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ABSTRACT

Twenty-five years ago, in 1966, historical archaeology was yet to be defined as a discipline, and yet considerable historic sites work had already been accomplished in California. Sites from the Spanish and Mexican period were among the first to be investigated, followed by those of pioneer statehood inspired by the Gold Rush Centennial. Paralleling developments within the growing discipline of historic sites archaeology, new technologies were developed and old techniques refined. Investigations have been profoundly affected by the continuing evolution of philosophies and research goals involving changes in both cultural and geographic perspectives. Future development should involve more consensus on the importance of historic sites and increasing use of comparative studies to discover significant patterns of our past.

INTRODUCTION

I am pleased to have taken part of the commemoration of the 25th anniversary of the founding of SCA, and honored to have been asked to comment on the development of historical archaeology in California. This retrospective is particularly appropriate as SCA shares an age-mate in the Society for Historical Archaeology, also celebrating its 25th anniversary this year.

As I take note of the other speakers who presented papers in the plenary session, I cannot help but observe that I was the only participant who was not working in California 25 years ago (I was a sophomore at St. Lawrence University). And, despite the abundance of female colleagues in the profession, I was the only woman participant. Perhaps I am part of a new era, a new movement in the discipline: Early Man, followed by Late Woman.

Historical archaeology has been defined as the study of sites that contain material evidence of non-Indian cultures, or about which there is documentary evidence (Fontana 1965). Recently, it has been suggested that historical archaeology is more specifically the study of the development and spread of European society and economy since 1400, the impact of this
expansion on native peoples, the cultural effects of the industrial revolution, and the emerging modern world market economy (Deagan 1988:9; Schuyler 1988:37).

As we look back over historic sites research in California, I will give examples of what we studied, how, and why. This is not a comprehensive survey of historical archaeology in California. There are other summaries of historic sites work in the state that should be consulted for additional references (Chartkoff and Chartkoff 1984; Heizer 1950; Schuyler 1978). More focused summaries have been compiled for work on Hispanic sites (Barker and Costello 1991; Hoover 1985; Kelly and Kelly 1984), on excavations in Sacramento (Schulz et al. 1980a), and on Asian-related sites (Ehrenreich et al. 1984).

25 YEARS AGO....

Let us travel back to 1966: The first soft landing of an unmanned spacecraft has just been made on the moon; Lyndon B. Johnson is president; and Willie Mays is playing for the Giants.

In southern California, two of the state's longest-running historic sites field schools have just begun at the San Diego Presidio and Mission San Diego de Alcalá. Ray Brandes' initial work at the Presidio will be carried on for a decade by Paul Ezell, and then others (Barbolla-Rolland 1983; Brandes and Broadbent 1968; Carrico 1973; Ezell 1976), while Brandes continues excavation at the San Diego Mission with Jim Moriarty (Moriarty 1969; Moriarty and Weyland 1971).

Plans for excavation of the Santa Barbara Presidio Chapel are underway, the first phase of reconstruction-oriented research that will continue under various archaeologists through to the present (Benté et al. 1982; Costello 1976; Fagan 1976; Glassow in Decker 1970; Hillebrand 1967).

Paul Chace is pioneering early-adobe research in Orange County (Chace 1966, 1969), while Roberta Greenwood is conducting some of her first studies around San Buenaventura Mission (Greenwood and Brown 1968; Greenwood and Gessler 1968), beginning her long-term involvement with the archaeology of Ventura (Greenwood 1975, 1976; Greenwood and Foster 1984, 1986). Richard Humphry (1965) has just completed his study of the La Purísima Mission Cemetery.

In the waters off of the Point Reyes Seashore, for the first time in the United States, a rubidium magnetometer is being systematically used to identify submerged historic resources (Murphy 1982:16). And in the interior we find one of the nation's first large-scale urban archaeology projects beginning in Old Town Sacramento by the California Department of Parks and Recreation (Landberg 1967).
In 1966, of the 207 founding members of the Society for Historical Archaeology, 19 are from California, including Sylvia Broadbent, Paul Chace, Frank Fenenga, Dave Fredrickson, Leif Landberg, Don Miller, and Paul Schumacher.

PRE-1966 INVESTIGATIONS

In the summary of 1966 projects, you may have noted a heavy emphasis on Hispanic sites. Indeed, since the turn of the century in California, the words mission, presidio, and adobe have elicited an emotional support that keeps these sites at the top of preservation funding and attendant archaeological research. Beginning in the late 1890s, public fascination with mission sites was promoted by southern California developers, embraced by automobile touring clubs, and nurtured by a romantic vision of the glory days of Padres and Rancheros (Thomas 1991). Early 20th-century restoration work undertaken at various missions typically included only modest concern for accurate details (Barker and Costello 1991).

The earliest major project in historic sites archaeology on the west Coast was, predictably, at a mission: the 1930s Civilian Conservation Corps' (CCC) excavation at La Purisima (Schuyler 1978:71). Advice on archaeological techniques was provided by Arthur Woodward of the Los Angeles County Museum and M.R. Harrington of the Southwest Museum, while other experts included historians, archivists, architectural historians, adobe experts, translators, and chemists (Hageman and Ewing 1980). This careful pre-restoration study was a model for its time and produced data that still contribute to new research.

Prior to this project, significant work had begun in the 1920s by botanists Hendry and Kelly (1925; Hendry 1931), who pioneered the innovative study of botanical remains in dated adobe bricks to trace the introduction of non-native flora. At the same time, mission historian Frances Rand Smith (1932) conducted a praiseworthy study of the aqueduct system at Mission San Antonio de Padua, including measured drawings, photos, descriptions, and chemical analyses of lime mortar, that is still relied upon.

One of the first "official" historic sites archaeologists was M.R. Harrington, who was involved in excavations at San Luis Rey, San Fernando Rey, and La Purisima (Harrington 1938, 1940a-g, 1945, 1948, 1954, 1958). In the 1940s and 1950s, Arnold Pilling also ranged over California, filling out University of California Inventory site forms on the missions and other well-known historic places, thereby obtaining official recognition for these properties as archaeological sites.

Anthropologists have long utilized the direct historical approach to gain information on prehistoric cultures (Heizer 1941b). John P. Harrington's (1928) report on excavation of the
Chumash village site on Burton's Mound included reconstruction of historic-period site activities to aid in interpreting the prehistoric finds. Heizer (1941a) and Meighan (1950) searched Indian sites at Drake's Bay for strata containing fragments of Chinese porcelain, relics from 16th-century ships that could date and provide contemporaneity for the prehistoric villages around the shore (Meighan and Heizer 1952). These sherds later identified both Drake's 1579 visit and that of Cermeno in 1595 (Shangraw and Von Der Porten 1981; Von der Porten 1972, 1984).

The romance between Californians and their Hispanic past was challenged when a new suitor appeared. The approach of California's Gold Discovery Centennial sparked renewed interest in the Mother Lode, Forty-Niners, and pioneer Yankee events (Beardsley 1946; Treganza 1968). The discovery site at Sutter's Sawmill was excavated (Penenga 1947) and Heizer and Penenga (1948) conducted their well-known survey of Mother Lode buildings. Robert Heizer, that man for all seasons, also at this time compiled the first commentary on historic sites archaeology in California (Heizer 1950).

The 1950s and early 1960s, however, saw continued interest in Spanish and Mexican-related sites by the California Division of Parks. Bennyhoff and Elsasser (1954) conducted excavations at Sonoma Mission which Treganza (1956) then continued, producing lucid and useful descriptions of its subsurface remains. John Clemmer (1961) was at San Juan Bautista, and work continued at La Purisima Mission by Gable (1952) and Harrison (1960a, 1960b).

Forts were also popular symbols of California history acquired by the State. In the 1950s, archaeological work was initiated at Ft. Ross (Treganza 1954), Ft. Humboldt (Jewell and Clemmer 1959), and Sutter's Fort (Gebhardt 1955, 1958; Olsen 1961; Payen 1960). All of these state archaeological programs were directed toward reconstruction, interpretation, and management of these publicly owned resources.

Within the confines of reconstruction and restoration efforts, the theme of acculturation persisted as the dominant anthropological research topic for historic sites in California through 1966. Non-Indian populations were not yet seen as viable subjects on their own, but as instruments of imposed culture change. An important study of Native American acculturation was carried out in Los Angeles in the 1950s at the site of the historic Hugo Reid adobe, home of an early Scottish settler who married a Gabrielson woman (Wallace 1959; Wallace et al. 1958; Wallace and Wallace 1958, 1959, 1961). Another landmark study occurred in 1962-63 when Jim Deetz, teaching at U.C. Santa Barbara, excavated areas at La Purisima Mission, comparing material from mission Indian residences to material from the nearby historic Chumash village site at Alamo Pintado (Deetz 1963).

This brings us back to 1966.
DEVELOPMENT OF THE DISCIPLINE

We began with California historical archaeology 25 years ago, and then looked further back to the foundations of this work. The sites of choice were those related to the romanticized Hispanic time period, and to California's celebrated Gold Rush and Yankee settlement. Techniques were descriptive and oriented toward architectural and material culture reconstructions. And anthropological research was largely confined to Native American acculturation studies. Now let us broaden our scope and put the development of California's historic sites research in perspective of the development of the field in general.

Historical archaeology emerged as a distinct area of research in the 1930s, developed as a tool to assist in the restoration and interpretation of some of the nation's important historic landmarks. The national counterpart to California's La Purisima CCC project was the extensive work undertaken at Colonial Williamsburg in Virginia. Large single-site projects became the primary vehicle for historical archaeological research. Reconstruction goals dominated the field during its early years and are still a compelling force for initiating historic sites research today.

Research on underwater sites was formalized in 1958 by John Huston of San Francisco when he founded the international Council of Underwater Archaeology. The first testing of the magnetometer at Point Reyes in 1965-66 opened the door to rapid technological advances in underwater archaeology and remote sensing, and to the rich cultural heritage lying under the earth's waters (Murphy 1982).

The 1960s was a period of reassessment and new thinking throughout the United States, including the discipline of archaeology. Historical archaeology began to expand its scope beyond architecture, artifacts, and acculturation. There was a rash of annual landmarks. Dethlefsen and Deetz (1966) published their classic study of gravestones in American Antiquity. "Death Heads, Cherubs, and Willow Trees" demonstrated the utility of testing general anthropological theories on well-documented sites of the historic period. Fontana and Greenleaf's (1962) thoughtful and detailed study of the history and artifacts of Johnny Ward's ranch in Arizona provided a model for the application of standard anthropological techniques to studying a late 19th-century non-Indian site. At the turn of the decade, Ivor Noël Hume, the dean of Colonial Williamsburg excavations, published his classic field guide, Historical Archaeology (Noël Hume 1969).

In the 1970s, the study of historic period sites exploded with new directions and ideas, helped in no small way by the advent of the 1976 U.S. Bicentennial. As the centennial of the Gold Rush had stirred interest in state history in 1949, the 1976 national celebration created a wave of interest in United States'
"roots" and a popular mandate to pursue research. The public will was also manifested in legal protection from national and state governments (NEPA, CEQA) for archaeological remains of all human activities, native and non-native.

The 1970s also saw a series of landmark publications in historical archaeology. The productive use of documents and archaeological data to explain human behavior was demonstrated by Mark Leone (1973, 1977) in his stimulating work on Mormon culture, while Henry Glassie (1975) extracted information on the evolution of cultural world views from his study of folk houses in middle Virginia. Bill Adams' (1975; Adams et al. 1975) analysis of world, national, and regional trade networks in Silcott, Washington, made the study of 20th-century sites respectable. The "older is better" dictum, however, was profoundly shaken when Bill Rathje started his Tucson Garbage Project (Harrison et al. 1975; Rathje 1974, 1977, 1978). This study of the contents of modern land fills and trash cans brought the study of the past up to, literally, yesterday. In 1977 Stanley South (1977a, 1977b) introduced site interpretive techniques of pattern recognition using functional artifact categories and mean ceramic dating. These new research tools, along with George Miller's (1980, 1991) later economic scaling, are now regularly used in historic site analyses.


HISTORIC SITE STUDIES IN CALIFORNIA

How was the 1970s period of general historic sites development manifested in California? And what subsequent progress in historic sites archaeology has been made in the past decade? I would like to discuss this within two major divisions:

1. Technologies and Techniques.
2. Philosophies and Research Goals.

Let us deal with the tangible first.

Technologies and Techniques
Technological advances in methods used for historic sites research have paralleled advances in the broader field of archaeology. These techniques include remote sensing (Dolphin and Yetter 1985a, 1985b); photogrammetry (Estes et al. 1977); trace-element analysis to determine ceramic origins (Magalousis 1983; Michel and Asaro 1982; Stenger 1986); and analysis of stable isotope concentrations in human bone collagen (Walker et al. 1990).
Virtually all of the techniques used by historical archaeologists, however, have been around a long time, although many have either been more widely adapted, or refined and improved upon. We will look specifically at some of these.

Excavation
Many historical archaeologists active in California today were not specifically trained in historic sites work but acquired critical field experience on complex urban sites in the Middle East, England, or the United States' East Coast or Southwest. Here, they learned the skills of excavating and interpreting sites by natural stratigraphy (Harris 1979). Not only did they learn that increased depth from surface does not necessarily equate with greater antiquity, but that distinguishing fine time periods -- separating the 1857 fire from the 1854 and 1859 fires in Columbia State Park's Fallon Theatre (Gary Reinoehl, personal communication 1991) -- requires fine removal of strata. The interrelationships of site strata must then be untangled to identify site structure, a particular challenge on complex urban sites such as Sacramento (Praetzellis et al. 1980; Praetzellis and Praetzellis 1990a-d), but nevertheless critical to all historic site interpretations.

Artifact Identification
There are abundant artifact types on historic sites, many of which require identification by specialists. Ceramics have always been the darling of archaeologists for their sensitivity in reflecting numerous aspects of culture and for their durability underground. English-made ceramics from the American Colonial period have long been well-defined by East-Coast archaeologists. Californians, however, have made notable contributions in defining other ceramic types common on the West Coast such as majolica (May 1972, 1976), earthenwares made at the missions (Evans 1969; Love and Risnick 1983), and porcelains and stonewares imported from China and Japan (Chase 1976; Costello and Maniery 1987; Etter 1980)

Important identifications have also been made of mass-produced items found in local contexts. For Old Sacramento these include studies of coins, bottles, glass beads, and ceramic marks (Farris 1980; Praetzellis et al. 1983; Schulz et al. 1980b; Schulz and Rivers 1980). "Tin cans", once derided as "trash", are now recognized as precise dating tools (Rock 1984) and as indicators of diet for site populations, particularly for the legendary "Euro-American-wheat-flour-eaters" (Duffield 1986). The regular recovery of opium-related artifacts from Chinese sites has stimulated significant studies of this recreational activity (Wylie and Higgins 1987).

Identification of faunal remains is often done by specialists in mammal (Gust 1982; Walker and Davidson 1989), fish (Schulz 1984), and avifaunal (Simons 1980, 1984) remains, while studies of pollen and macro-floral fossils continue to contribute to reconstructions of historic landscapes (Honeysett 1982; West 1990).
Architectural Studies
Evidence of alterations to historic buildings is analyzed with the same stratigraphic methods applied to the development of site structure (Winter and Schulz 1990). In both applications, techniques have improved with practice. Pioneering work in the early 1970s by Wallace (1973, 1975) and Butler (1973) have been built upon to produce refined analyses and techniques such as those used by Felton (1985) at the Neary-Rodriguez adobe.

Industrial Sites
Knowledgeable descriptions and accurate identifications of artifacts, features, and processes are particularly critical for any meaningful future use of data from technological sites. Detailed studies of technological sites in California have addressed kilns (Costello 1975, 1985; Greenwood and Foster 1986; Treganza 1951); a forge at Mission San Juan Capistrano (Koppenaal 1988); bone-burning for lime production (Langenwalter and McKee 1985; Schulz 1987); a whaling tri-works oven at San Diego (May 1988; Schroth and Gallegos 1989); railroad logging (Rock 1986); gold and silver mines (Fuller and Costello 1991; Hardesty 1988; Teague 1980); and a Death Valley borax works (Teague and Shenk 1977).

Documentary Research
One of the most important techniques used by historical archaeologists involves the extraction and evaluation of documentary data. This is not an adjunct activity, and results are not confined to unintegrated chapters in final reports. Both site-specific documentary data and a perspective of broader cultural events are integral to survey, excavation, and analysis phases of work.

Use of Informants
Working on historic sites can be a humbling experience. An apt allegory is found in Mark Twain's description of his Connecticut Yankee encountering a magician in King Arthur's court:

"...The abbot and his monks were assembled in the great hall, observing with childish wonder and faith the performances of a new magician, a fresh arrival...His speciality was to tell you what any individual on the face of the globe was doing at the moment; and what he had done at any time in the past, and what he would do at any time in the future. He asked if any would like to know what the Emperor of the East was doing now?...

"The high and mighty Emperor of the East doth at this moment put money in the palm of a holy begging friar--one, two, three pieces, and they be all of silver."

A buzz of admiring exclamations broke out, all around:

"It is marvelous!" "Wonderful!" "What study, what labor, to have acquired a so amazing power as this!"
Would they like to know what the Supreme Lord of Inde was doing? Yes. He told them what the Supreme Lord of Inde was doing. Then he told them what the Sultan of Egypt was at; also what the King of the Romote Seas was about. And so on and so on; with each new marvel the astonishment at his accuracy rose higher and higher...I must put a cog in his wheel, and do it right way, too. I said:

"If I might ask, I should very greatly like to know what a certain person is doing."

"Speak, and freely. I will tell you."

"It will be difficult--perhaps impossible."

"My art knoweth not that word. The more difficult it is, the more certainly will I reveal it to you."

"...If you make no mistake--if you tell me truly what I want to know--I will give you two hundred silver pennies."

"The fortune is mine! I will tell you what you would know."

"Then tell me what I am doing with my right hand."

"Ah-h!" There was a general gasp of surprise. It had not occurred to anybody in the crowd--that simple trick of inquiring about somebody who wasn't ten thousand miles away..." [Twain 1977:153-154]

Like Twain's magician when confronted by the Connecticut Yankee, historical archaeologists are extremely vulnerable in their interpretations. In addition to new documents which may turn up, resident old-timers can walk onto a site and dash our finest hypotheses and field identifications with a stroke of first-hand knowledge. Although we have a great deal more data to work with than our prehistoric colleagues, this wealth of information often serves to make us more reluctant to draw simplistic conclusions. We have found that cultural patterns are typically intricate and convoluted, and the idiosyncratic behaviors of individuals are manifest at every turn (Costello 1990).

Philosophies and Research Goals

This leads us into the second topic in the development of historical archaeology: the philosophies and research goals that guide investigations. What were we interested in 25 years ago? Sites of the Spanish Colonial and Mexican periods and sites of our Gold Rush roots. And what were the questions? Where was the site located; what did the building or structure look like; what artifacts or features were associated with particular structures and activities; and, the major anthropological topic, what evidence is there of Native American acculturation processes?

Today, we are still interested in these topics; they
constitute legitimate and important aspects of historic sites research. But, we have broadened our vision, and many of the questions have become more detailed. Although the highest standards must be held for excavation techniques, artifact identification, and documentary research, it is not enough to simply locate, identify, and date archaeological remains.

At a symposium in 1980, I took my speaker's seat next to Jim Deetz following what I thought was an exciting presentation of the myriad buried historic features we had found in downtown Los Angeles: Spanish-period trash deposits, the zanja madre, artifact features associated with a late 19th-century brothel, and the important County Water Works building (Costello and Wilcoxon 1978). Jim leaned over and muttered to me: "We are going to have to get beyond simply being delighted at finding things where the documents say they are." It is, indeed, time to move beyond the identification of archaeological remains to their interpretation.

We are products of our times. The priorities of our society and, therefore, what we think is important to know about the past, have changed over the past 25 years. These changes can be grouped into two categories:

1. Changes in Cultural Perspective
2. Changes in Geographic Perspective

Changes in Cultural Perspective

The social upheavals of the 1960s (the Black civil rights movement; the rejection of materialistic, middle class values; and the women's movement) have had long-term effects on anthropological research. Interest expanded from serving a "white, moneyed, male" perspective to include minority groups, the disadvantaged, and the historically overlooked. At the California Spanish missions, Indian residences are now as likely to be the location of research as the church (Hoover and Costello 1985; Porter et al. 1981).

This interest in sites related to ethnic minorities was nationwide (Schuyler 1980) and was manifest in California particularly in an explosion of studies on Chinese sites. One of the first investigated was Ventura's Chinatown (Benté 1976; Greenwood 1980), followed by studies in the Chinatowns of Lovelock (Hattori et al. 1979), San Francisco (Pastron et al. 1981; Pastron and Hattori 1990), Sacramento (Praetzellis and Praetzellis 1982, 1990a; Praetzellis et al. 1987), and Riverside (Great Basin Foundation 1987). Chinese in the small communities of Woodland (Felton et al. 1984) and Walnut Grove (Costello and Mainery 1987) were researched, as were those on rural gold-mining sites in Shasta and Tehama counties (Tordoff 1987).

New cultural visibility of previously overlooked groups is also seen in studies of early 20th-century work camps (Foster et al. 1988; Sutton 1986), Italians in the Mother Lode (Costello
Concern with class disparities between segments of the United States population also stimulated studies of economic aspects of material culture by historical archaeologists. Techniques are being developed to measure changes in the cost and variety of goods over time, determine the relative value of goods associated with different portions of the population, and evaluate the effects of mass-marketing on the poor and the middle class (Felton and Schulz 1983; Felton et al. 1984; Praetzellis and Praetzellis 1989, 1990c, 1990d; Schulz 1982; Schulz and Gust 1983). Identifying archaeological evidence of ethnic and class distinctions, however, is heady stuff, and we are sobered by the need to establish a baseline profile for white, middle-class artifact assemblages before we can elaborate on ethnic deviations (Praetzellis et al. 1988).

This new lens for looking at the past has called some old assumptions into question. No topic has been so scrutinized as the relationships between the Spanish Missions and Native Californians, a scrutiny stimulated by the proposed canonization of Fr. Junipero Serra and the imminent Quincentennial of the arrival of Columbus in the New World. Rather than celebrating, most Indians regard the arrival of the Spanish as the beginning of the end of their culture. Archaeologists are looking for new evidence, and evaluating old data, in an effort to sharpen the focus on this emotion-laden issue (Johnson 1988; Thomas 1990).

Small, on a Large Scale: Changes in Geographic Perspectives

There are numerous fruitful avenues for historic sites research, including artifact styles, feature distributions, architectural changes, historic landscapes, and settlement patterns (Hardesty 1980, 1986). I would like to use the example of artifact features to illustrate some changes which have taken place in the geographic perspectives of historical archaeologists.

Research questions about specific people in well-defined time periods require discrete assemblages of artifacts. Historic sites were sometimes occupied by the same people for a long period of time, or for a short time by several groups of people. The ideal artifact assemblage is part of a well-defined feature that can be securely correlated to known historic events on the site and associated with a specific household, activity, or occupation. The rich artifact deposit recovered from the Cooper-Molera adobe in Monterey is valuable for the information it provides on the Manuel Díaz merchant family (Felton and Schulz 1983), and the analysis of goods from Sam Stein's late 19th-century junk store in Sacramento is particularly meaningful in its reflection of the economic life of a Jewish immigrant from eastern Poland (Praetzellis and Praetzellis 1990d).

These dated, discrete deposits constitute a primary comparative tool for addressing economic, social, or value
changes within a site, within a region, over time, or between population groups. It is comparative analysis, the contrasts and similarities between such assemblages, that produces answers and insights related to important research questions. Assemblages from later 19th-century contexts have been compared to assist in evaluating economic status in specific population groups (Felton and Schulz 1983; Schulz and Gust 1983) and the development of urban life (Schulz 1982). Productive comparative work has also begun on Spanish sites within California, addressing issues of acculturation and the spread of world economic systems (Costello 1990; Farnsworth 1987; Walker and Davidson 1989).

The geographic scope of these historic sites comparisons is not limited by political boundaries. The steady solidification of a world economy and the increasingly rapid global dissemination of cultural ideas are processes that have been going on since the 15th century. These processes are eminently susceptible to historic sites research. The record of social and economic status found in the 1840s Diaz privy in Monterey has been compared not only to similar artifact data from Sacramento, but also with data from contemporary slave and slave-owner features recovered from Cannon's Point Plantation in Georgia (Felton and Schulz 1983). Sacramento urban life has been compared to that of Milwaukee (Schulz 1982). Artifact repertoires from Chinese gold-mining sites in California's Sierra Nevada have been shown to be virtually indistinguishable from those in New Zealand (Ritchie 1986). Occurrences of glass bead types in California have been related to sites in Canada and Europe in order to address significant questions about economics and trade (Ross 1990). Jim Deetz, a leader in calling for a world-wide research scope, has expanded his study of English colonial life from Virginia to South Africa (Deetz 1991). As modern economies reduce the world to a global village, the village itself becomes the arena of study.

THE FUTURE

As part of this plenary session, I was asked to make some comments on the future of historic sites research. Not wanting to run the fate of King Arthur's wizard, I will confine myself to summarizing a few relevant areas:

1. As our questions become more sophisticated, so will our data requirements, and we should make increasingly prudent choices of what we excavate and analyze.

2. We should not stop at site-specific investigations; we will make real strides in understanding the past only when we broaden our geographic range.

3. We should continue our efforts to standardize excavation techniques, artifact nomenclature, and artifact classification systems to enhance intersite comparisons.
4. We should continue to strive for relevancy in research, both to anthropological research domains and to current social concerns. What we choose to study in the past, and how we interpret it, can have a profound effect on our future.

NOTE

1. This story was first used by a colleague over a decade ago to make a similar point. I regret that I have not been able to rediscover who it was or where I read it.
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