Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology | Vol. 28, No. 1 (2008) | pp. 85-87

COMMENT

A Response to Warren's Review of *Five Thousand Years of Maritime Subsistence at CA-SDI-48, on Ballast Point, San Diego County, California*

DENNIS R. GALLEGOS

The Ballast Point report (*Five Thousand Years of Maritime Subsistence at CA-SDI-48, on Ballast Point, San Diego County, California*) was the first such report to document the complexity of maritime subsistence in San Diego County from circa 6,600 B.P. to 1,300 B.P. It was completed in 1988, and later published by Coyote Press in 1998, "with very minor editing and corrections." CRM reports by their very nature are usually not structured for publication; however, the Coyote Press publishers felt that this report was publishable in the format provided. Coyote Press is one of the few outlets for CRM publications and should be commended for publishing "grey literature," therein ensuring that these studies are available to the archaeological community.

I'll begin with Warren's statement (2007) that "... it [the report] still contains the errors and omissions common to CRM reports, such as poorly keyed maps and illustrations and incomplete bibliographic citations. The authors include six chapters and an appendix contributed by others." Actually, the Coyote Press publication has 12 chapters, 32 figures, 86 tables, and one 3-page appendix on an otolith analysis prepared by Richard Huddleston. The blatant stereotyping involved in the reference to "the errors and omissions common to CRM reports" is insulting to the CRM archaeological community, and lacks the specificity of a professional review. With respect to the statement that the authors "depend on specialized studies," I believe that it is a common practice to consult with specialists and to depend upon their work, and in response to the comment on hypothesis testing that "there must be a better approach," I will leave that question to the CRM/academic community to respond to, or find a better approach.

The placement of excavation units and the sample sizes selected were based on the identification of areas that had not been previously destroyed by grading or building construction. The Ballast Point archaeological site is located adjacent to San Diego Bay, within old Fort Rosecrans, and it has been used for one military facility or another for over 100 years. Working in the open desert or back country is quite different from working in a built environment that, in this case, included underground water, gas, and communication lines—not to mention a cement bunker, sidewalks, introduced landscaping, sprinkler systems, parking lots, fill soil, and historic structures adjacent to San Diego Bay. Given these limitations, the 1 x 1 m. units were placed in areas where the ground was least disturbed and lacked structures; in addition, the 2 x 2 m. units were used due to the depth of the excavation units, which extended to 270 cm. (including 100+ cm. of capping fill). Also, given the considerable area disturbed by historical period activities, the sample excavation of the remaining site area was much larger than what was initially proposed.

The artifact inventory was small, but not the ecofact inventory. I remember that in the early discussions with SHPO I argued that the importance of the Ballast Point site was based on the faunal assemblage and not on the artifact assemblage. SHPO was looking at our low artifact counts, and not looking at the high amounts of shell and bone that were present. The importance of the Ballast Point site was—and still is—its potential to contribute to a better understanding of the environmental setting, diet, and activities conducted around a major bay in Southern California from 6,600 B.P. to 1,300 B.P.

Milling tools (73 manos and 8 metate fragments) were not overlooked. Milling was an activity that was conducted, but it was not the primary activity. We simply stated (page 191) that the occupants of CA-SDI-48 "primarily foraged for shellfish and fish, but complemented this diet with small terrestrial mammals, large marine mammals, birds, and plant foods." There was no implied hierarchy in the listing of contributory foods. Also, the lithic assemblage contained 2,379 artifacts, and the percentage of milling tools was not one-third of

the assemblage, but rather less than four percent of the lithic assemblage.

The Ballast Point site does not simply represent a "collecting economy" as described by Warren (1968) for the Encinitas Tradition. Warren's work was a landmark at the time, but it was limited, as it was based on a few sites in northern San Diego County. The Ballast Point site demonstrated that there was a significant emphasis on fish (36 species, 12,425 elements), and shellfish (with over 300,000 g. of shell from 64 species). In addition to a diet of shellfish, fish, and plant foods, the people occupying CA-SDI-48 were also hunting rabbit, sea otter, sea lion, mountain lion, southern mule deer, kit fox, badger, southern fur seal, and harbor seal. It certainly is not necessary to have artifact counts to discuss a continuity in the use of shellfish (rocky foreshore or sandy beach or lagoon), as well as in the use of fish and other faunal resources, whether the people collected or hunted or fished, using nets, gorges, or composite fish hooks. The faunal record is evidence enough of the diet, and of the continuity of activities conducted.

We did not provide photographs or illustrations of manos, metates, choppers, hammerstones, cores, flakes, or angular waste. However, we did provide illustrations of all bifaces; photographs of all beads; a photograph of the stone bowl; photographs or illustrations of most if not all of the bone tools (i.e., composite fishhooks, bipointed bone gorges, and unipointed fragments). Descriptive information on the flaked lithic tools, shell beads, and historic artifacts was provided on pages 46–53.

Figure 31 is a composite diagram, which brings together unit levels, strata by unit and depth, radiocarbon dates, associated features, and diagnostic artifacts. Unit levels were excavated using both 10 cm. unit levels and strata, which were determined by soil color and consistency. This figure also provided descriptive soil information, such as whether the stratum was a dark brown sandy loam, medium brown sandy loam, compact sandy loam, or sandstone. More soils work certainly could have and should have been done. However, the diagnostic artifacts (i.e., beads and bone tools) identified in Figure 31 had been previously described in detail, with drawings and photographs in Section 7; in addition, the radiocarbon dates also shown in Figure 31 had been previously discussed in Section 11, showing unit, level, material dated, lab number, and date in both table and chart formats.

Many of Warren's comments pertain to my questioning the validity of the Encinitas Tradition as described by him (1968). Warren and I will continue to disagree on the chronology for San Diego County, and that is the beauty of archaeology—we do not have to agree. We were never taught to agree; we were taught to question, test, and put our results on the table. Warren's review is simply about turf and chronology, and that's the real problem—archaeologists for too long have been forcing the data to fit the existing chronology (i.e., San Dieguito, Encinitas Tradition/La Jolla Complex) and have not been questioning and challenging the existing chronology.

With respect to the basal date for the Harris Site, it is 9,030 B.P. ±350 (not 9,300 B.P. as stated in Warren's review). The lab report on that 9,030 B.P. date states that "insoluble carbonaceous matter...may be fine charcoal... was 25 cm. below erosional contact and predates San Dieguito artifacts... (Haynes et al. 1967). Two additional dates, also based on charcoal, of 8,490 B.P. ±400 and 8,490 B.P. ±400, are identified as dating the "San Dieguito artifact-bearing unit" (Haynes et al. 1967). It should be noted that the Harris Site is situated in the San Dieguito River valley and is subject to rapid sedimentation and the introduction of materials from upstream. Therefore, some (if not all) of the materials used to date the San Dieguito component may have no direct association with the archaeological site.

We made no statement that the people who occupied Ballast Point had contact with the people of present-day Santa Barbara County who were associated with the Campbell Tradition. However, one cannot assume that past groups lived in a vacuum and had no contact with other people in what is now Santa Barbara or Yuma. I am sure that the people who occupied Ballast Point were aware of activities conducted by others near them, as well as of activities taking place hundreds of miles away. The point that was being made was that the Encinitas Tradition did not fit the Ballast Point collection, so the collection was compared to the Campbell Tradition. I do not support the presence of the Campbell Tradition in San Diego County; however, I do support a much broader view of what has been termed the Encinitas Tradition or the La Jolla Complex. Also, I do have one citation for the presence of the Campbell Tradition in San Diego County: "...it therefore appears that the changes in artifact types noted on the San Diego coast may have been

stimulated by an intrusive but short-lived cultural unit with affiliation with the Campbell Tradition..." (Warren 1968). One hardly needs an intrusion for hunting. That activity has been present and continuous in San Diego County for over 9,000 years.

The term hybrid was used to denote that the Ballast Point site did not fit into the Encinitas Tradition or the Campbell Tradition. Sites in San Diego County are not hybrids; they reflect changes in technology and environmental conditions through time, the varied environmental settings of San Diego County, and the use of plant, animal, and stone resources within these varied environmental settings.

Such statements by Warren as "[i]f this hypothesis were limited to the Ballast Point site..." or "[b]ut again, this conclusion applies only to CA-SDI-48, which is important and intriguing, but should not necessarily be anticipated for other coastal sites where resources were more restricted," illustrate that the concept of the Encinitas Tradition only works for coastal sites where resources were more restricted, but does not work for the full range of sites in San Diego County. Using terms such as "Encinitas Tradition" or "La Jolla Complex" severely limits our understanding of a people who fished, collected plant foods and shellfish, and hunted. We now have coastal San Diego County sites dating older than the Harris Site, and that fact also needs to be addressed. Therefore, as was previously stated in the Ballast Point report and updated here, the present chronology needs to be redefined to allow prehistoric sites dated from 1,300 to 10,000 years ago and identified as Early Period, La Jolla Complex, Encinitas Tradition, and Milling Stone Horizon to include shell dumps and habitation sites near coastal lagoons, inland hunting and gathering camps, quarry sites, and coastal bay hunting/gathering sites for the exploitation of marine resources. The concept of a simple gathering people may have fit northern San Diego County lagoon sites in 1968 "where resources were more restricted," but it no longer fits the present archaeological record involving 20,000 archaeological sites representing nearly 10,000 years of occupation in San Diego County.

In summary, I take full responsibility for the report writing and editing. It should be noted that one of the most important jobs of a Project Manager is to assemble a highly qualified team of specialists for the study at hand, and this was recognized by Warren as having been accomplished with regard to the Ballast Point study. The report entitled *Five Thousand Years of Maritime Subsistence at CA-SDI-48, on Ballast Point, San Diego County, California* still serves and will continue to serve as a contribution to the better understanding of the people who occupied Ballast Point, San Diego County, circa 6,600 to 1,300 years ago.

REFERENCES

Haynes, C. Vance, Jr., Donald C. Grey, Paul E. Damon, and Richmond Bennett

1967 Arizona Radiocarbon Dates VII. *Radiocarbon* 9:9–10. Tucson: Geochronology Laboratories, University of Arizona.

Warren, Claude N.

1968 Cultural Tradition and Ecological Adaptation on the Southern California Coast. In *Archaic Prehistory in the Western United States*, C. Irwin-Williams, ed. *Eastern New Mexico University Contributions in Anthropology* 1(3):1–14. Portales.

2007 Review of *Five Thousand Years of Maritime Subsistence at CA-SDI-48, on Ballast Point, San Diego County, California*, by Dennis Gallegos and Carolyn Kyle. *Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology* 27(2):201–204.