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ABSTRACT The new concept of “secondary provenance” is examined through a case study of Ac ko mok ki’s map, one of the most famous from the collection of the Hudson’s Bay Company Archives. This map is reinterpreted as an evolving text rather than as an objective record. In deconstructing this map, new possibilities of interpretation arise in order to better understand the map and its provenance. These interpretations are also affected by the impact of “transmedia shifts” on the provenance of the record as this map has been reproduced in books and digitized on the Internet. As the map experiences a shift from one technology to another, its provenance acquires another layer – a “secondary provenance.”

A document is more than its subject content and the context of its original creation. Throughout its life cycle, it continually evolves, acquiring additional meanings and layers, even after crossing the archival threshold. As such, archivists need to read documents against the grain to search for the deeper contexts of their meaning. Historical geographer J.B. Harley called on his profession to redefine the map as a representation of power as much as it is a representation of geography.¹ Hugh Taylor was one of the first theorists to call on archivists to transform their thinking in this manner.² While neither had any direct contact with each other, their work has been very influential in their

respective fields. In recent years, a growing number of writers in archival studies have developed Taylor’s and Harley’s ideas.

Through an archival interpretation of Ac ko mok ki’s map (see Figure 1),

3 In one of Taylor’s articles, “Recycling the Past: The Archivist in the Age of Ecology,” Archivaria 35 (Spring 1993), pp. 203-13, footnote 27, he acknowledges Ed Dahl of the (then) National Archives of Canada for drawing Taylor’s attention to Harley’s article “Text and Contexts in the Interpretation of Early Maps.” Since Taylor became aware of Harley’s work a couple of years after Harley’s death, the two men would not have had the chance to exchange correspondence.

4 See Joan M. Schwartz, “‘Records of Simple Truth and Precision’: Photography, Archives, and the Illusion of Control,” Archivaria 50 (Fall 2000), pp. 1-40. For supportive analyses of the early comments of Taylor and Harley, see the two double-length thematic issues of Archival Science 2, nos. 1-2, and 3-4 (2002) on “Archives, Records, and Power,” edited by Joan M. Schwartz and Terry Cook, which contain fifteen essays critiquing traditional approaches across all archival functions. See also Terry Cook, “Fashionable Nonsense or Professional Rebirth: Postmodernism and the Practice of Archives,” Archivaria 51 (Spring 2001), p. 20, note 14, for an extensive listing of similar writing.
this article illustrates the need for archivists to step away from the “dreary emphasis on physical description” and instead “read between the lines of the map” in order to “interrogate the hidden agendas of cartography.” By going beyond the “snapshot of information” in the finding aid to discern the deeper meaning or context of Ac ko mok ki’s map, this interpretation begins in the margins of the text – with the record’s “silences and contradictions that challenge the apparent honesty of the image.” A deconstruction of Ac ko mok ki’s map shows additional layers of context – secondary provenance. By recording the results of such research in their descriptive tools, archivists will enhance the use of collections, the possibilities for researchers, and the understanding of history’s various pasts.

**Ac ko mok ki’s Map as Text: Deconstructing the Map**

In 1801, Hudson’s Bay Company (HBC) surveyor and fur trader Peter Fidler drafted a map of the Siksika (Blackfoot) territory from information that he received from Siksika chief Ac ko mok ki. This map contains the names and locations of various Aboriginal nations and major rivers and landforms in the area surrounding Chesterfield House, the HBC post where Fidler was in charge. Fidler relied upon Ac ko mok ki for valuable knowledge of physical and human geography. He also collected word lists in the Atsina, Shoshoni and Crow languages, and gathered information on the social norms of these First Nations. Ac ko mok ki’s map shows an area that had been little explored by fur traders and was therefore the first piece of information about the area available to Europeans until Lewis and Clark’s famous expedition in 1804–06. Fidler sent the original map to the Hudson’s Bay Company’s head office in London. The map was then forwarded to British cartographer Aaron Arrowsmith for incorporation into his updated map of North America. As a result, Arrowsmith’s 1802 map of North America helped to guide Lewis and Clark’s 1804–06 expedition. Ac ko mok ki’s map has been subsequently published in several forms, including reprints in books and more recently, digitized images on various Web sites, and widely used by researchers and historians over the last century. Ac ko mok ki’s map is a unique record which depicts the Siksika cartographic conventions, provides a census of the First Nations living in the area, and had a significant role in the exploration of the upper Missouri River basin. The use and re-use of this map has given it particular value, and consequently, it has been the subject of several publications relating to the history of the fur trade, and Canadian and American history.

6 Harley, “Deconstructing the Map,” p. 3.
7 While the original has not survived, the copy commonly known as Ac ko mok ki’s map is located in the Archives of Manitoba, Hudson’s Bay Company Archives.
Researchers’ initial impressions of most records are formed by the description in the finding aid. In the case of Ac ko mok ki’s map, the finding aid attributes authorship to Peter Fidler. The map is dated and the title taken from an inscription on the actual document: “An Indian Map of the Different Tribes that inhabit on the East & West Side on the Rocky Mountains with all the rivers & other remarkbl[e] places, also the number of Tents etc. Drawn by the Feather[s] or Ac ko mok ki – a Black foot [sic] chief – 7th Feby. 1801 – reduced ¼ from the Original Size – by Peter Fidler.” The finding aid further describes the record as a map consisting of ink and paper mounted on linen, with no scale, measuring 37 by 47 centimetres or 14½ by 18½ inches. The formal description, aside from the title, states the longitude and latitude of the map: “Lat. 45–60N Long 110–130W.” On the second page of this finding aid is an addendum: “Lengthy explanations detailing the various tribes noted on the map (names, number of tents; Explains the number of days walk between different features[.])” In the notes section (enclosures in markings, etc.), further description of the map’s contents is listed. The archivist has added: “Identifies river systems: Ot te netha, or Sheep; Cwoosse net cha, or Red Deers; Bay in net cha, or Pearl; In ne thaw oro, or Warm Water; Bep caw ow, large; oo ne ceese; Na tootoo kse; Pun na kieks, or Little; Moo-koo wans; Bad; Red Deer; O mok kat I, or Big; Red Deer or [c]unna kow. Identifies HBC post: Chesterfield House.”

In addition to this information, a selected bibliography is included.

While the finding aid provides detailed information on the map’s physical attributes, surface markings and wording, as well as the geographical features it depicts, there is little information on context and provenance. In this manner, the finding aid serves to present the map as an objective, scientific, and technological artifact, creating the illusion of a non-problematic representation of geophysical realities. But as Terry Cook points out, maps also serve as a “skillful representation of those facts [used] to support a specific political program.” The use of colours, the suppression of some details, and the highlighting of others, the placement of continents, the projection chosen, for example, can be deliberate manipulations to make the reader share the mapmaker’s worldview.

Similarly, J.B. Harley observed that while maps are constructed with symbols to communicate geographic information, they “are related to values, such

8 Ala Rekruit, Archives of Manitoba Preservation Services Chief, removed the linen overlay prior to the map being sent on exhibition in June 2003.
9 Archives of Manitoba, Hudson’s Bay Company Archives map collection finding aid, Ac ko mok ki’s map (HBCA G.1/25).
as those of ethnicity, politics, religion, or social class ... embedded in the map-producing society at large." He applies the rule of ethnocentricity and rules of social order to develop a greater understanding of maps. The rule of ethnocentricity follows the principle that the cartographer places his own territory at the centre of his cosmography or world map; the rules of social order focus on the smaller codes and spaces of cartographic transcription. Although Harley applies the rule of ethnocentricity as a kind of "subliminal geometry" in which the creator adds meaning to the representation by centering specific symbols, Akoko mok’s map reflects a manipulation of this rule in a significant way. Fidler used few symbols, except for numbers and letters that are incorporated into the legend. Thus, the few symbols that do appear have increased significance even though they are scattered across the page. On this particular map, Fidler used two types of symbols. The first denotes the hills and height of land. For these, Fidler relied on the standardized notation for the height of land as AAM, and hills as nnnn. These symbols are situated to indicate the geographical feature of the corresponding location.

The second type of symbol is used to highlight the location of the Chesterfield House, where Akoko mok had met Peter Fidler and had drawn the map. According to Harley and his rule of ethnocentricity, this symbol should be in the centre of the map. Yet it is not. Chesterfield House is located along the centre horizontal fold line at the right edge of the map. In fact, the symbol and words “Chesterfield House” appear to run off the edge of the paper. Nonetheless, the rule still applies because there are no other symbols on the map. The symbol for Chesterfield House, consisting of a side profile of a three-dimensional house with a flag, is unique and therefore, a representation of power. In addition, it is located centrally between the top and bottom of the map. The power of this symbol increases ever more when compared with the Aboriginal groups who are randomly represented by numbers and letters. Only the Hudson’s Bay Company post and geographical features are represented through artistic symbols, testifying to and reinforcing European domination of Aboriginal peoples.

The arbitrariness of the numbers and letters assigned to the Aboriginal peoples highlights Harley’s second principle of the rules of social order. These rules focus on the smaller codes and spaces of cartographic transcription. The text of the map is, as Harley argues, “as much a commentary on the social structure of a particular nation or place as it is on its topography.”

12 Ibid., p. 6.
13 For a more in-depth analysis of European concepts of land and cultural meanings of conquest, see Elizabeth Vibert, Traders’ Tales (Norman, OK, 1997), chapter 3, “Landscaping the Wilds: Traders Imagine the Plateau.”
features such as churches and mansions are represented with visible symbols, whereas private, or commonplace, human landscapes "will have the right only to the general and common representation of an arbitrary and institutional sign, the poorest, the most elementary ... of geometric elements; the point identically reproduced in bulk."  

Those Aboriginal groups represented on Ac ko mok ki's map as a number or letter are subordinated to the Hudson's Bay Company post that has its own clear and unique sign.

In addition, by ignoring the individuality of particular Aboriginal groups, Peter Fidler (or perhaps Ac ko mok ki, who provided the information) suppressed these groups' heterogeneity. At the same time, the map includes only select Aboriginal groups. This enforces the perception that those not represented on the map either do not exist or are not worthy of mention. The text is also intensely metaphorical – Chesterfield House is drawn on the map, and the Aboriginal peoples are represented by a single common mark. In short, the map is about Chesterfield House rather than human and physical geography.

Viewed in this light, Ac ko mok ki's map becomes an articulation of European values and rights. Harley's work shows that we need to "question the orthodox definition of maps as images of the world."

Benedict Anderson, in his very influential book *Imagined Communities*, provides another means of examining Ac ko mok ki's map. He argues that nationalism, or in this case, European power, was constructed and then institutionalized through three means: the census, the map, and the museum. Together, these "profoundly shaped the way in which the colonial state imagined its dominion – the nature of the human beings it ruled, the geography of its domain, and the legitimacy of its ancestry." Anderson's work has particu-

---

15 Ibid., p. 7.
17 When viewed as cultural texts, maps contain social relations that construct a "mythic geography" of points of interest and societal values, in which the cartographer codifies and legitimates the ethnocentricity of, in the case of Ac ko mok ki's map, the Hudson's Bay Company. Cook's analysis of Parkin's map suggests how the importance of imperial power legitimized the political and socio-cultural power of the British Empire. Also, Thomas Richards points out that information on a map is constructed and construed to support the will of imperialist nations. In this sense, the use of symbolism reinforces imperial ideology. Imperial powers act to make the mythic geography and societal values real. See Thomas Richards, *The Imperial Archive: Knowledge and the Fantasy of Empire* (London, 1993).
20 Ibid., p. 164.
lar relevance because Ac ko mok ki’s map is simultaneously a census and a map. The names and affiliations used in censuses are European constructs, and not based upon Aboriginal (indigenous) identities. Similar to the census, maps were tools that artificially located, or demarcated, Aboriginal nations. Ac ko mok ki’s map represents the landscape as a vacant space available for explorers, traders, and surveyors to take possession. Aboriginal peoples listed in the census and residing in the geopolitical boundaries of the map take shape within the ideology of European hegemony and power. Like Harley, Anderson argues that maps are models for what they purport to represent, and in this sense create imagined communities, that is, communities as those holding power – and making and keeping records – want them to be. In naming and counting indigenous nations, Peter Fidler and Ac ko mok ki create a particular representation of Siksika territory.

Transmedia Shifts: Publication and Digitization of Ac ko mok ki’s Map

The Hudson’s Bay Company Archives contains one of the largest collections of North American Aboriginal maps in the world, of which Peter Fidler recorded two-thirds. Ac ko mok ki’s map has been the subject of much ethnographic and geographical research, and consequently, has been reprinted in several publications as well as digitized on various Web sites. With each “transmedia shift,” the provenance of the record has shifted or acquired new layers of meaning. Archivists need to re-examine the record in light of many possible provenances, instead of the concept of a unique provenance derived from the older theories of Samuel Muller, Johan Feith and Robert Fruin, and early- and mid-twentieth century archivists Sir Hilary Jenkinson and T.R.

21 Anderson goes one step further in critically analyzing the relationship of European power and the census. He argues that the “real innovation of the census-takers ... [was in] their systematic quantification” which lead to subsequent uses of information. Accordingly, Fidler’s enumerations of the Siksika also aided the Hudson’s Bay Company’s financial goals relating to its control of the fur trade by locating Aboriginal nations on the map. Such subsequent use by the Company is important in understanding the broader context and provenance of Ac ko mok ki’s map. See Anderson, Imagined Communities, p. 168 (emphasis in original).

22 Ibid., p. 173.

23 See also Richards, The Imperial Archive.


25 Taylor’s reference to transmedia shifts encourages archivists to rethink the electronic record as the same image and text consuming less space and moving faster through space and time. This requires a new paradigm of understanding how organizational culture utilizes information that is available from all directions and levels, rather than being fixed and dispersed through chains of force or command. See Taylor, “Transformation in the Archives.”
Schellenberg. The givens of “fonds” and “original order” provide the satisfaction of an appearance of a right answer; however, through a postmodern lens, a description “is liable to be more idiosyncratic, reflecting one possible arrangement of the collection, and perhaps a distorted arrangement at that.”

All descriptions and arrangements begin with the record, defined as context, structure, and content. This combination describes the circumstances of creation and use of the record (its context), the physical, or extrinsic, qualities and formulaic layout (structure), and the information contained within the record or its intrinsic qualities (content). Overall, the content remains relatively constant; however, with each transmedia shift new meanings or layers are added to the record’s context and structure, in a continual evolution of the history of the record, even after it is “fixed” in archival custody. In turn, the record is reinterpreted to suit the new media and that author’s wishes.

With electronic media (and digital reproductions), or even many hard-copy reproductions as well, archivists are unable to control the record or its pattern of presentation. Archivists must transform their ideology of the record to accommodate the ever-changing digital world. In classifying the shifting patterns of presentation, archivists create new information, which in turn, accumulates (at least ideally) with the construction of the ever-evolving finding aid.

In the finding aid for Ac ko mok ki’s map, there is very little information on the map’s original context. In essence, on-line researchers, utilizing this finding aid, have little or no understanding about the provenance and the meanings related to the text of the map. When viewed, then, for the first time in a book or on a Web site, the researcher is only exposed to the context presented in that book or Web site, not necessarily to the connection of the record to its creator, the creating processes, and the original uses by that or successor creators. The connection between the creator and these contemporary processes and uses, reflects the provenancial influences. Although the “original” provenance remains with the creator of the origin, I would add that in many cases this original provenance is forgotten or buried, replaced by another set of circumstances, or a “secondary provenance.” The successor creators’ and later authors’ reuses of the record become important dimensions of the record’s context, but this is often overlooked in defining an enlarged, more nuanced view of provenance.

At one time, Ac ko mok ki’s map would only have been accessible to

26 Ibid., p. 12.
researchers in the Hudson’s Bay Company Archives reading room, and later, available as a reproduction in publications or on microfilm. The ephemeral nature of these media shifts has transformed the map’s meanings through caption and context. With the explosion of digitization, the archivist is finding it more difficult “in securing the ‘original,’ as oral and scribal modes of input and manipulation via terminals of microcomputers erode the sanctity of the authorized, canonical text and we return to a pre-Gutenberg environment.” Taylor cautions archivists that the “original” may not be so important in this age where authority is gained from being printed, published, and distributed – and in that, authority may have little in common with truth, or with authenticity as classically conceived by archivists. However, remembering Marshall McLuhan’s “the medium is the message,” archivists need to understand better the link between recording media (the “original” record) and the subsequent history of its communication. Knowledge is disseminated to people not by the record alone, but by its communication processes, yet that very communication subtly alters the record. As Taylor points out, information is represented in the media, “which takes into account the transmedia shifts from speech to writing or writing to automation with its accompaniment of altered perceptions” in terms of orality, printed symbols, or bits and bytes of the computer age.

Historians, archivists, and other scholars have described Ac ko mok ki’s map in several articles and books; however, only recently has the map been critically analyzed. Although the following examples are not exhaustive of the material relating to Ac ko mok ki’s map, they do present some of the highlights presented in academic literature. One of the earliest articles regarding the map first appeared in The Beaver in 1977. Wayne Moodie and Barry Kaye wrote a short exposé on the provenance of the document. In addition, the article published Fidler’s entire letter to the Governor and Company, which contains references to the map and its importance in the exploration of the upper Missouri River basin and Rocky Mountain areas. Nearly ten years later, the Keeper of the Hudson’s Bay Company Archives, Judith Hudson Beattie, presented a paper focussing on the possible origin of the Fall (Siksika) Indian maps (of which Ac ko mok ki’s map is one). Following this presentation, she published an article, “Indian Maps in the Hudson’s Bay Company Archives: A Comparison of Five Area Maps Recorded by Peter Fidler, 1801–1802.” Again, Beattie provides a brief description of the maps, but does not offer an

29 Ibid., pp. 16–17.
30 Ibid., p. 17.
31 Ibid., p. 18.
analysis based on critical theory. Richard I. Ruggles published a historical commentary in 1991 on the maps created by Hudson's Bay Company employees. In regard to Ac ko mok ki's map, Ruggles does provide additional historical information; unfortunately, it remains superficial. The book did include one of the better reproductions of Ac ko mok ki's map.34

Theodore Binnema has argued more recently that the map needs to be reinterpreted in light of Aboriginal, particularly Siksika, values and rights. He deconstructs the map, like Harley, to enhance "our understanding of how the text works as an instrument operating on social reality."35 According to Binnema, "knowledge of the individuals and societies that produced the maps, of the contexts in which the maps were produced, and of the landscapes portrayed in the maps should help us interpret them."36 While Harley warns us that the map is not a mirror of nature, Binnema makes the assumption that the map is "scientifically" accurate (in terms of the Siksika worldview), and any inaccuracies are rooted in European inability to understand Siksika cartographic conventions.37 Binnema further argues that Ac ko mok ki was successful in conveying cartographic information through the process of selection to ensure the maximum effectiveness in communication.38 Focussing on the assumptions of Arrowsmith, as well as historical geographers Wayne Moody and Barry Kaye, Binnema argues that Ac ko mok ki's map is geographically accurate and contained all the information needed to navigate the northwestern plains.39 As Binnema points out in another article: "The remarkable accu-

35 Theodore Binnema, "How Does a Map Mean? Old Swan's Map of 1801 and the Blackfoot World," in Theodore Binnema, Gerhard J. Ens, and R.C. MacLeod, eds., From Rupert's Land to Canada: Essays in Honour of John E. Foster (Edmonton, 2001). Although these are Harley's words, Binnema's approach to Ac ko mok ki's map is an excellent example.
36 Ibid., p. 208.
37 Like Binnema, historical geographer Malcolm Lewis presents an argument regarding the problematic interpretations of Aboriginal historical cartographic conventions, and how these misinterpretations were reproduced as scientific inaccuracies in European maps. Aboriginal cartographers "frequently failed to distinguish on their maps between river courses, portages, and trails, which to them were merely parts of a single communication network." Instead, they chose to highlight significant strategic routes, even though this meant representing small rivers and minor mountains as equal to major rivers or noteworthy mountains (as determined by European cartographers). These markers served to communicate routes rather than ensure topographic accuracy. See G. Malcolm Lewis, "Indian Maps: Their Place in the History of Plains Cartography," in Frederick C. Luebke, Frances W. Kaye, and Gary E. Moulton, eds., Mapping the North American Plains: Essays in the History of Cartography (Norman, OK, 1987), pp. 63–80.
racy of the maps shows that these Siksika did not hesitate to provide the traders with a working knowledge of the geography of the region.\textsuperscript{40} The use of topographical features presented concrete reference lines or points, much like Harley’s mirror of nature. On the other hand, Ac ko mok ki’s map lacked the detail found in European maps to depict the size and importance of rivers by the thickness of the representational line. Nonetheless, Siksika convention avoided unnecessary information while allowing for the flexibility of presenting the most appropriate travel directions. Ac ko mok ki incorporated Aboriginal points of interest that highlighted significant geographical features to navigating the region. In adopting an Aboriginal worldview to understand its cultural meanings, Binnema deconstructs the map to illustrate how Aboriginal cartography operates on a two-dimensional document.

Ac ko mok ki’s map has also been re-presented on several Web sites. A typical Google search returns with fifteen hits, including Web sites for the Hudson’s Bay Company Archives, Louisiana State Museum, Arizona State University, and the Common Ground Community Mapping Project. Each of these Web sites represents the context of the map differently as the structure changes from paper and ink to bits and bytes. In most cases, the content remains much the same since a digital image of the map is reproduced on the Web site. The Hudson’s Bay Company Archives provide the context of the map as “[t]he most famous” within their extensive collection of maps. The information presented in this site gives a breakdown of maps by date and type. On the other hand, the Louisiana State Museum presents Ac ko mok ki’s map as an ethnographic record. Although the caption provides some of the information related to the map’s provenance, it neglects the importance of the map in providing key information for Aaron Arrowsmith’s 1802 map of North America, and for Lewis and Clark’s expedition of 1804–06. The Arizona State University, one of the top ten hits, does not reproduce the map; instead, the site provides a bibliography for American Indian Conceptions of Direction and Navigation. In this case, content, structure, and context do not play a role in defining the record; rather the researcher is led to other resources to determine this information. The Common Ground Community Mapping Project Web site reproduced an article by Maeve Lydon who briefly mentions Ac ko mok ki and his map. Once again the provenance of the map is incomplete in regard to the connection of the map and the uses by successor creators. His presentation of the information presumes that Lewis and Clark had access to Ac ko mok ki’s map, when instead, they possessed a copy of Arrowsmith’s map. As such, the Common Ground Community Mapping Project provides a

different provenancial context to Ac ko mok ki’s map than what is recorded in Fidler’s documents and in the Hudson’s Bay Company Archives finding aid.  

In the examples provided from scholarly literature and Web sites that publish or publicize Ac ko mok ki’s map, each has in some way changed the record’s context and, thus, created or added another layer to its secondary provenance. In terms of reproductions in books, the structure of the record changes from that of paper, ink, graphite, linen, and silk overlay to one that is made of twentieth-century glossy paper and ink. Web sites are somewhat more complex in their virtual nature. The image, created with 1s and 0s that form bits and bytes, is limited by the technology of the person digitizing the image. The definition of the image, or its clarity, is further shaped by its re-presentation of the dots per inch (dpi), and once put up on the Web site, the colours and size, and the nature of the terminal and monitor of those downloading or viewing the image from the site. The Louisiana State Museum changed the background colour of Ac ko mok ki’s map from a sepia brown to blue. Images are often reformatted to fit the computer screen and to allow space for the text surrounding the image.  

For all the Web sites and the reproductions used in various publications, Ac ko mok ki’s map has been reduced in scale to accommodate the media used. Furthermore, many Web sites (although in the case of Ac ko mok ki’s map this did not happen) will use pop-up imaging to enlarge sections of the image for the viewer. Consequently, the viewer is never able to view the entire image at once, only as sections or as a reduced image. These are limitations of technology that influence the definition of the record, as well as its perception and understanding. 

The transformations of the record also reflect how the context is manipulated for specific audiences, particularly digital records. Ac ko mok ki’s map had particular meaning in different situations. For the Common Ground Community Mapping Project, the image of the map and its provenance were less important compared to the Louisiana State Museum’s link, “The Map as an


42 Personal Communication, Dr. Shelley Sweeney, Head, University of Manitoba Archives and Special Collections, 23 April 2003. The “look and feel” of the document is modified in such a way that the researcher may not always get a sense of what the “original” looked like. The dimensions and colour are changed, and in some cases text may even be enhanced, to draw the researcher’s attention to a particular aspect of the record, or to sharpen the image. In addition, the sense of awe that results when faced with the original record can have a strong impact on the researcher’s perception of the record – we can contrast the experience of viewing the Mona Lisa or the United States Declaration of Independence in person with viewing virtual images of these documents.
Ethnographic Record." The changes become ever more apparent when comparing media forms. Context and provenance are extremely important for Theodore Binnema in his study of Ac ko mok ki's map. Academic scholars would find the Web sites futile and frustrating, preferring published academic works as alternative media sources.

Provenance defines a record's origin and its relationship to the creator. Although the finding aid is one of the basic reference tools, it usually lacks the deeper context necessary to familiarize the researcher with the record. And with the increase of on-line finding aids and search engines, metadata needs to be more prominently displayed. Otherwise, the researcher loses the larger context of the record and, consequently, faces problems that arise from new meanings and layers issued to the record as it evolves over time.

In this case study, the deconstruction of Ac ko mok ki's map has revealed how symbols represent facts and power. Maps are not objective or scientific in nature; instead, they are subjective records used to construct the creator's ethnocentric world view, and need therefore to be interpreted in order to understand the deeper meanings associated with provenance and context. Furthermore, the transformation of the record and the subsequent transmedia shifts impact the meaning of the record as its context and structure are manipulated. This has lead to the creation of a "secondary" provenance, which at times overshadows the primary or original provenance of the record. By understanding these impacts on the provenance of the record, a richer context and definition arise even after the record is deposited in the archives. In deconstructing Ac ko mok ki's map and reinterpreting its contextual message, light is shed on Peter Fidler and Ac ko mok ki, the creating processes, and evolving uses by that or successor re-creators. Archivists should view or read the map, like any record, not as a pure vessel passed directly from the creator to the archivist, but through filters - some may be subconscious - of many intervening readings that have subtly changed the context of the map. In other words, archivists and researchers need to read records against the grain, and search for the various contexts that subtly change their meaning, resulting in secondary provenance. Even this article and the reproduction of the map on the cover of this issue of Archivaria present a secondary provenance in that the context of Ac ko mok ki's map is changed, once again.