

UC Merced

Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology

Title

Hampson et al.: *Cultural Resources Survey, Upper Santa Ana River, California*

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/5zf3c6xs>

Journal

Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology, 11(1)

ISSN

0191-3557

Author

Altschul, Jeffrey H.

Publication Date

1989-07-01

Peer reviewed

actually are yellow-brown, orange-brown and occasionally red-brown cherts. The vanishing point of this issue is approaching with yet another report of a fist-sized unmodified cobble of float jasper, this one recovered just south of El Toro Marine Corps Air Station, Orange County (P. Jertberg, personal communication 1989). It is increasingly doubtful, then, that inland areas, such as the Prado Basin, will contribute more than negative evidence to this stone-procurement issue.

And finally, the ethnographic overview reports that a chiefdom-level sociocultural integration may have characterized the Gabriolino, a supposition based on descriptions of the society as possessing social "ranks." Because social differentiation and true political centralization are not necessarily linked, labeling societies with recognizable social differentiation as "chiefdoms" gives rise to frequent misapplication of the term (Hoopes 1988). The current "bias for complexity" in studies of native Californian society probably arises as a counterpoint to the racist portrayal of "Digger Indians" as overly simple and despised folk (Oetting 1985).

These few critical comments represent no serious flaws in a well-edited volume that pulls together a wealth of descriptive information, complemented by an extensive bibliography. With the many questions directed toward future research, this work becomes an indispensable reference for archaeologists who would explore prehistory in the Prado Basin or its larger regional context. Appendix A is available gratis from the Environmental Planning Section, Army Corps of Engineers, Los Angeles District.

REFERENCES

- Cottrell, M. G.
1985 Tomato Springs: The Identification of a Jasper Trade and Production Center in Southern California. *American Antiquity* 50:833-849.
- Hoopes, J. W.
1988 The Complex Tribe in Prehistory: Sociopolitical Organization in the Archaeological Record. Paper read at the annual meeting of the Society for American Archaeology, Phoenix.
- Koerper, H. C., J. E. Ericson, C. E. Drover, and P. E. Langenwaller II
1986 Obsidian Exchange in Prehistoric Orange County. *Pacific Coast Archaeological Society Quarterly* 22(1):33-69.
- Koerper, H. C., D. L. Fife, C. A. Singer, and J. E. Ericson
1987 Comments on Cottrell's Long Distance Jasper Trade Hypothesis: In Defense of Renfrew's Trade Models. *American Antiquity* 52:623-630.
- Oetting, A. C.
1985 Sociopolitical Complexity in California: A Review of the Evidence. Paper read at the annual meeting of the Society for American Archaeology, Denver.
- Shackley, M. S.
1987 Comment on "Tomato Springs: The Identification of a Jasper Trade and Production Center in Southern California." *American Antiquity* 52:616-623.



Cultural Resources Survey, Upper Santa Ana River, California. R. Paul Hampson, Jerrel Sorenson, Susan K. Goldberg, Mark T. Swanson, and Jeanne E. Arnold. Los Angeles: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Los Angeles District, 1988, vii + 150 pp., 42 figs., 7 tables, gratis (paper).

Reviewed by:

JEFFREY H. ALTSCHUL

Statistical Research, P.O. Box 31865, Tucson, AZ 85751.

Prior to the 1980s, the upper Santa Ana River basin had largely been ignored by archaeologists. In response to the Santa Ana Mainstream Project, the Los Angeles District of the Corps of Engineers (CoE) has spon-

sored a series of studies of which the subject report is the latest.

In reviewing this report, it is appropriate to take stock of what has been learned about the prehistory and history of the upper Santa Ana River drainage. This locality received only cursory attention prior to the advent of cultural resource management (CRM) projects. What little was known of the study area was largely through the efforts of Gerald Smith and the San Bernardino County Museum Association. The onset of CRM studies led to large numbers of mostly small-scale surveys and minor test excavations. Emphasis clearly was placed on prehistoric sites, with historic materials receiving scant attention or being ignored altogether.

Yet the amount of work alone did not translate into greater understanding. Prior to the mid-1980s there had been no attempt to synthesize or explain the observed patterns. Projects sponsored by the CoE have attempted to remedy this situation. In part, this result is due to the large regional scale of CoE projects as opposed to the more restricted nature of most compliance work. Whatever the reason, this work has produced a major body of literature that has made significant contributions to our knowledge of history and prehistory. As with many projects that have evolved over time and involved large numbers of researchers and institutions, the CoE reports on the upper Santa Ana River are highly varied. Some emphasize prehistory, others history, and still others methodology. The present report is no exception.

The ultimate objective of the upper Santa Ana River survey report was to present the results of an intensive survey of 9,375 acres concentrated primarily in a linear strip along the river. The background of the survey is presented in the first four chapters. The discussion is presented clearly and concisely.

The only problem with the background is one of balance. The summary of prehistory and ethnohistory is relatively short. The presentation frequently refers to another document (Goldberg and Arnold 1988) produced for another Santa Ana River project. Having read the referenced report prior to the reviewed one, I had no trouble with this discussion; the same perhaps would not hold for those who read the survey report alone.

The history chapter is the main strength of the report. The authors of this chapter, Swanson and Hampson, are to be commended for their effort. They bring a fresh perspective to the historic period, the weakest part of all previous Santa Ana River reports. If for no other reason, researchers will want the volume for this chapter.

At first reading I was perplexed why such emphasis was placed on the historic period. The rationale became clear when I reached Chapter 5, which presents survey methods and results. Of the 68 cultural resource sites, 58 have historic components. Most of the historic sites postdate 1880. They range from small dispersed artifact scatters to railroad bridges and town sites. The prehistoric sites consist mainly of milling features with no associated artifacts.

The presentation of the survey results is clear and straightforward, but there is a slight problem in the beginning of the section. Table 5.1 shows a total of 72 cultural resource locations, while the presentation states that there are only 68 (I still am not sure which is correct, although the figure of 68 is used throughout the document). Other than this error, the technical production of the volume is excellent.

Upon reflection, I wish the authors had attempted to use their results to address some of the research questions posed earlier in the document. The concluding section of Chapter 6 is short and focused more on methods than

on research questions. Part of this problem is not the authors' doing. The CoE, as with many Federal agencies, has a stated policy not to allow site location maps in reports. The purpose of this policy is to deter, or at least to not aid, vandalism. While the policy is well-intended, it also greatly restricts the research utility of the reports. In the case of the Santa Ana River survey, it is very difficult to assess the authors' conclusions because the reader has absolutely no idea where the sites are located *vis-à-vis* each other or major environmental features. This problem, of course, transcends this report. It only is mentioned here because of its impact on the utility of an otherwise commendable effort.

Overall, the Santa Ana River survey report fits nicely with the other reports on this project. This report clearly concentrates on the history of the region. Given the intense effort placed on the Santa Ana River drainage, it would be extremely useful if the CoE would produce a final, comprehensive volume, this time with maps.

REFERENCE

- Goldberg, S. K., and J. E. Arnold
1988 Prehistoric Sites in the Prado Basin, California: Regional Context and Significance Evaluation. Los Angeles: U. S. Army Corps of Engineers, Los Angeles District.



Papers on California Prehistory: 2. Salinas: Coyote Press *Archives of California Prehistory* No. 22, 1988, 114 pp., \$11.20 (paper).

Reviewed by:

A. B. ELSASSER

824 Park Way, El Cerrito, CA 94530.

This volume includes three papers, by Keith Dixon, Joseph and Kerry Chartkoff, and

William Wallace, in that order. Dixon's paper "Archaeology and Geology in the Calico Mountains: Results of the International Conference on the Calico Project," is reprinted from a 1970 newsletter of California State University, Long Beach. Its appearance in the present collection no doubt was based on initial limited distribution of a carefully balanced report of an important international meeting at San Bernardino in October, 1970. The conference was attended by an unusually impressive group of Paleolithic archaeologists and geologists, literally from all over the world: Japan, Siberia, Africa, Europe, and the Near East, with L. S. B. Leakey, the leading sponsor, being the most well-known on the list here presented.

Despite the eminence of the group and perhaps expectations of definitive conclusions on the dating of the site and its allegedly man-made lithic tools, Dixon was not able to present an entirely favorable picture of the Calico site as the earliest representative of human occupation in the New World. He emphasized meticulous excavation techniques of the group led by Ruth Simpson, and certainly did not write off the site as unprovably ancient or the tools as made by nature. Moreover, he made cogent suggestions as to the direction future research should take regarding analysis of the site and its contents.

Unfortunately, almost twenty years later, the original proposals regarding age and tool associations have not been widely accepted. In neither of the recent summaries (1984) of California archaeology by Moratto and J. L. and K. K. Chartkoff is the Calico site given much more than a dubious status. Meanwhile, Simpson, in 1989, has reported a uranium-series date of 200,000 years as a suggested date of early human occupation of the site, supplementing the 1970 estimates based on geological data. The difficulties of accepting this date, together with what may be