

UC Merced

The Journal of California Anthropology

Title

Introductory

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/17m9d3kx>

Journal

The Journal of California Anthropology, 1(1)

Author

Kearney, Michael

Publication Date

1974-07-01

Peer reviewed

Introductory

With this issue the *Journal of California Anthropology* begins its existence, and a few words about its purpose are therefore in order. For some time a number of us have felt the need for a periodical dealing solely with the native societies and cultures of California. Several current publications are more or less regular outlets for material on California anthropology. But what has been lacking is a journal-format periodical devoted exclusively to native California anthropology in general, in which California anthropologists and Indians can exchange and discuss information of common concern.

Today there are undoubtedly more people working in and interested in California anthropology than during any previous time, and there are indications that we are about to enter a renaissance of the "Golden Age" of California ethnology and archaeology pioneered by Kroeber and his early colleagues and students. This journal will hopefully encourage and aid this renaissance. It is true that today California anthropology is more dependent on library research, which has special attendant problems—such as Heizer discusses in this issue. But there are still thousands of living Indian people in California, and I intend that this journal will serve their cultural needs, as well as the professional needs of anthropologists working and studying with them.

One of the ironies of American anthropology is that California has generally been considered atypical and peripheral to the rest of North America. It appears that even many

anthropologists themselves have been victims of the insidious "digger" Indian stereotype insofar as they (the anthropologists) have generally assumed that aboriginal Californians were anomalous examples of preindustrial peoples, and that California was not therefore an appropriate testing ground for theories of social and cultural development. What is most ironic about this attitude is that here, within one region, are represented every major type of subsistence, economic adaptation, and system of thought occurring elsewhere in aboriginal North America. And it has also generally been overlooked that California had an accompanying cultural and linguistic diversity exceeding any other area of comparable size north of central Mexico.

From the perspective of the present, those of us non-Indian anthropologists, standing on the shoulders of our predecessors, are beginning to realize what many Indian people have always known: that there is here a depth and complexity of native culture which has not been adequately reflected in the literature.

This new trend is apparent in several of the contributions to this issue. Kunkel's article is a reinterpretation of aboriginal social structure in northern California which gives "quite a different picture from the conventional depiction of hunting and gathering populations as small, nomadic, owning little property, and characterized by only 'band-level' types of social organization." His interpretation is consistent with other recent reassessments of hunters and gatherers. It now appears that rather than being anomalous,

California societies are more representative of the non-urban stage of human prehistory than the "band-level" societies of contemporary hunters and gatherers in marginal environments which are relatively over-represented in the literature. Similarly, Fredrickson's article demonstrates a degree of prehistoric cultural diversity in central California that has not been generally realized. And Broadbent's is a corrective of the Mission Indian stereotype as applied to all native Californians as docile, and passively accepting subjugation to European invaders. As she shows, where Californians were not annihilated by European diseases, guns, and religions, they adapted and resisted with courage, skill, and honor.

Another theme that is emerging in California anthropology is the realization that aboriginal subsistence economies were more elaborate and varied than previously recognized. Lawton's article, Wilke and Fain's report, Sullivan's report, and the Ballena Press volume reviewed by O'Connell are part of a rapidly growing literature on this topic, one of the main issues of which is the existence of aboriginal agriculture west of the Colorado River, and of other extensive environmental manipulations throughout the entire area. Research on these problems is a prime ex-

ample of the combined efforts of contemporary ethnography, archaeology, ethnohistory, and a number of other specialties. While the *Journal* will deal with these specific issues and others within its own areal domain, their wider theoretical implications are obvious. Fredrickson reveals such an awareness in his present article by noting that, "California offers an excellent research area for the study of the adaptations and development of hunters and gatherers." This and future issues of the *Journal* should therefore be of interest to many anthropologists working with non-agricultural societies elsewhere.

It is also our intent that the *Journal* should appeal to as wide a non-professional audience as is consistent with sound scholarship. Accordingly, we will regularly publish items of general interest, and when possible, we will offer works of both scholarly and literary achievement such as the essays by Carobeth Laird and Jaime de Angulo.

With these thoughts in mind, and speaking for the entire editorial staff, I welcome you to this new venture.

*Michael Kearney, Editor
Banning, California*

