

## **UC Merced**

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

#### **Title**

Heizer: *Some Thoughts on California Archaeology at the Moment*

#### **Permalink**

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/7594j3jx>

#### **Journal**

The Journal of California Anthropology, 3(1)

#### **Author**

Elsasser, Albert B.

#### **Publication Date**

1976-07-01

Peer reviewed

adjective "Indian" (as in *Indian Bar*, *Gulch*, *Flat*, *Diggins*, and the like) was fairly common (24 times), but the most frequently used specific Indian tribal name was *Cherokee* (eight times), which is, of course, representing a non-Californian group. This comparative neglect of Indian names suggests the negative attitude toward the native occupants and the proprietary rights to which the miners seemed to feel entitled for the new land being expropriated from the old population.

Many of the names are unique, often with ironic overtones, like *Bunionville*, *Pinchmentight*, *Hornswoggle Ravine*, or *Sorefinger*. Others repeatedly employ common adjectives or nouns to produce numbers of relatively trite names: *big*, *little*, *stone*, *rock*, *rocky*, *green*, *greenhorn*, *poverty*, *granite*, *quartz*, *union*, and *empire*. As might be expected, the most frequently given names in the entire corpus have *gold* as one of their elements, usually as an adjective (e.g., *Gold Run*). Among the names referring to lands outside of California are *Yankee*, with its eastern U.S. regional implication, along with *Texas*, *New York*, *Missouri*, and *Oregon*, in that order of frequency, but all appearing at least 15 times. *Chile*, *China* (or *Chinese*), *Scotch* (or *Scottish*), and *Dutch* (i.e., German, Austrian, Swiss, and Netherlands all lumped together) are all heavily represented. *French* appears more than *Dutch* (45 against 24 times), but the authors comment that, although French gold diggers were less numerous than the Germanic, the "real French seldom associated with Americans, and their camps kept their national identity."

The volume is illustrated with attractive reprints of drawings of mushrooming towns or diggings of the times; these, together with locality maps, further reinforce any statement about the almost incredible magnitude of the gold rush, both in terms of population and in energy, hand and mechanical, expended upon the extraction of the metal. In sum, the book will appeal to general readers, while at the

same time serving as a basic reference for anyone concerned with socio-demographic analysis of this hyperactive period of California history.



***Some Thoughts on California Archaeology at the Moment.*** Robert F. Heizer. *Journal of New World Archaeology* (Institute of Archaeology, University of California, Los Angeles), Vol. 1, No. 1. November 1975. 13 pp.

Reviewed by ALBERT B. ELSASSER  
R. H. Lowie Museum of Anthropology  
University of California, Berkeley

Introduction of this new journal of archaeology, intended to incorporate the function of the now terminated *Annual Reports* of the University of California Archaeological Survey, Los Angeles, comes at a time when there are rumblings of crises in American archaeology. It seems fitting therefore that the first article in the new format refers in large part to impending or already existing conflicts between "public" and "anthropological" or "new" versus "old" archaeology.

The essay was taken almost *verbatim* from the text of a recently-delivered lecture in Los Angeles. Many ideas are covered summarily, but at least one is developed at some length. This refers to the paradox brought about by projected increased support through special public funds for conservation of Indian cultural remains where for decades there has been comparative indifference to preservation. Heizer suggests that expensive conservation or salvage programs, involving training of

archaeologists, administration of excavation projects, and reports and the like can detract in some measure from academic or "anthropological" archaeology by shifting emphasis from important general problems, investigation of which already suffers from lack of funding. A possible result of this shift may be the creation of an "extramural" job market which ultimately will draw upon academic institutions for personnel, but which does not contribute intellectually to the discipline as a whole.

Probably these thoughts could not be translated to direct action programs without much more discussion and analysis. Nevertheless there are some concrete suggestions here about what could possibly be done to resolve some of the questions raised.



***Prehistoric Rock Art of Nevada and Eastern California.*** Robert F. Heizer and Martin A. Baumhoff. Berkeley: University of California Press. 1976. 412 pp. Illustrations. \$24.95.

*Reviewed by* CAMPBELL GRANT  
*Santa Barbara Museum of Natural History*

This important book, a milestone in the study of prehistoric aboriginal rock art, was first published as a paperback in 1962 and has been out of print for some time. Its reissue as a hardback edition will be good news for professionals and laymen alike who are interested in these graphic records of vanished peoples and ways of life.

Rock art (paintings and carvings on stone) has long intrigued observers in this country, and as more and more of it was revealed during the nineteenth century push to the west, articles began to appear on the

subject. This interest culminated with Garrick Mallery's huge 1893 work on the picture writing of the American Indian. He listed pictures on a great variety of surfaces—hide, bark, wood, stone, and the like. In 1929, Julian Steward's *Petroglyphs of California and Adjoining States* appeared, the first serious regional study of rock art. This book set a certain standard approach to the subject that would influence others for many years. A similar study, *Picture Writing of Texas Indians* by A. T. Jackson, was published nine years later. The Jackson book followed the Steward pattern in describing sites and mapping design elements, but neither author attempted interpretation except in the most general terms.

Heizer and Baumhoff wrote the next major regional rock art study about an area entirely within the Great Basin, a region where a remarkably homogeneous desert culture had endured for at least 8000 years. The only deviation from this hunting and food gathering pattern was in southeastern Nevada, where there was a strong Puebloan influence in the area drained by the Moapa Wash and the Virgin River.

The authors used a number of disciplines in their study, such as archaeology, ethnology, and linguistics to aid in interpreting the mysterious glyphs and placing them in cultural context. They noted that in most instances the petroglyphs were concentrated along known migration routes and game trails of deer and bighorn. Great numbers of petroglyphs were near water in the form of springs or natural rock basins trapping rainfall runoff. Such spots, as well as entrances to narrow canyons and places where canyons constrict to form gateways, are ideal locations for the ambushing of animals.

This type of hunting had to be a communal affair employing large numbers of men, women, and children. The more skillful marksmen remained hidden behind rock blinds above the trail while the others served as beaters to drive the game past the blinds, where