

rect, it offers the possibility of new questions and interpretations, that might be tested by archeology.

If the village sites, which were located some distance from the mission (according to Treganza's survey), and the mission occupation, are contemporary, the emplacement of the mission in relation to the villages remains in question. The answer might be indicated by the presence of neophytes from thirty-five different tribes and from different missions—missionizing efforts among the local tribes may not have been overly successful at Sonoma.

What I am driving at, quite obviously, is the need for problem-oriented research in historic site archeology, and I merely repeat the pleas of others in this respect. But this research, and the excavations which might result from it, must, I think, be useful to students of culture, whether they are "Indians" or not.

A useful definition of a mission will clarify the concept:

"A mission is an ecclesiastical unit of area of sufficient size, within which all activities (such

as construction, farming, handicrafts, herding, recreation, etc.) are administered by a ministry commissioned by, and dependent upon a larger religious organization for direction or financial support".

REFERENCES USED

BERKHOFER, ROBERT

1965 *Salvation and The Savage: An Analysis of Protestant Missions and American Indian Response, 1787-1862*. University of Kentucky Press.

BURNS, ROBERT IGNATIUS, S.J.

1966 *The Jesuits and The Indian Wars of the Northwest*. Yale University Press.

HARRINGTON, J. C.

1955 "Archeology as an Auxiliary Science to American History", in *American Anthropologist*, Vol. 57.

JAMES, GEORGE WHARTON

1905 *In and Out of Old Missions of California*. Little, Brown and Co. Boston.

KUBLER, GEORGE

1940 *Religious Architecture of New Mexico*. Colorado Springs. The Taylor Museum.

TREGANZA, ADAN E.

1956 "Sonoma Mission: An Archeological Reconstruction of The Mission San Francisco de Solano Qaudrangle", in *Kroeber Anthropological Society Papers*, No. 14. Berkeley.

MILITARY SITES—POST-1700

by STANLEY J. OLSEN

ABSTRACT

Nearly every manufactured object recovered from military sites in this country can be of help to the archaeologist in dating and interpreting the post with which they are associated. Many objects, particularly gun parts and china have volumes written about them to which the historian may refer. Not so with the very important but much neglected military insignia which by its very nature is among the most durable material recovered. (A list of publications pertaining to military insignia was passed out at the Dallas meeting.) Fortunately, military insignia (buttons, buckles and hat plates) were manufactured by many companies from the beginning of the American Revolution to the end of the 19th century. The surface designs were changed

every few years for the various military branches. Many manufacturers were in business for only short periods of time. All of these things taken together work for the benefit of the archaeologist and enable him to identify military units and furnish him with dates as to when they were in existence. Insignia and uniforms for enemy armies as well as those of the United States are illustrated by colored slides, showing the style changes and variety of materials and designs used in the manufacture of metal insignia.

Methods of recovery (metal detectors) of these objects from military sites and where they will most likely occur on a site are also mentioned.