

## **UC Merced**

### **The Journal of California Anthropology**

#### **Title**

Simpson, et al.: *Rock Camp Site: Archaeological Excavation of an Indian Campsite Near Lake Arrowhead, San Bernardino Mountains*

#### **Permalink**

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/1092n3rd>

#### **Journal**

The Journal of California Anthropology, 4(1)

#### **Author**

Hedges, Ken

#### **Publication Date**

1977-07-01

Peer reviewed

prehistoric and protohistoric group boundaries in the Lava Beds and southern Klamath Basin. In these respects, the present study will be relevant to research being conducted in other areas of California and the Great Basin.

### REFERENCES

- Kroeber, A.L.  
1925 Handbook of the Indians of California. Washington: Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin 78.
- Murray, K.A.  
1959 The Modocs and Their War. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.



***Rock Camp Site: Archaeological Excavation of an Indian Campsite Near Lake Arrowhead, San Bernardino Mountains.*** Ruth Dee Simpson, Gerald A. Smith, Robert Reynolds, Doris Hoover Bowers, and Arda Haenszel. San Bernardino: San Bernardino County Museum Association *Quarterly* Vol. 20, No. 1, Fall 1972. 174 pp., maps, tables, bibliography, 31 plates.

*Reviewed by* KEN HEDGES  
*San Diego Museum of Man*

*Rock Camp Site* is presented as one of the first archaeological reports for the Transverse Range of southern California. Work at the site, located in the San Bernardino Mountains northwest of Lake Arrowhead, was conducted by the San Bernardino County Museum from 1965 to 1968.

The report consists of two introductory chapters; a chapter on "Rock Camp Ecological Setting" containing sections on Geological Background, Biological Survey, and History; a "Regional Anthropological Background" with both archaeological and ethnological overviews; and discussions of the site, the excava-

tion, and the artifacts.

The sections on geological and biological background are useful additions, but both suffer from a total lack of bibliographic citation. In the case of the ethnobotanical discussions, the bibliography lists no ethnobotanical references for either the Serrano or any other southern California Indian group. It appears that plant uses were derived from popular books on early uses of plants in California and the West. These sources are not culturally specific and cannot be used as citations for Serrano uses at Rock Camp; as a result, the ethnobotanical data lack validity as presented in the Rock Camp report. The history section, written by Arda Haenszel, is complete, well-written, and beautifully referenced, with numerous footnotes containing full bibliographic citations and additional notes. It is by far the best section of the Rock Camp volume; however, the discussion of post-aboriginal history of the area is the least essential part of the report. As fine as the history section is, it does not provide much assistance in archaeological interpretation.

The "Regional Anthropological Background" contains a few citations, but it also is essentially without references. One must assume that the statements have basis in fact, but it would have been useful to have them properly cited in the text.

The archaeological report itself is the most frustrating part of the Rock Camp volume. Although it appears that considerable effort went into the discussion of site layout and excavation procedures, the section is disorganized and difficult to follow. The site map shows that pits were laid out apparently at random—some approximating north, others magnetic north, northwest, or other orientations. The artifact discussion is even more exasperating. Artifacts are discussed in general typological categories with some information on materials used, size ranges, and whether the artifacts were from "western," "central," or "eastern" pits. There is a tabulation of artifact types by

depth within the site, but there is no breakdown of artifacts by materials, size, or provenience within the site, so that it is impossible to relate the artifacts to the materials used, to one another in a distributional sense, or to activity areas at Rock Camp. Illustrations provide a sampler of artifacts, but the examples shown are not identified in any way other than general typological class. The discussions of typologies and their significance, and presentation of inferences derived from the artifacts are, again, without bibliographic citation. The Rock Camp report fails as archaeological analysis, and has only minimal value as a generalized presentation of artifacts found in the Rock Camp excavations.



***California Indians: Primary Resources. A Guide to Manuscripts, Artifacts, Documents, Serials, Music and Illustrations.***  
 Lowell John Bean and Sylvia Brakke Vane.  
 Socorro, New Mexico: Ballena Press  
*Anthropological Papers* No. 7. 1977.

Reviewed by M.A. BAUMHOFF  
 University of California, Davis

The authors say (p. 2) that "We regard this volume as a guide in part to known primary sources about Native Californians; in part as a source of suggestions about where to look for material which *may* pertain to them." I would say that they have come closer to achieving the latter than the former.

The larger part of this volume consists of county-by-county listing of organizations having or publishing material relevant to Native Californians. To these are added organizations of the same kind in other states and other countries. The organizations were then circularized with requests for confirmation and additional listings. The authors indicate that they got replies to over half their question-

naires, which means there were a large percentage of failures as well. In addition, they have a section on serials (very useful) and on audio-visual materials. The data on collections of photographs and recorded music are minute—these categories should not be in the title.

I find the volume extremely useful and I have no doubt that it will prove essential to all Californianists. Accordingly, what is said in the following should not be construed as condemnation.

To my mind the vital part of the volume is the county-by-county survey—the important out-of-state material will automatically become known to anyone knowing his local sources thoroughly. This being so, the most important thing would be an on-site survey of the counties with a personal evaluation of local resources by experts like Bean and Vane. Someone simply must go through these materials and catalog them systematically if they are to become available to scholars. Of course, something as difficult to handle as the J.P. Harrington material will have to be dealt with by a variety of experts. On the other hand, much of the manuscript material in the state could be dealt with more straightforwardly, but the bibliographers will have to examine it in order to do so. I realize this is a really extensive piece of research and that the present authors may have been justified in the procedure they followed. Nevertheless, if we are to get a real assessment of California ethnographic resources, the program will have to be as outlined.

One really bizarre aspect of this publication strikes my eye. Why did the authors include the complete listing of California Indian monographs in the University of California series in *American Archaeology and Ethnology* and the *Anthropological Records* and yet fail to list University of California *Publications in Anthropology*, the Southwest Museum *Papers*, and publications of the San Diego Museum of Man? And anyway if they wanted to