

1. Mettre le risque et l'imputabilité au centre de la prise de décision;
2. Réorganiser le partage des responsabilités entre le public et le privé;
3. Assurer l'imputabilité par les mesures suivantes : (a) la transparence dans l'information; (b) la spécification de la performance en fonction d'objectifs; (c) la formulation explicite d'un mécanisme de contrôle; (d) la participation du privé au capital de risque.
4. L'utilisation de deux modèles différents d'imputabilité selon le type de gestion de projet : propriété de l'état; (b) construit et opéré par le privé, puis transféré à l'état (p. 138-140).

L'application de ces principes devrait assurer une prise de décision impliquant l'ensemble de la société civile concernée et assurant que les différentes catégories de risques et l'imputabilité à la fois des promoteurs économiques et politiques soient incorporées dans celle-ci. Les auteurs n'expliquent pas de façon générale comment et par qui ces principes—auxquels on ne peut que souscrire on nom d'une meilleure démocratie—pourraient être mis en place et observés. Cependant, un exemple donné en appendice concernant un projet de lien routier entre le Danemark et l'Allemagne (Fehmarn Belt) à travers la mer Baltique et dans lequel les auteurs ont été directement impliqués démontre qu'il est possible de les mettre concrètement en application dans un cas ponctuel.

## Référence

Charest, Paul

1995 *Aboriginal Alternatives to Megaprojects and Their Environmental and Social Impacts*, *Impact Assessment*, 13(4) : 371-386.

**Molly Lee and Gregory A. Reinhardt with a Foreword by Andrew Tooyak, Jr.**, *Eskimo Architecture: Dwelling and Structure in the Early Historic Period*, Fairbanks: University of Alaska Press, 2003, xii + 200 pages.

Reviewer: *Peter C. Dawson*  
*University of Calgary*

In "Eskimo Architecture," Lee and Reinhardt present us with what may be the first real synthesis of Inuit/Eskimo architecture across the circumpolar world, from the time of Frobisher (1577) to the modern era. Although primarily descriptive in nature, this wonderful book systematically examines Inuit and Eskimo house forms from Greenland, the Central Arctic, Northwest Alaska and Bering Strait, Southwest Alaska, Siberia, and the Pacific Eskimo Zone. Within each of these culture areas, the house forms built and used by various groups are categorized and discussed according to seasonal and/or ritual usage. Lee and Reinhardt do an admirable job mining

the ethnographic and ethnohistoric literature for detailed information on construction materials, design principles, and the spatial organization of domestic activities and people. Indeed, their thoroughness makes this book an invaluable source for Arctic archaeologists interested in the evolution of circumpolar architecture.

What immediately becomes apparent as one reads "Eskimo Architecture" is the incredible diversity of house types found across the Arctic. From the stilt houses of King Island in the Bering Strait region to the unique domed tents of the Nunamiut of interior Alaska, Lee and Reinhardt successfully challenge the idea that the architectural ingenuity of circumpolar peoples was restricted to the snow house. While the authors explain that the objective of their book is to describe rather than theorize about Inuit/Eskimo architecture, all regional sections include a discussion of the spatial organization and patterns of housekeeping practised by various groups, as well as the rituals and beliefs associated with each dwelling type. Out of this emerges some interesting information about the social dimensions and cultural meanings affixed to these house forms. For example, Lee and Reinhardt cite Boas' (1904) observation that although various types of houses appear prominently in Central Inuit string games, there is a notable absence of character myths that account for their origins. This distinguishes them from other Native American cultures such as the Navajo, where the origins of the hogan (traditional Navajo house form) are explained in the Navajo house blessing ceremony. One might speculate that the reasons for this lie partially in the impermanent nature of Central Inuit house forms like the snow house.

One of the most intriguing sections of the book deals with special purpose structures used by many Inuit/Eskimo groups for female seclusion during menstruation and childbirth. In reading the descriptions of these unique dwellings, one wonders how many of these structures have been encountered by archaeologists and misinterpreted as childrens' playhouses. Lee and Reinhardt also discuss the use of death huts among some groups to house individuals who were sick and/or terminally ill. Citing accounts by Parry (1812) and Lyon (1824), the authors suggest that the practice of placing a sick individual inside a sealed snow house lit by a single lamp may have been used to impart a quick and human end through carbon monoxide poisoning.

In addition to descriptions of raw materials and construction materials, Lee and Reinhardt touch upon issues relating to energy efficiency, air quality, and lighting. Unfortunately, most of this information is restricted to early European descriptions of the interiors of these dwellings that inevitably rely heavily on such adjectives as "filthy," and "evil-smelling." What does come across, however, is the importance of the lamp as a source of light, heat, and gender identity throughout the circumpolar world.

All through the book, Lee and Reinhardt make excellent use of historic photographs and drawings of the various houses they discuss. They are well captioned, and add substantially to

the textual descriptions provided. In the concluding section, the authors provide a useful comparative synthesis of the architectural features shared by dwellings across the Arctic. This synthesis, coupled with the detailed summaries of houses provided throughout the book, should provide an excellent point of departure for Arctic researchers interested in further exploring the structural and social dimensions of circumpolar architecture. For the lay reader, Lee and Reinhardt have produced a highly informative and enjoyable book that illustrates the important link between house form and culture.

---

**Alison Wylie**, *Thinking from Things: Essays in the Philosophy of Archaeology*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002, 357 pages.

Reviewer: *Erika Evasdottir*  
*Columbia University*

One of the most enduring—and endearing—consequences of the New Archaeology is that it continues to make people think long and hard about the nature of archaeology, the questions it can and cannot answer, and the goals it ought to have in a changing world. Alison Wylie has produced a marvelous catalogue of all the ways in which New Archaeology has made her think over the years. She thereby exemplifies the possibilities engendered by the combination of theory and practice and shows throughout the value of inquiry to the discipline. Students of anthropology as well as archaeology would do well to read this book not so much for the substance, but as an example of how to be a curious, well rounded, and—above all—a thinking archaeologist.

Wylie begins her tale in 1973, in the summer after her first year of undergraduate studies, at the excavations at Fort Walsh, Saskatchewan. Archaeology was then a discipline deep in the throes of the revolutions begun in the late 1960s by the New Archaeologists. In reading her account it struck me how funny, almost quaint, the rhetoric of New Archaeology seems today, more than 30 years on, and how deeply misplaced the urgency of its posturing. Yet nevertheless, Wylie manages also to convey—and to remind those of us who have forgotten—the excitement of feeling like one was truly participating in a revolution. It was a time that made thinking acceptable, fun, and productive. The process of thinking itself became a site of competition and struggle. Archaeology had till then never been (or seen itself as) an oasis for the practical, taciturn, rugged outdoorsy type; perhaps we first needed a 1950s male-oriented “science” of archaeology in order to break down the contempt felt for the effete armchair thinker before we could move on to find creativity, diversity, and even room for the traditional male ego in more complex theories. For being the true proximate cause of the flowering of the many schools of archaeology that followed, Wylie reminds us to feel ungrudging gratitude for even the most acerbic of the New Archaeologists.

To anyone who prefers the polemical statement, Wylie’s writing can be frustrating because it is, and has always been, marked by a calm, even tone that refuses the rhetorics of extremist posturing or the grandiose statement. She refuses to ally herself with any school in particular. She is fundamentally confident in the persistent resistance of the archaeological record to the play of theory, but she is no processualist. Her basic certainty does not stop her from reading newer and more complex theories and reaching to the feminists, the interpretivists, and the critical theorists, but she is certainly no post-processualist. Wylie’s school is the middle road: the work of archaeologists may be more complex than heretofore expected, but it is both possible and worth doing and, most importantly, new knowledge about the past can indeed be accumulated. In Wylie’s mind, everyone and every theory has something important to contribute to archaeology’s common task. While each idea spurs her to consider the situation from a different angle, she never loses her own sense of where she stands on the basic issues.

That sense of certainty combined with the ability to see something important in every theory is a rare and laudable trait. She is therefore the ideal narrator to walk us through the rise and fall of New Archaeology since it is a tale marked by immoderate statements ranging from grand unified theory to the end of the possibility of knowledge itself. Wylie refrains from making fun of words that strike us now as simply silly, but rather shows the truly interesting issues and problems with which the speaker was grappling and explains how the answers are far more complex than their odd vocabulary may suggest. It is as if she is translating a 16th-century English play full of words that mislead because they seem familiar but whose context must be supplied before they can be understood.

Although the first main chapter does set the scene from a chronological standpoint, the book is not a slave to the order of things (pun intended). Wylie breaks the book into topics and weaves in older, already published essays with new commentaries or essays to show the range of issues and answers each topic brings up. Within each topic, the chronology and context of what was going on at any given time is provided and the topics themselves are wholly well researched. What is perhaps the most useful part of the book for a student is that Wylie provides an encyclopedic list of all the major names and actors in each topic and debate. As for a more established archaeologist, to teach “Intro to Archaeological theory” using this book would be a breeze—Wylie not only provides all the relevant citations but gives a short and easily digested version of each person’s position. For that alone, we must be grateful, and the fact that Wylie’s writing is clear, her précis apposite, and her compilation complete is merely an added benefit.

The problems with the book are not Wylie’s; on the whole, I was unimpressed by how ugly the book is and the font choice was frankly annoying and confusing. I found myself searching to figure out which essays were written when (their dates are cleverly disguised) and which was written solely for this book. Are these criticisms too picky? I would say not, since I found