

UC Merced

Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology

Title

Unpublished Guides to Collections in the University Library, University of Nevada, Reno

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/0q79r0gk>

Journal

Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology, 12(1)

ISSN

0191-3557

Author

Searcy, Susan

Publication Date

1990-07-01

Peer reviewed

REVIEWS

Unpublished Guides to Collections in the University Library, University of Nevada, Reno

Submitted by:

SUSAN SEARCY

University Library, Univ. of Nevada, Reno, NV 89557.

Crum, Steven J., comp.

1990 The Battle Mountain Shoshone Colony: Select Articles from Nevada Newspapers (1889-1989). University of California President's Fellowship Program, 1989-1990. Report on file at the Special Collections Department, University Library, University of Nevada, Reno.

Crum, Steven J., comp.

1990 The Western Shoshone and Other American Indians; Guide to Articles in the *Elko (Daily) Free Press* (1883-1989). University of California President's Fellowship Program, 1989-1990. Report on file at the Special Collections Department, University Library, University of Nevada, Reno.

Crum, Steven J., comp.

1990 The Western Shoshone of the Great Basin: Guide to Articles on the Western Shoshones in the *Native Nevadan* (1964-1989). University of California President's Fellowship Program, 1989-1990. Report on file at the Special Collections Department, University Library, University of Nevada, Reno.

Archaeological Investigations on the Rancho San Clemente, Orange County, California.

Constance Cameron. Coyote Press Archives of California Prehistory No. 27, 1989, viii + 270 pp., 120 figs. plus tables and appendices, \$16.95 (paper).

Reviewed by:

CLAY A. SINGER

C. A. Singer & Associates, Inc., 2450 Main Street #99, Cambria, CA 93428-3406.

Once there were (at least) 26 archaeological deposits on the Rancho San Clemente, a 2,000-acre area in southern Orange County. Now there are none. Instead, we now have "more than 6,800 lithic artifacts and 11,000 flakes . . . 1,100 pieces of bone . . . and 1,270 pieces of shell," plus this descriptive report. Cameron's report documents the archaeological work done at 21 (or 26) sites prior to their complete destruction. This "salvage" report contains site descriptions, lists of artifacts, frequency tables, and many illustrations, including both photographs and line drawings. Also, there is an analysis of ceramic materials (Appendix D).

The stated goal of the research was "to examine the data retrieved from the site collections and place the site(s) into a temporal-cultural framework" (p. 13). By comparing the Rancho San Clemente sites to other excavated sites in Orange, San Diego, and Riverside counties the report attempts to answer the question of whether or not Juaneño and Luiseño were one cultural group (p. 1 and p. 247). A simple hypothesis is presented: If the Juaneño and Luiseño were one group, the archaeological assemblages between the two areas occupied during ethnographic times should be similar (p. 14). Based



primarily on the reported distribution of ceramics in the region, the author concludes that they were not a single group (p. 245).

However, the report has some very serious deficiencies. For example, the grammar and syntax are often strange, and the format is sometimes difficult to follow because of the artifact tables (many with only one entry). The lithic analysis is truly strange. Thirty-four different kinds of stone are first identified (p. 17), and then abbreviated (p. 40) for use in the tables. But, the sources of most of the materials are not discussed and the artifact classification is naive, reflecting fundamental misconceptions about typology and lithic technology. There is an overemphasis on projectile points and bifaces, and some items are given very strange names (e.g., perforators and reamers are called "tip tools" and perforated discs are called "spindle whorls"). Furthermore, no attempt was made to relate the cores, retouched tools, and other worked pieces with the lithic debitage.

All of the analyses, including stone, bone, shell, soil, ceramics, flora, obsidian hydration, and radiocarbon, are shallow and simplistic. Settlement pattern analysis is limited to four site distribution maps (Figs. 107-110), and the site typology is illogical. Ignoring such factors as size, elevation, topography, geology, microclimates, and local environmental conditions, "Archaeological sites [were] separated into types by the range and number of artifacts and ecofacts found in them" (p. 13). Other than talking briefly about destroyed and missing sites, there is virtually no discussion of sampling strategy, sampling bias, or intra-site variability. Site dimensions were determined by surface distributions of (large) artifacts, and excavated soils were processed dry using 1/4-in. screen. A minimum of two column samples (15 cm. square) was removed from each site and processed using water and 1/8-in. mesh. Perhaps the most ridiculous statement in the entire report relates to the

column samples. "The analysis of the column samples proves that, in this instance, small artifacts, flakes, and faunal remains were not being lost by using 1/4" screens in the field" (p. 17).

On the positive side, Coyote Press has provided readers with a fine example of "pre-processual archaeology." Cameron's report is another reflection of the appalling CRM policies and practices that characterize archaeology in Orange County, and much of southern California. The report is like root beer, some people like it, others do not. For some students and researchers working in southern California it may be a valuable addition to their libraries. But, for those who are seeking new ideas, or statistically significant data, it will be a disappointment. The author says it most succinctly: "This may be a beginners work" (p. 45).



A Taxonomic Analysis of Avian Faunal Remains from Three Sites in Marina Del Rey, Los Angeles County, California. Joan C. Brown. Coyote Press *Archives of California Prehistory* No. 30, vii + 71 pp., 8 tables, appendix, 1989, \$6.20 (paper).

Reviewed by:

GERRIT L. FENENGA

Dept. of Sociology and Anthropology, California State Univ., Bakersfield, CA 93311-1099.

Zooarchaeologists usually are pleased to see a contribution in their specialized field of interest. This is particularly true when it is a monograph length study of a fairly large collection of fauna. Avifauna are not commonly encountered in large numbers in faunal assemblages, but when they do occur, they are particularly useful for assessing seasonality and making other behavioral inferences. In addition, bird remains are relatively difficult to identify and often are