

The Consciousness-Raising of a California Archaeologist:
by Dave Fredrickson

Public Lecture prepared for Marin Museum of the American Indian, Novato,
presented at the Marin Art and Garden Center, Ross,
March 4, 2001

My presentation this evening is going to be much more autobiographical than I originally intended. The story begins in 1944 when I first enrolled at U.C. Berkeley. It may seem unbelievable at the present time, but when I began college, I had never heard of academic Majors despite being on a college track in high school and having been specifically tutored with my classmates on college entrance examinations, which proved to be no problem. It's still a joke to my friends when I describe coming to Berkeley to register, and discovered to my thorough embarrassment that one had to apply to the University before one could be admitted. I had grown up in a semi-rural background and had several illnesses, including tuberculosis, that kept me out of school and relatively isolated from social contact.. It took me several years out in the world to overcome my basic ignorance. Following three consecutive semesters at Berkeley, I was accepted in the Navy V5 officer training program and spent two more semesters, one at Gonzaga University in Spokane, Washington, and one back at U.C. Berkeley while in the Navy. I was released from the Navy in the Spring of 1946, a few months after the war ended. Coming back to Berkeley in the Fall of '46, I finally needed a Major. However, not having a particular educational interest, I followed my parents wishes and registered as Pre-Med. By the winter of '46 I realized Pre-Med was not for me, not least of which reason was that it would have required at least four and perhaps five more semesters because of need for courses that I lacked. In actual units to graduate, I needed only three semesters. So, after searching the catalogue without success for a traditional major for which I was qualified based on courses I had already taken, I petitioned for entry into an unusual major, General Curriculum. This major required upper

division courses in any three traditional majors. I soon discovered that I had lower division prerequisites in only two fields, German and Psychology. A search of the catalogue showed very few traditional majors that did not require lower division prerequisites for their upper division courses. I eventually discovered a discipline called Anthropology was one of these. I had no idea at all what Anthropology was about, my general ignorance emerging once again. Scheduling courses into my work hours, I began that semester with one German and one Psychology and three Anthropology courses. I was surprised to find the variety of courses in Anthropology, three different instructors, three different topics: a critique of the Cultural Evolution espoused in the 1800s, and courses on Primitive Religion and the Archaeology of North America. Although my grades weren't particularly good in Anthropology, and I had no idea what the field was really about, having had no introductory courses, I decided that the variety of content to which I had been exposed suggested that Anthropology must have some place for me and I switched majors again, from General Curriculum to Anthropology. And I did indeed graduate in three semesters.

Toward the end of the semester, Robert Heizer, who taught the archaeology course, announced that there would be summer field work for the first time since the beginning of World War 2, and that interested students should see him in his office. Since I had no summer plans, I dropped by and was accepted for the field party. Thus was the beginning of my experience doing archaeological fieldwork, in the summer of 1947 as an undergraduate at U.C. Berkeley. The 14 undergraduate volunteers were divided into two crews, one with Heizer, the other with Russ Newman, a graduate student finishing up his dissertation. I was on Newman's crew. I should note that more than half of the 14 volunteers eventually had long, successful careers as professional archaeologists and anthropologists.

After six weeks in the Sacramento Valley, excavating at two sites, I was invited, along with another worker, to join a crew for the remainder of the summer under the direction of Adan Treganza, at Topanga Canyon in Southern California. From Topanga I went back to Berkeley and finished off the Anthropology major. Out of nowhere Heizer suggested I apply for graduate school, a career direction that I had never ever considered. In the summer of 1948, while part of a crew working at sites in the pool area of the proposed Pine Flat Dam in the Sierra Foothills, I was notified that I had been accepted for the graduate program at Berkeley and, also important to me, I had my first meeting with a California Indian, who dropped by one afternoon for a visit at a site we were excavating. He seemed friendly, but more importantly, it prompted in me an awareness that we were digging into his past. Discussions with fellow students and instructors in the following months revealed the nature of anthropology at Berkeley during that time. With few exceptions, it was the prehistoric past of California Indians that prompted interest, not their present lives. It was suggested that study of their present lives belonged to the fields of sociology or social welfare. An important exception to this view was held by a colleague Fritz Riddell, who even at that time had a long history working with California Indians and a great respect for them. I found his perspective much more attractive than the other alternatives.

Although my participation in archaeological activities continued, I found myself gaining more and more of an interest in broadening my anthropological understanding generally and reducing the intensity of my archaeological work. In the spring of 1950, after more discussions with Fritz and also Heizer, I devoted the semester to ethnographic field work and subsequent analysis, focusing on a Native American Community near where I dug at Pine Flat. I hoped to become an anthropologist first, an archaeologist second, if at all. The aim of my field work was to

investigate the extent to which their indigenous culture still affected their present lives. Because information seemed readily available and because I had strong inhibitions about intruding into other aspects of their lives, I focused on some of their food patterns, discovering for myself the importance of food sharing among them, especially periodic distributions of ground acorns and their products throughout a dispersed community. After six weeks of ethnographic effort, having tried my best, I decided that it was a skill I could not master. I constantly felt my uninvited intrusion into the lives of other peoples, despite their friendly acceptance of me.

Although I remained involved in archaeology, I did attempt to gain more understanding of sociocultural anthropology. However, my lack of success in a graduate seminar was the "straw that broke the camel's back" when combined with bales of straw already weighting me down, that is, my declining interest in archaeology and personal doubt about my capability as a scholar (in contrast with my relative confidence as a digger), and perhaps most of all the emergence of serious doubts about my interest and capabilities if I were to become a college teacher, for which the Ph.D. was designed back in those days. From what I could see of it, there was nothing in that life style that appealed to me. In January of '52 I walked away, accepting that I was burning my bridges behind me. The next seven years I learned about everyday life within my own culture. I drove a taxicab for five years in Oakland and Berkeley, got married, had two children, spent two years of part time truck driving combined with word of mouth odd jobs mostly landscaping, giving guitar lessons, and art school modeling. The African-American president of the San Francisco Models Guild, which admitted both my wife Vera-Mae and myself as members, was a charismatic woman with a long and outstanding career as an artists model, very well known in the local art world, and who hoped to stop modeling quite soon. She informed me, as

well as the other Guild members, that I was to be the next president, a position I held for several years, actually into the 1960s, after the pro forma election. I thoroughly enjoyed my life, played guitar for several years in an old timey string band, and found it rewarding to be relieved of the obligations of student life.

In 1959, Vera-Mae decided she wanted to return to school for a Master's degree to add to her BA from the University of Minnesota. She selected Anthropology as her field. I had compiled an extensive anthropology library during my earlier tenure as a student. We sold the library book by book during the 50s and she read each book before it was sold, developing an excellent background in anthropology through this process. She participated in several archaeological excavations during her first year and I felt our lives and interests diverging. I also was becoming aware of the ever increasing expenses entailed as our children became older, and recognized that we needed a more reliable income. To shorten an already long story, I made a few inquiries that revealed how archaeology had recently been incorporated into highway building and a few other government ground disturbing projects. This was a relatively new occurrence and there was a lack of trained persons to do the work. Through my old friend Fritz Riddell, who I hadn't seen for years, I gained employment as a field director for a newly formed non-profit group, the Central California Archaeological Foundation.

From 1961 through 1964 I spent up to six months per year in the field, adding eight different counties to the nine or more from my earlier UC experience. Time at home was devoted to writing up reports on excavations. Interestingly, the legislation which sponsored the excavations did not include funds for write-up. Thus my work at home was done for free; during the time at home I had an important and rewarding role in caring for our three daughters, especially our youngest who was born in 1962. This was possible because Vera-Mae

completed her Masters at this time and was immediately employed by the Lowie Museum at Berkeley as an exhibit researcher, thus stabilizing our income and giving me another learning experience as house-husband.

It was interesting to me that despite (or perhaps because) I had been completely out of the field, doing a wide variety of quite different things, my confidence had increased and my archaeological field work received very positive reviews for both methods and theory. I was also able to select my own digging crews, which varied from six to eight persons including myself. My life away from the academic context had widened the scope of friendships which Vera-Mae and I developed. During these years I drew my crews from my friends, including both men and women, and from those they recommended. I was demanding in that I required evidence of a strong work ethic, reliability, and a commitment to take archaeology seriously. Some found themselves involved in work they were certain that elsewhere they would have had to pay out money to do. Perhaps by chance, but with consciousness on my part, every one of my crews included at least one and sometimes up to three Native Americans. The archaeological work setting provided many opportunities for informal discussions, including the down side of archaeology with respect its quite frequent lack of attention to Native American concerns. I consider these years with their often intense conversations with friends, not part of the archaeological discipline, and the exchange of information, ideas, and value positions, with its examination of the practice of archaeology, to have had a very important influence on my later professional life. I doubt that I would have had such experiences if I had remained in school in 1952.

I was working with only a Bachelor's degree and I slowly realized that I was inherently limited to the part time work I was doing, despite my enjoyment of that life style and finding myself capable of handling the added responsibility. I also participated in professional

activities, including presenting papers at meetings. I recall giving a paper at a professional meeting in San Francisco, when a professor from a southern California University, a generation above me when I was a student at Berkeley, informed me that there was an opening for an archaeologist in his department and invited me to apply. When I told him that I did not have a graduate degree, he responded, "Give me a call when you get one." He is still a good friend, by the way.

Bypassing more detail, I was accepted into the then new graduate program at U.C. Davis, not applying to Berkeley because Heizer, who had been receptive to my suggestion that I might apply at Berkeley, placed a requirement that I cease doing "salvage archaeology" as it was usually called back then. This was not acceptable to me for quite a few reasons, hence my application to Davis. Martin Baumhoff at Davis, who remembered me from the Berkeley days, suggested I bypass the Masters Degree and go directly to the Ph.D. When I told him that this was what I was told at Berkeley in 1948 and thus spent more than two years without even a certificate, I would prefer to obtain a Masters just in case, for whatever reason, I was unable to complete the Ph.D.

In 1965, Baumhoff immediately introduced me to Yehudi Cohen, a social anthropologist, new to the department. I felt that the introduction gave me an opportunity to focus on social anthropology rather than archaeology, and I became, with Baumhoff's approval, one of Cohen's students. Despite the fact that both my Masters thesis and Ph.D. dissertation were devoted to archaeological topics, all my formal coursework at Davis was social anthropology. I was allowed to use archaeological work I had carried out in the 60s as the basis for both of my graduate degrees. I was awarded my Master's in 1966, and in 1967 passed my doctoral exams, both written and oral. Although I had a fellowship that provided a stipend and would have extended my student life while I worked on my dissertation, I wanted a job. I was offered

one at Davis and also one at Sonoma State. I selected Sonoma because it was not a "publish or perish" institution, and began teaching there in the fall of 1967.

My time at Davis was very well spent, I found it both enjoyable and exciting. Cohen taught from a theoretical perspective with which I took issue. However, I was not a debater, so I figured the way to make clear my contrarian position was through the data analyses which he asked his students to do using ethnographic literature. He seemed excited when I reported the results of my work, which I felt often contradicted the ideas he was expressing in the seminar room. These apparent contradictions, fortunately, were backed with data, and it was the data which moved Cohen. There was no scholarship funding available when I was first at Davis and I became his reader in classes such as comparative religion and culture and personality. I was familiar with both fields from intensive readings in what I might call my past lives. Eventually, I became his research assistant, and to my surprise after he met Vera-Mae, he employed grant money to employ her as an assistant also. One project in which both Vera-Mae and I were involved was taking extensive notes on selected topics from 60 cultures which Cohen had selected from a world ethnographic atlas. It was not only from the coursework but also from this extensive reading of ethnographies that I felt I became an anthropologist, something I had wished for years earlier as a student back in Berkeley. I am saddened that I disappointed Cohen, who died several years ago, because I never took advantage of several invitations to submit papers for publication utilizing the results of some of our joint work while I was at Davis. I admit that publication was not my goal, but I took teaching seriously.

I was the first full time anthropologist employed at Sonoma State and had more influence than I ever dreamed of in shaping the yet to be established Department of Anthropology. My recommendations for building

an anthro department and an anthropology faculty were taken quite seriously by the administration. My first faculty choice was a woman with a Berkeley Ph.D., Mildred Dickemann, who I knew slightly and who had often been mentioned by friends, students at the University at Berkeley, who had gone through her courses at a local junior college, before she left for the University of Kansas. She was unanimously described as the most rigorous and best instructor they had ever had. I had a great deal of respect for the opinions of Dickemann's ex-students. The Dean and Vice President at Sonoma were surprised that rather than me moving into the position of chair that I recommended her to be chair of the Anthropology Department when it was created the next year. For the third faculty member of the new Anthropology Department, Dickemann agreed with my nomination of the late David Peri, of Bodega Miwok descent, whom I had known for several years and whose knowledge, intelligence, and experience (much of it gained through work with Alfred Kroeber and Sam Barrett), I highly respected. The next addition to the Anthro Department was Shirley Silver, an anthropological linguist specializing in California Indian languages. Her addition to the department further enabled and enhanced our specialty in the Native Americans of California, past and present, which brought to fruition a vision I had for the department when I was first hired.

My life was still going on in other dimensions outside of Davis and Sonoma State. Throughout the time I have discussed, I continued to take part in professional activities, formal and informal, including meetings and discussion groups. There was growing awareness on the part of archaeologists, especially younger ones a generation or two younger than I, that archaeology in California was experiencing some troubles within its academic setting. In part this was related to the growth in the number of higher educational institutions, the two year colleges, the California State Colleges, and the University of California. This was

in large part due to the increase for the need of higher education facilities prompted by the G.I. Bill which encouraged and enabled unprecedented numbers of persons to obtain financial assistance, related to military time served, for higher education. Two year colleges proliferated, the California State Colleges added numerous campuses, including Sonoma State in the early 60s, and the University of California added campuses.

One result of this growth was the establishment of many more programs in anthropology than had ever existed in the past. Each college was adding courses to serve its potential students. Departments were also lobbying in various ways to encourage enrollments. Anthropology Departments discovered that there was a positive response to archaeological field courses and it became very common for a college, two year or four year, to have a summer or week end field program. The downside was that individual schools (1) rarely had the space to properly curate archaeological materials obtained as a result of these field programs, (2) were reluctant to provide funds for classes to do analysis and write up, because of poor student response, and (3) often assigned field programs to instructors who were not trained adequately in archaeological methods. The teaching of archaeology in this context often provided a training ground for persons with little or no interest in archaeology as a scholarly endeavor. The result was that archaeological sites, soon to be called "nonrenewable resources," were being damaged or even destroyed in the process of "teaching" excavations with very little or no return in the form of information yielding new knowledge.

As archaeologists perceived this process, they also recognized that economic development exerted negative impacts to archaeological resources including large scale destruction in the name of public good. Weekend "rescue" operations by volunteers including archaeologists and

minimally trained persons under direction of an archaeologist could do little other than "bandaid" operations. The concept of "Conservation Archaeology" soon developed on a nation-wide level and was adopted by only what I believe to be a relatively small number of professional archaeologists, having once been a member of the "Society for Conservation Archaeology." The concept was that an archaeologist make a commitment to excavate only sites that were threatened to be destroyed or damaged, by construction or other destructive processes. With respect to research problems, archaeologists should also seek threatened sites whenever possible rather than excavate sites not otherwise threatened. The idea of "banking" sites for the future began to grow, eventually reinforced by the passage of environmental protection and historical preservation laws at both the national and state levels. I had no difficulty accepting the concept of Conservation Archaeology and I still consider myself to be a Conservation Archaeologist.

For several years at Sonoma, archaeology was a minor part of my teaching load, no more than one course per semester. My other courses were social structure, psychological anthropology, introductory ones, and ethnographic ones dealing with indigenous cultures of North America. I was expected to teach archaeology and was encouraged to teach a field class. My usual approach was a field opportunity as part of a survey course one semester, and a laboratory class the following semester treating the materials that were recovered during the usually small scale field class. With the assistance of David Peri, who was from Santa Rosa, we were able to find sites that met the Conservation ethic. David, who was also active in local Native American organizations, kept local Native Americans aware as to the nature of the archaeological activities. This approach seemed to work and for several years field archaeology was a low key activity at Sonoma.

There was a major shift in the role of archaeology in 1973 when a legal decision was made that the California Environmental Quality Act did include archaeological resources, not explicitly mentioned in the 1970 CEQA act, as also being historic resources, explicitly mentioned in the original act. Coupled with this was the implementation of the National Historical Preservation Act of 1969 after the several years it took to develop regulations. After some initial resistance, I agreed to become involved in the process of carrying out archaeology in a regulatory context.

Involvement with this process was complicated. I was a full time employee at Sonoma State and it required some time to work out a way to coordinate extracurricular archaeological work with regular University responsibilities. However, I did believe in starting slowly, until 1975 accepting only survey work, that is, on the ground examination of specific properties to determine whether archaeological resources were present. I usually employed students as part of survey crews. There was a great deal of student enthusiasm for archaeological involvement and, working mostly with volunteer students, an "Anthropology Laboratory" came into existence. Also necessary was the development of a relationship with Sonoma's "Academic Foundation, Inc," a non-profit auxiliary organization of the University whose function was to administer grants and contracts awarded to the University, its faculty and staff, and its students. The Foundation entered into contracts on behalf of the Anthro Lab, with me usually the Principal. Student workers were paid for their services from funds generated from the contracts. Contracts included overhead which the Foundation charged for its services. Eventually, the Foundation returned a portion of the overhead to the Anthro Lab to cover a portion of its operating cost.

I should point out that this general period was accompanied by a rise of Native American activism across the country. Native Americans

of Sonoma County, making use of an obscure law, had gained ownership of a relatively large land parcel near the Russian River, called Ya-Ka-Ama, and administered since then as an Indian Education Development Organization. Alcatraz was occupied by Native Americans. Activists were speaking out against the perceived misdeeds of archaeologists and others. And emotions were still aroused by violent events at Wounded Knee in South Dakota.

Thus, when I finally accepted that I was going to become active in studying Native American archaeology in California, I knew very well that I was working with the past of peoples, many of whom had extremely negative views of archaeology and archaeologists. Regarding Native American attitudes, I was well aware that there was widespread distrust of archaeologists, one of the most serious being the archaeological treatment of the dead. Although Native American distrust and the widespread animosity against archaeologists gave me doubt regarding the wisdom of continuing to be active in the field, the passage of both Federal and State laws that actually required archaeology to be done, put me in a bind. I had discussions with Native American friends, including my colleague David Peri, all of whom urged me to become more involved. I had already made the commitment to Conservation Archaeology and gave a great deal of thought to the treatment of the dead by archaeologists. I had no trouble with leaving the dead in the ground, untouched if they were discovered through archaeological work, but only if steps could be taken to ensure that they would not be disturbed later by the project that prompted their archaeological discovery. Knowing that there would be those who disagreed with me, I felt strongly that if threatened by physical destruction, human remains should be removed as a sign of respect. I believed their eventual reburial was inevitable, but hoped for study of the remains before reburial, if permitted by Native American descendants. These thoughts moved me to adopt a position that

I felt I must take. I concluded that archaeology was not necessarily a culturally destructive undertaking. I also considered that although change in the archaeological status quo was likely to be slow, I was in archaeology for the long haul and could possibly assist in making changes. I felt quite deeply that the decision making process of the archaeologist must be genuinely responsive to those whose culture is under study. This position did not imply rote acceptance of every demand, but a true dialogue, not only with words, but with communication through behavior.

When I made this decision I was convinced, and I remain so today, that most people, if not given reason to do otherwise, will usually make reasonable decisions if they know their decisions will be taken seriously. However, decisions must be made on the basis of information at hand, lacking information regarding the immediate context, then information that is irrelevant to the immediate situation will inevitably affect decisions. Elements of trust must be present. To be treated with condescension does not foster trust. I don't think I have to go further into this topic, I have hope here that everyone understands sufficiently what I am attempting to communicate.

I have been called naive many times in my life, I believe most of my naivety derived from my childhood and youth, parts of which I briefly described earlier regarding my youthful ignorance. I reflected deeply upon the kind of commitment I was accepting for myself. I was convinced that it did not come from ignorance. It came from years of observations, of continually trying to know myself, of internalizing what I had learned as an anthropologist, of a life of problem solving, of trying not always to take the self-serving alternative. What I intend to do in the remaining time is to be more anecdotal, with all of you here having heard the goals and principles which guided my behavior.

By 1975 I felt that the program, still developing and gaining ~~CAPRIENCE~~ *was ready for small scale excavations.* About the same time, I received a call from the Contra Costa Planning Department, asking that I take responsibility, under CEQA, for a controversial project in the town of Danville. A bank was to be built in a previous residential area. When homes were demolished, it was found that there was once a Native American village on the parcel, now an archaeological site. Almost immediately, vandalism began, pits were dug in search of artifacts, human remains disturbed and associated items stolen. County personnel informed me that they had called elsewhere for help, with little success, except that Sonoma was mentioned several times as a possible place where help could be obtained.

Despite misgivings, I agreed to become involved. After a field visit, I was convinced that at least some archaeological work was necessary; the County was willing. I made an effort to determine whether there were any Native American groups in the County that might be interested. Vera-Mae and I found out about and contacted the Contra Costa Native American Council in the town of San Pablo, whose members, mostly from out of state, appreciated our desire to make contact with local Native Americans, but they had no leads. As an aside, the group invited us to a social which it was having during the week end. We were greeted warmly when we showed up after accepting the invitation, and shared fry bread and other goodies with them. We participated in several other of their socials over the next few months.

Although we could not locate any local Native Americans, we had as an observer/consultant a man of Plains Miwok descent who had contacted the Lab earlier in the year about other issues. Although field work went well and the project was successful, I did receive a message from a Native American acquaintance that it would be good if I attended a meeting in San Francisco on a particular date to be held by the San

Francisco Chapter of the American Indian Movement (AIM). He informed me that they were interested in the Danville project because of the controversy that had arisen over it and were considering action. I showed up at the AIM office a bit early on the specified date, and found only a couple of folks present. They greeted me in a friendly manner and told me that the toilet wasn't working and they were trying to fix it. They were not at all hesitant to accept my offer to help and fortunately I was able to repair the problem. The meeting itself was not quite as friendly as its prologue. More than 20 Native Americans were present, including about a half dozen Lakota women whom I was told were recently back from Wounded Knee. It turned out that the Danville project and I were at the top of their agenda for the evening. The next two hours were filled with an intense interrogation about Danville, archaeology in general, archaeologists in particular, and where I was coming from. I responded as best I could, avoided as best I could a debate format which tried to emerge from time to time, and found that while some members enjoyed the attack mode, others were listening to what I was saying. The Chairman, after about two hours, called the discussion to an end, asking, "Can't you see he's on our side?". In a nonadversarial social time following the heavy interaction, I was told that AIM may decide to make an issue out of the Danville situation, but if they did, I was to be assured that it was not me that would be the target of their critique. I was also informed that although most of the membership were out of state Indians, they felt they had a responsibility to speak out for Native peoples of the past, if local descendants were no longer present. A few others told me that although many of the members were totally anti-archaeology, there was a significant number that believed that archaeology could prove positive for Native Americans. Apparently, AIM had enough to do elsewhere and there was no demonstration about the Danville situation.

The year 1975 was a very, very busy year. Two other excavations, very small scale, were carried out, with the Plains Miwok descendant serving as observer. Many relatively small surveys were conducted for housing developments, winerys, and public works projects as well as many in the geothermal area of Sonoma and Lake counties. Surveys were done on Indian lands in the Round Valley and Hupa reservations and the Laytonville and El-EM reservations. And by the end of the year administrative affairs were arranged for a complex project at Lake Mendocino investigating the effects of years of water immersion on archaeological sites in the lake basin, uncovered by lowered water levels after severe drought for several years. This major project, sponsored by the Corps of Engineers had a high profile and successful Native American involvement.

The following year, 1976, was even more intense. Our work was expanding into Humboldt County and an old friend from the 60s recommended I contact a recently formed Native American group, the Northwest Indian Cemetery Protective Association (NICPA) for which she served as secretary. NICPA was founded in the early '70s following an on-site confrontation between local Native Americans and an archaeologist who had obtained a permit to conduct a summer field class on a village near Stone Lagoon which was last occupied in the 1930s. The site had a history of vandalism and the field class was too much for the locally resident Native Americans. The story goes that they met the archaeologist and the field class with deer rifles and shotguns and asserted that the weapons would be used if they or any other archaeologist came to dig in Humboldt County. Although the work we were planning to do in the county was survey only, I knew the time would come, under the existing laws, when excavation would be required. Thus, I took the recommendation of my friend quite seriously. She arranged to have me placed on the agenda for their next business meeting. The

meeting was scheduled following the completion of a survey on nearby residential Indian lands. The survey crew included two Native American students from Sonoma as well as another interested Native American nonstudent who had recently worked with us on a complex project in Santa Rosa.

I showed up for the meeting as it was convened. It was in one of Eureka's beautiful old Victorians, somewhat made over to allow offices on the ground floor, with the dining room turned into a conference room. The setting and organization of the meeting was similar to many business meetings I had attended over the years. The chairman, Milton Marks, a Yurok elder now deceased, brought the meeting to order, the minutes of the last meeting were reviewed and approved, and the agenda changed to allow the agenda item that involved the visitor, me, to be moved to the top of the list. Although it would not be correct to refer to the group as friendly, it was not hostile. Neutral would be the best term.

The chair asked why I was there. I explained the nature of the work we would be doing, under what legal and institutional auspices it would be done, and our hope we could establish regular communications with the local Native Americans to obtain their input regarding the work and the projects. I answered several requests for more information and the chair then spoke. In a calm voice, he began a clearly articulated narrative, describing examples of what the whites who had first entered the region, as well as their descendants, had done to the indigenous population, including massacres about which I had read. He continued with what early anthropologists had done, entering into the homes of local Native Americans, asking numerous questions, and then publishing information, available to all, of a sensitive nature. He concluded with accounts of archaeologists, not so long ago, including work of one of my teachers, who excavated historic sites that included graves of their

relatives, as well as the episode which I just described that prompted the forming of NICPA. He then asked me, "Why are you here?" I answered as best I could embellishing here and there on my introductory statement. One of the questions that was raised referred to my "work" with AIM. Apparently news of my meeting with the San Francisco Chapter of AIM had traveled to Humboldt County. I replied as best I could, remarking that AIM had told me their role was to speak for sites when there were no locals to speak for them. I was given a very strong piece of advice: "Never assume that there are no direct descendants in an area. Many have gone underground, have taken up identification with other groups, such as the Mexicans, because they would have had no chance of survival at all if they retained a public identity as Indian." A general discussion ensued that included all of the members, who represented almost all of the tribes of the region. At length, the discussion was brought to a close, and I was excused from the meeting. As I drove back home to the San Francisco Bay Area that night, I was very depressed and seriously considered, once again, getting out of the world of archaeology. So much for my beliefs and principles.

A couple of weeks later I attended a meeting in Sacramento to which I was invited by the Department of Parks and Recreation to consider the formation of a Native American Advisory Group for the Department. When I walked into the room, a small auditorium, I saw that I was one of perhaps four or five non-Indians present. I also saw almost immediately Milton Marks, the chairman of NICPA, who caught my eye and nodded as I entered. Within a few minutes I heard my name mentioned from the podium with regard to how I had interfered with the plans for a cultural center on a reservation. I have to say I became somewhat paranoid and anxious, wondering if somehow one of the goals of this meeting was to get me. A brief explanation. I had done an archaeological survey on an Indian reservation that focused on the locations of a proposed cultural center

and its access roads. I was accompanied by members of the Native American community who were interested in the process, and we discovered an archaeological site within the right-of-way of the major proposed access road. I discussed it with the local folks, explained the alternatives, and they responded positively to my suggestion that I come back with a larger crew and conduct a more extensive survey so that an alternate access route could be selected. This was done. However, within a week or ten days I received a call from the National Park Service, with which we had contracted to do the work, asking for information to help them understand a strong complaint that was raised, questioning my findings. They accepted my explanation, which had been documented in a written report they had not yet received.

At the Sacramento meeting I was waiting for the axe to fall when the speaker finished what he had to say. The chair of the meeting then called for the next speaker on the agenda, who had a completely ^{DIFFERENT} topic to discuss. At coffee break, Milton Marks approached me and asked that I stay for a moment before leaving for lunch because there was someone he wanted me to meet. At the noon break, I found my way to where he was standing in conversation with another person. When he saw me, he turned so that the three of us were facing one another. He then spoke to his friend and said, "Joe, this is Dr. Fredrickson, he is working with us." There were hand shakes and brief words, and we all went our separate ways.

Slowly it came back to me. In the period of NICPA interrogation, there was a brief question, "Would you work with us on this issue?" to which I said, "Yes." Then on to another question. I was finally able to reconstruct the context. The village site which prompted the formation of NICPA was suffering from erosion and human remains could be seen in an eroding area. NICPA wanted the remains removed. Eventually, after more discussion and planning, NICPA was successful in obtaining a

\$10,000 contract from Parks and Recreation for the purpose of conducting archaeological excavations at the village site for stabilization purposes, including a research focus as stabilization was carried out, and for an archaeological report. Excavations were duly undertaken, during the summer of 1976 and the summer of 1978. This work to me, of course, was sufficient evidence that I need not withdraw from the profession.

There have been many more archaeological projects in which Sonoma was involved that included Native American partnerships. A survey of the Round Valley Indian Reservation in the mountains of Mendocino County included one Native American Trainee for each experienced crew member. A partnership between Ya-Ka-Ama and Sonoma carried out a training program in Cultural Resources Methods, both archaeological and ethnographic. The program was organized so that Sonoma graduate students who had demonstrated high levels of appropriate skills were instructors for the mostly Native American students. Several of the Native Students students are still active in the field, as are many of the Graduate students who taught them.

The Sonoma Lab also created a position of Native American Coordinator, who responded to requests for assistance from Native Americans throughout our service area and at times beyond. Such calls were becoming common, such as the discovery of human remains found while a ditch was being dug. The Native American Coordinator could sometimes help out with information provided over the telephone, and, at times, a field visit would be advisable. A land mark project, "The Warm Springs Cultural Resources Study," was associated with the construction of the Warm Springs Dam in Sonoma County. A twelve-person, multi-tribal Native American Advisory Council was established and funded for regular monthly meetings, with support from the Corps of Engineers, throughout the four years of the project's existence. All current cultural resources work

and future planned work was discussed with the Council, Native American input was elicited, and when feasible included in the adopted plans. Native Americans were also employed as archaeological technicians, during excavations. The project itself would warrant a full evening examination to fully appreciate its ground breaking nature.

One more point. Eventually, all of Sonoma graduate students in the Cultural Resources graduate program were expected routinely to contact Native American individuals and groups appropriate to the projects with which they were involved. During this year's annual meeting of the statewide archaeological society about ten days ago, I was buttonholed by both working archaeologists and Native Americans. The archaeologists, all from Sonoma, reported on the usefulness of their Sonoma experience to their work and careers, and the Native Americans commented that they could recognize quite quickly archaeologists from Sonoma because of their obvious acceptance and respect for the Native American role in archaeology.

I have one last story in terms of my consciousness being raised. That is, that the values which I have tried to espouse for many years are now alive outside of myself. An MA graduate of Sonoma's program, Kathy Dowdall, will be going next week as an invited participant to the meetings of the Society for American Archaeology to report upon an archaeological project initiated through her job as a Caltrans archaeologist. An archaeological site within traditional territory of the Kashaya Pomo was excavated collaboratively in the sense that it complied with the governmental regulations known as Section 106 (of the National Historic Preservation Act) and also with ceremonial regulations of the Kashaya Pomo community. It must be understood that the Kashaya traditionally held and still hold the belief that it is dangerous to Kashaya individuals and to the Kashaya as a community for a Kashaya person to handle or even touch cultural things from the ancient past.

Kathy's partner in the excavation effort was Otis Parrish, a Kashaya Pomo, who is her coauthor of the presentation she will make to the SAA. Otis received his introduction to archaeology as a student at Sonoma during the period most of the events I described were occurring. Otis recently told me that it was a 1974 class in archaeology which I offered at Sonoma that stimulated his interest in archaeology. He saw archaeology as a possible means for him to learn even more than he already knew about the history of the Kashaya, and possibly even contribute a different, Kashaya interpretive perspective on the findings of archaeology.

Otis was a part of the Warm Springs Cultural Resources Study, initially he was Native American Coordinator for the Warm Springs Native American Advisory Council and then an archaeological technician. As a technician, Otis was subject to spiritual danger when he touched things of the past. It required constant ceremonial mitigation of the negative forces for him to maintain his safety, including his health. Otis, now a graduate student in the archaeology program at the University of California, was instrumental in the successful effort by Kashaya spiritual elders of today to develop ways to ceremonially offset the negative forces awakened during archaeological undertakings.

The project being reported by Kathy and Otis is still in progress in that the interpretive dimensions are now being explored. A preliminary finding is that the interpretations according to usual archaeology are congruent with interpretations that the Kashaya are generating from their own cultural knowledge. I conclude by simply saying that a new, collaborative, mutually reinforcing archaeology is indeed possible.