

UC Merced

Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology

Title

Goldberg and Arnold: *Prehistoric Sites in the Prado Basin, California: Regional Context and Significance Evaluation*

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/8ks23985>

Journal

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

ISSN

0191-3557

Author

Koerper, Henry C.

Publication Date

1989-07-01

Peer reviewed

from nonscientific propositions. What this volume reveals most strongly to me, as an admitted skeptic and a believer in scientific method, is that those archaeologists most interested in studying the "origins of science" in California prehistory and ethnohistory via rock art and archaeoastronomy are clearly the least interested in practicing science.



Prehistoric Sites in the Prado Basin, California: Regional Context and Significance Evaluation.

Susan K. Goldberg and Jeanne E. Arnold.
Los Angeles: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 1988, xi + 132 pp., 4 figs., 8 tables, gratis (paper).

Reviewed by:

HENRY C. KOERPER

Dept. of Anthropology, Cypress College, Cypress, CA 90630.

This volume reports the assessments of prehistoric sites near the junction of Orange, Riverside, and San Bernardino counties, with regard to their eligibility for inclusion into the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). Research domains necessary to this task are generated from a review and synthesis of archaeological data drawn from a larger regional context, territory sandwiched between and including parts of the Peninsular and Transverse ranges. Here, Cajon Wash and the inland Santa Ana River drainage, which bisects Prado Basin, together formed a natural corridor for prehistoric diffusion, trade, and migration between the Mojave Desert and southern Los Angeles Plain. Goldberg and Arnold's work points to the kinds of research efforts that lie ahead if issues of either external relations or internal chronology and past lifeways are to be effectively addressed.

The study is divided into two parts: Part I, "Regional Context," and Part II, "Signifi-

cance Evaluation." Following a project goal statement, report prospectus, and a geographic delineation of the study area, Part I reviews regional prehistory and ethnography (Gabrielino and Serrano) and subsequently discusses research issues. The review includes a summary of previous archaeological work by subregion.

The section covering research issues proposes that two concepts, "Milling Stone Horizon" and "Shoshonean Incursion," have been uncritically adopted in previous research and that these "confining frameworks" should be rejected in favor of rigorous analyses of components of general research domains (i.e., technology, subsistence, settlement, exchange/external relations). Objectives are identified for each research domain, and questions specific to each objective are formulated, followed by data requirements. This research discussion provides a quick overview of scientific observations and analyses critical to a synthesis of regional culture history.

In Part II, Goldberg and Arnold first discuss the meaning of "significance evaluation" of archaeological resources and the constructs that guide their particular evaluations. Following a definition of the Prado Basin Archaeological District, each Prado Basin site is summarily described and evaluated for NRHP eligibility.

Judged as a CRM document, the report is better than most of its genre; nonetheless some critique might be helpful to the purpose of the study.

The justification for abandonment of the "Milling Stone Horizon" concept for adoption of "rigorous componential analyses" rests on several complaints. For instance, the authors write that the concept was developed for coastal chronology, and thus its application to interior regions implies an interregional homogeneity that has not been demonstrated. Manos and metates are not particularly time-

sensitive, but archaeologists working in the region have assigned Milling Stone status to sites "that might contain little more than a mano and some flaking debris." Further, the "Milling Stone" label implies functional and cultural baggage that might be attached uncritically to a site component, thereby obscuring the variability expected among components of a site or different sites.

The call to replace the "Milling Stone" concept with "componential analyses," proposes, I believe, an unnecessary choice between different research objectives. Components of the several "domains" revolve largely around issues of past lifeway reconstruction (synchronic and diachronic), but the Milling Stone concern, as presented, primarily is a chronology-building issue. Thus, granted the validity of a "componential analysis" approach, the approach, of itself, presents no case against particular chronological units that must be treated as hypotheses to be tested. It may well be that another culture unit concept should replace that of Milling Stone for the Prado Basin or elsewhere, but only future research can offer such guidance.

Chronology building, which depends on identifying consistent associations of particular kinds and proportions of artifacts, must necessarily abstract variability out of formulations of regional chronologies. Such variability, however, is preserved in lifeway descriptions and "the larger picture," or culture history, for a region. It also should be noted that two of Goldberg and Arnold's complaints address uncritical use of the "Milling Stone" concept, an indictment not of the concept itself, but rather of archaeological practice.

Goldberg and Arnold also call for the abandonment of the "Shoshonean Incursion" concept to be replaced, again, by componential analyses. Their informative overview divides concerns related to the Shoshonean entry concept into a tripartite grouping: (1)

dating the initial incursion of Shoshoneans coastward; (2) recognizing desert Shoshonean cultural influence in the study area and beyond without reference to initial intrusion; and (3) distinguishing specific Shoshonean ethnic groups archaeologically either from one another or from non-Shoshonean groups. Their view that most questions relating to these Shoshonean concerns are intractable to possibly insoluble strikes a concordant note. Yet, paralleling a previous point, abandonment of the concept is not a necessary condition to pursuing componential analysis of the several research domains. The Shoshonean conundrum should, and undoubtedly will, continue as an attractive intellectual exercise, perhaps never achieving a consensus.

Recent published discussions of desert-coast trade and procurement connections involving obsidian and jasper, respectively, are reviewed in a section on exchange and external relations. Because the Cajon Pass/inland Santa Ana River drainage has been proposed as a Coso obsidian trade route (e.g., Koerper et al. 1986), sourcing and hydration data from the district can be invaluable for testing long-distance desert to coast exchange models. Regrettably, the compendium of obsidian research results intended as Appendix A of the report was published as a separate document (completed in 1989).

Reference is made to a "trade" hypothesis which posits that coastal entrepreneurs trekked into the Mojave Desert to procure unmodified blocks of jasper for transport to Tomato Springs (CA-ORA-244), the supposed control center for importation, production, and exchange of this material (Cottrell 1985). Others have argued that such jaspers are locally available, being concentrated in the Tomato Springs area (Koerper et al. 1987; Shackley 1987). Goldberg and Arnold mistakenly assume that the jaspers in question are red cherts, when most of these lithics

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-