Ragir, Sonia R.
1969 The Early Horizon in Central California Prehistory. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.
1972 The Early Horizon in Central California Prehistory. Berkeley: Contributions of the University of California Archaeological Research Facility No. 15.

Riddell, Francis A.
1960 The Archaeology of the Karlo Site (Las-7), California. University of California Archaeological Survey Reports 53. Berkeley.

Wright, Robert H. (Compiler)
1971 Map Showing Locations of Samples Dated by Radiocarbon Methods in the San Francisco Bay Region. Miscellaneous Field Studies May MF-317. U.S. Department of Interior, Geological Survey, Menlo Park.

Reply to King and Gerow

DAVID A. FREDRICKSON

I'm pleased that my suggestions about early Central California prehistory, which appeared in the first issue of this journal, have stimulated constructive commentary. In response to King: The division of California prehistory into the various temporal periods summarized in my paper was based upon the premise that a culture's utilization of new or different sources of energy will be accompanied by changes throughout that culture. Changes in the sources of energy available to a culture may be a function of any combination of environmental circumstances, technological developments, or exchange relationships between societies. I believe that the periods and their descriptions which I suggest in the paper are consistent with this premise.

In response to Gerow: While I do summarize some data in support of the contemporaneity of what I have called the Berkeley Pattern with the Windmiller Pattern, nowhere in the text of the paper do I suggest temporal priority for either pattern. It is true that Fig. 2 suggests that Windmiller began about 3000 B.C. (following Ragir's conservative rather than her expansive estimate) and that Berkeley began about 2500 B.C. (following a conservative evaluation of the C-14 date from CCo-308). I'm glad to have the opportunity to state my opinion that with respect to Windmiller/Berkeley temporal priority, the data at this point in time are not definitive. Neither are data on their origins. Careful analyses such as those carried out by Gerow may someday help provide answers. With respect to other questions brought up by King and Gerow, dealing with them may hopefully provide interesting problems for undergraduate seminars.

California State College, Sonoma
Rohnert Park