitting an assignment late or may need to make up a missed assignment within the timeframe of the term. Arts Academic Advising is a valuable resource if you are an undergraduate in the College of Arts; see their website for a “self-declaration form” that you can use to arrange in-term concessions.
- *Deferred standing:* If you anticipate that you will not be able to complete the course requirements by the end of the examination period, **April 27**, you will need to apply for “deferred standing.” This must be adjudicated by Arts Academic Advising, or the Graduate School, and will be granted only in cases covered by the UBC “academic concessions” policy: medical circumstances, compassionate grounds, or conflicting responsibilities. Contact the instructor as soon as you know you may need an academic concession that extends beyond the end of the term.

Grading policies

Assignments will be assessed on the standard UBC mark-to-grade conversion scheme outlined in the UBC Calendar: <http://www.calendar.ubc.ca/vancouver/index.cfm?tree=3,42,96,0#217>

Specific to this course: low stakes assignments – individual discussion posts – will be graded on a 5-point scale

Percentage (%)	Letter Grade	Check / Check +/-
90-100	A+	√++ 95-100
85-89	A	√+ 85-90
80-84	A-	
76-79	B+	√ 75-85
72-75	B	
68-71	B-	√- 65-75
64-67	C+	
60-63	C	√-- 55-65
55-59	C-	
50-54	D	-