anyone else. Either these data are being underutilized or the problems are more complex than we imagine. I suspect that as well-designed centralized databases and information-sharing become more commonplace, it will be increasingly possible not only to see things regionally from the godlike perspective afforded by GIS, but also to drill down to answer site and subsite-level problems. Also related to obsidian, it is discouraging that it has been almost 40 years since Singer and Ericson’s work at Bodie Hills and almost 20 years since Gilreath and Hildebrandt’s work at the Coso obsidian source and we seem no closer to understanding the mechanisms behind the “peak and crash” pattern of obsidian quarry use. There are certainly some good explanations, and the two papers on the subject in this volume (by King et al. and Gilreath and Hildebrandt) go a long way towards resolving the issue, but I don’t think we can say the book is closed on this one yet (take notice, graduate students).

There is no need to go into any more detail about each chapter as this has already been done in the two excellent review chapters at the end of the book by Michael Moratto and David Hurst Thomas. What can I say about the book that these two eminent scholars have not already said? If you are working in either of these two regions or farther afield and have a project or research topic dealing with trade and exchange, you will definitely want to cite it, likely want to read it, and probably ought to own it.

**California’s Channel Islands: The Archaeology of Human-Environmental Interactions**

Christopher S. Jazwa and Jennifer E. Perry (eds.)
204 pages, 24 illustrations, 19 maps, 20 tables, $40 (Paperback), $65 (Cloth), $52 (eBook).

Reviewed by Adrian R. Whitaker
Far Western Anthropological Research Group, Davis, CA 95616

Although they comprise a tiny fraction of the area and the archaeological record of the state of California, the Channel Islands have played a disproportionately large role in the development of California archaeology over the past 25 years. A recent volume edited by Jazwa and Perry and published by University of Utah Press demonstrates why these small and isolated islands hold such allure. The sub-title of the volume—The Archaeology of Human-Environment Interactions—is somewhat of a misnomer, because the contributions go beyond simple environmental considerations to delve into many of the key questions addressed by hunter-gatherer scholars worldwide. The chapters are tied together geographically, but are topically diverse, demonstrating that in many ways the islands are a microcosm of the archaeology of the Western United States.

The volume begins with an introduction and synthetic overview of Channel Island prehistory and geography by the editors. Nine contributions follow, arranged more or less in chronological/archaeological order from Early to Late Holocene. Braje, Erlandson, and Rick examine the distribution and nature of Paleocoastal sites and artifacts on the northern Channel Islands. Gusick and Glassow offer chapters discussing settlement patterns on Santa Cruz Island during the Early (Gusick) and Middle Holocene (Glassow). Jazwa, Kennett, and Winterhalder expand on previous Ideal Free Distribution studies with an application of the model to a single drainage on Santa Rosa Island. The remainder of the contributions focus on Late Holocene phenomena. Guttenberg and colleagues provide a novel application of GIS to an examination of spatial patterning at a single site on San Nicolas Island. Gill synthesizes previous studies as well as her dissertation research on paleoethnobotanical remains from all eight islands. Perry also synthesizes data from the entire chain in a study of ritual items, particularly those related to the Late Holocene ‘Antap and Chingichgnish cults. The final two chapters report the results of recent work on Santa Catalina, perhaps...
the least studied of all the inhabitable Channel Islands. Teeter, Martinez, and Kennedy-Richardson present their research involving a large-scale survey project examining cultural landscapes on the island, while Strudwick uses mission and historical records to track the depopulation of the island during the early nineteenth century. Finally, Jochim provides a synthesis of the volume’s main themes.

There are several recurrent themes that offer guidance for future research on the islands. In particular, I want to highlight two topics—sampling and inter-island interaction—that are recurrent throughout, and one—the theoretical foundations of research—that is exemplified in several papers.

One of the hallmarks of Channel Island archaeology is the excellent preservation afforded by the lack of burrowing rodents, relatively minor historic/modern disturbances, and pothunting. When coupled with the copious amounts of time required to analyze microfaunal and artifact constituents from shell-dominated sites, there has been a tendency on the part of managers to limit the scope and scale of excavation at island sites with the goal of preserving them for future research. In his chapter, Glassow concludes that “larger sample sizes per site must be obtained, large enough for characterizing variation in artifact assemblages, food remains, and features related to food processing” (pg. 70). The benefits of large-scale excavation are exemplified in the chapters by Guttenberg et al., and Perry. The nearly complete excavation of SNI-25, coupled with GIS analysis, allows Guttenberg et al. to identify patterns in the record—ceremonial activity, shell fishhook manufacturing—that would not have been evident had only a small sample of 1 by 1-meter control units, or even smaller column samples, been excavated. Similarly, Perry’s chapter on ceremonialism across the islands relies on data obtained mainly from large-scale excavations at a limited number of sites, including the Lemon Tank and Old Airfield sites on San Clemente Island, SNI-25 on San Nicolas, and Smugglers’ Cove on Santa Cruz Island. Although preservation of the archaeological record is an admirable management goal, studies in this volume show the value of allowing the controlled, large-scale excavation of selected sites on all of the Channel Islands. Hopefully, resource managers will take note of the benefits of excavation and allow researchers to take larger samples for analysis (cf. Stevens 2009).

Perhaps the greatest strength of this volume is the synthesizing approach that characterizes many of the papers, in conjunction with the acknowledgement that the interconnectedness of the islands and the mainland was paramount to the survival of island cultures. Both Gill and Perry are explicit in their synthetic approach. Gill demonstrates the importance of plant foods, particularly corms, on all the inhabited islands. One obvious implication here is that acorns may not have been such an attractive import from the mainland if other plant foods were readily available. Perry’s chapter on the archaeology of ritual combines the ethnography and archaeology of both the mainland and islands in one of the most synthetic approaches to island archaeology that I have read. Strudwick similarly (and perhaps necessarily given the dearth of historical data) takes a regional view of island depopulation in the early nineteenth century, examining records focused not only on the islands but also on the mainland coast. I think that these types of studies bring out the similarities between the northern and southern islands and move archaeological research in the Channel Islands forward in novel ways.

A related theme that is especially present in the later chapters of the volume, but perhaps bears some consideration in others, is the inter-connectedness of the islands. Teeter et al. suggest that the archaeological study of trails/paths be extended to include sea routes between islands and between the islands and the mainland. Similarly, Perry suggests that inter-visibility between islands may have structured the location of ceremonial sites. Strudwick posits that the final exodus from the islands by native peoples was not the result of Euro-American pressure, but rather the collapse of intra- and inter-island social and political support and connectedness. Too often those working on the Channel Islands focus on single sites or single islands, and sidestep the necessary relationships between the islands and between the islands and the mainland.

Finally, many of the papers provide a middle-range approach to the record or synthesize data. This is valuable in providing background data for future applications, but my favorite paper in the volume, that by Jazwa et al., takes the same basic data available from nearly all Channel Island sites—paleoenvironmental records, faunal data, and artifact remains—and places them within a firm theoretical foundation (the Ideal...
Free Distribution model or IFD). This application of the IFD combines environmental and cultural change and provides insights into how human societies adapt to changing ecological circumstances, and how humans, in turn, structure the environment around them. As this paper—and other theoretical applications by Gill and Teeter et al.—show, the archaeological record is more broadly applicable outside the specific study area when it is firmly based on a theoretical approach.

As the contributions in this volume show, the Channel Islands continue to provide exciting data germane to myriad topics of broader archaeological interest. The papers will, of course, be of interest to California archaeologists working along the Southern California coast, but many of the methods and models that are employed here are likewise relevant to those working with hunter-gatherers or on islands elsewhere.
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*Treasures from Native California: The Legacy of Russian Exploration* offers the most thorough accounting yet of the Native Californian ethnographic objects collected by Russian military officers and scientists who came to California during the first half of the nineteenth century. The bulk of these collections are housed at St. Petersburg’s Kunstkamera, the Peter the Great Museum of Anthropology and Ethnography, including a wide variety of materials collected by Il’ia Voznesenskii in 1840 and 1841. The authors also survey additional materials collected by Russian visitors to California, which in some cases were deposited in other museums in central Europe. Through the authors’ detailed commentary and ample photographs, this book provides an unprecedented look at the ingenuity and beauty of Native Californian material culture during a pivotal time.

The book’s first four chapters provide the context for the Native Californian collections. After a brief introduction (Chapter 1), the authors assess what is known—or in many cases, not known—about the origins of the materials collected by the Russians in California. Chapter 2 gives a broad overview of the men who returned to Europe with Native Californian objects, while Chapter 3 details the important collecting work of Voznesenskii, whose travels took him from the Pacific coast around Fort Ross to the missions of the San Francisco Bay to Sutter’s New Helvetia near modern-day Sacramento. These excursions enabled him to obtain large quantities of ethnographic objects that were shipped back to St. Petersburg, although records linking materials to specific villages or groups are largely unavailable. Chapter 4 discusses the ethnographic observations that Russian visitors made in California, notably pointing out the differences between the generally even-keeled assessments offered by the Russians and the decidedly less favorable attitudes of the Spanish toward Native Californians. While the ethnographic collections themselves will perhaps attract the attention of most readers, these opening chapters are important in that they outline the current dispositions of the collections as well as the social circumstances under which they were made.

The second half of the book describes the items collected by the Russians in California. These richly