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INTRODUCTION

This volume reports on a cultural resource inventory of prehistoric and historic archeological sites, historic standing structures, and other historic features located in Jack London State Historic Park (SHP). The sites and structures were recorded on Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) forms, which are included as Volume II. Obsidian hydration and sourcing analyses of a sample of cultural materials collected from prehistoric sites were conducted. The results of these studies provided a basis for suggesting a tentative temporal sequence of site use and aided in the evaluation of the potential significance of the prehistoric sites within the SHP. Historical research and oral history were undertaken to associate specific historic archeological sites and structures with specific historic events, individuals, and themes.

Jack London SHP is located in the hills above Sonoma County’s Valley of the Moon, just west of Glen Ellen (Map 1). The SHP is an irregularly shaped 803.1 acre parcel situated on the eastern slopes of Sonoma Mountain. Terrain is generally steep, sloping down to the east from approximately 2370 feet above mean sea level to approximately 520 feet in elevation.

The major drainages include the headwaters and tributaries of perennial Graham Creek and the intermittent tributaries of Asbury Creek. Perennial springs are abundant; prehistoric and historic-period cultural materials are commonly associated with these springs. Flora are abundant and strikingly diverse, with the majority of the SHP covered with forest comprised of oaks, bay laurel, madrone, manzanita, Douglas fir, and small, dense stands of redwoods. The understory includes various species of ferns, forbs, shrubs, and grasses. The forests are interspersed with large grassy meadows in the western portions of the SHP. Several large patches of chaparral also occur.

PREHISTORIC PERIOD

The first evidence of human activity in and around Jack London State Historic Park is from the Middle Archaic Period, around 5000 to 3000 years ago. During the ensuing 3000 years, cultural activity in the area apparently increased in its intensity. This trend continued until cultural contact with Euroamericans was sustained. At that time, prehistoric human lifeways were probably disrupted by the effects of introduced diseases and thoroughly changed during the period of Indian acculturation to Euroamerican values.

The study area lies on the border between the North Coastal and the San Francisco Bay archeological regions. Because of this, cultural influences from both north and south of the SHP are anticipated to have occurred; cultural influences from the east are also likely. In addition, the SHP is situated within an area hypothesized to have experienced substantial population movements. Such population shifts may have been occurring until the early historic period.
HISTORIC PERIOD

European presence in the area began in 1823 with the establishment of the Mission San Francisco Solano de Sonoma in Sonoma Valley. The mission used Indian “converts” as laborers. In 1834, with the secularization of the missions, Mariano G. Vallejo was sent to Sonoma to dispose of church property, establish a presidio, encourage settlement, and stop the encroachment of the Russians stationed at Fort Ross. Due in part to Vallejo’s help, American settlers began to arrive in the Sonoma area, which, in 1846 was the site of the Bear Flag Revolt.

Following the Gold Rush, many Euroamerican settlers discovered the rich agricultural land around Sonoma Valley. With the encouragement and successful example of Agoston Haraszthy and Kohler & Frohling, grape culture took root in the area. Despite many economic problems and the devastating phylloxera epidemic of the late 1800s, winemaking continued to be a mainstay of the area; wine is still made on the Jack London Ranch, which adjoins the SHP.

Small farmers and ranchers settled next to large vineyards, on land unsuited to the vine. Jack London’s Beauty Ranch was made up of both of these kinds of properties: the large Tokay Vineyard formerly owned by Kohler & Frohling and bordering areas farmed, unsuccessfully, by the pioneer families and single men who had settled there in the 1860s and 1870s.

In the spring of 1905, internationally known writer Jack London moved to Glen Ellen and bought the first of many parcels that came to make up his Beauty Ranch. Until his death, 11 years later, London strove to develop these worn-out properties into a model farm.

There is a tremendous amount of available material on the life and work of Jack and Charmian London. Numerous biographies have been written on Jack London, but most London scholars agree that none are completely satisfactory. To some degree they all perpetuate inaccuracies and errors from previous works—including untruths initiated by Jack and Charmian themselves. Jack’s fiction often reworked material from his own experience, and Irving Stone’s (1938) “biographical novel” has retranslated this into fact, turning London into a mixture of many of his own heroes. In a too-far-reaching refutation of this “myth,” John Perry (1981) has produced an extremely abusive biography of Jack London, denigrating nearly everything that London ever did or wrote. The biographies by London’s wife, Charmian (1921), and his daughter by a former marriage, Joan London (1939), are also inaccurate and biased. The discrepancies among these secondary sources make research difficult.

Enormous quantities of primary material on the Londons have survived and are curated by various institutions; the Huntington Library possesses the largest collection. Materials are also stored at Jack London SHP. Papers from the Huntington Library were not used for this inventory, except as cited or gathered by other researchers. Three biographies of Jack London (Stone 1965; Perry 1981; and Kingman 1979) and all of London’s “Sonoma Novels” (London 1908, 1910, 1913, 1916) were used in this inventory.
A fairly large amount of historical data are also available for Kohler & Frohling, who operated a winery on the property from 1873 until 1894 (Clukey 1981). Material on their predecessor, Louis Csomortanyi, is relatively scant. Primary documentary material was located concerning the small farmers who settled the land grant and public domain surrounding the Tokay Vineyard; this material facilitated the association of historic archeological sites with specific persons.

Primary data were collected from the Sonoma County Recorder’s Office; Sonoma County Clerk’s Office; Bancroft Library, University of California at Berkeley; California Room in the Sonoma County Public Library; Bureau of Land Management in Sacramento; and the National Archives in Washington, D.C. Interviews were conducted with Russ Kingman, a Jack London scholar and biographer; Milo Shepard, grandson of Jack London’s stepsister who grew up the ranch and currently runs the Jack London Ranch vineyard; and Clarice Stasz, biographer of Charmian London (Appendix I contains notes from these interviews).
INVENTORY PROCEDURES

PREFIELD RESEARCH

Prior to the field reconnaissance, a records search was conducted at the Northwest Information Center of the California Archaeological Inventory, Sonoma State University. Information including archeological base maps and site records, ethnographic maps and literature (cited below), historical inventories (Department of Parks and Recreation 1976 and 1979; Sonoma County Department of Planning n.d.; United States Department of the Interior 1979-1986); historical maps (Bowers 1867; Thompson 1877; USGLO 1853, 1860, 1871; USGS 1916, 1944), as well as environmental data (Miller 1972), were reviewed. Historical maps in the Interpretive Collection at Jack London State Historic Park (Ricksecker 1893; Anon. 1915) were also employed.

This prefield research was aimed at identifying cultural resources that might be located within or adjacent to the study area and evaluating the potential for their occurrence within the unit.

POST-FIELD RESEARCH

Published ethnographic information and published and unpublished archeological studies were further reviewed after completion of field work (cited below). Historic sites recorded by the field team were researched by the Staff Historian in order to document the sites' historical associations. This work involved identifying the persons responsible for the site's creation and their use history. In addition, Jack London's literary works were examined to see how these recorded sites were used as inspiration for his fiction.

PREVIOUS INVESTIGATIONS

Prehistory

Major syntheses that include general information and hypotheses regarding the southern North Coast Ranges artifactual assemblages, environmental changes, and cultural chronologies can be found in Fredrickson (1973, 1984), Stewart (1982), and Wickstrom (1986). Wickstrom’s work (an M.A. thesis) proposed a cultural sequence with chronology based upon obsidian hydration and formal artifact types for the Santa Rosa area. Because few formal artifacts have been found within the SHP to date, the prehistory of the study area can be only partly understood at this time. The present study utilizes a small sample of obsidian materials, primarily flakes, retrieved from the surfaces of prehistoric sites identified in the SHP; these materials provide a limited basis for making preliminary temporal comparisons. Further surface study and the subsurface investigation of sites within the SHP would probably produce sufficient artifacts to allow a more meaningful comparison with the Santa Rosa sequence. It should be kept in mind, however, that a greater complexity in northern bay area site assemblages is expected, due to numerous prehistoric population shifts and also because both northern and southern cultural influences on local sequences probably occurred (Fredrickson 1984:512).
Several archeological studies have been conducted either within the Jack London SHP boundaries or immediately adjacent to them. All of these investigations included archeological survey and surface inspection of the sites found, but only one study included obsidian sourcing and hydration analyses of surface samples of obsidian flakes and tools. These studies are discussed below.

Between 1903 and 1933, local naturalist and avocational archeologist Jesse Peter recorded more than two hundred archeological sites in the North Bay area. Four of these sites, Peter’s numbers 104, 105, 106, and 112, have been relocated within the current SHP’s boundaries. Unfortunately, no record forms for these sites are on file with the Northwest Information Center of the California Archaeological Inventory. It is not known whether portions of the SHP, other than site locations, were surveyed by Peter. Peter’s base maps are on file at SSU’s Cultural Resources Facility. The distribution of sites he recorded on his maps indicates that, in general, only primary drainages were inspected (apparently only Graham Creek in the study area). For some part of his survey, Peter collaborated with L.L. Loud of the Department of Anthropology, University of California, Berkeley. Stewart (1982:9) commented that unpublished notes on the survey are reported to exist (Loud and Peter n.d.).

In 1979 archeologist Claudine Young recorded one archeological site, CA-SON-1196, just south of the House of Happy Walls. The site was described as containing several red chert flakes. This site’s described location was found during the present study, but no cultural materials were identified in the field.

During the period between Peter’s activities and the current study, one systematic professional archeological reconnaissance was conducted to determine whether cultural resources were present with the SHP. This study was directed at an approximately 0.5 kilometer stretch of a fire-road repair project located in the western portion of the SHP near the headwaters of Graham Creek (Parkman 1983). As a result of Parkman’s survey, one previously recorded prehistoric site, CA-SON-104 (Jesse Peter’s 104) and four other prehistoric cultural resources were identified. The other four cultural resources included: (1) a possible chalcedony source area, now designated CA-SON-1419; (2) a single fragment of a shaped pestle, recorded as an isolated find; (3) a single chalcedony flake, recorded as an isolated find; and (4) a second possible chalcedony source area, now designated CA-SON-1420.

Two additional surveys were directed at acreage outside but adjacent to the SHP’s boundaries. Both investigations were initial studies for environmental clearance required by the Sonoma County Planning Department. The first study (Bramlette and Hale 1985), a mixed-strategy field survey, focused intensively upon approximately 90 acres of the 170-acre Jack London Ranch, held in trust by I. Milo Shepard, grandson of Jack London’s stepsister. The survey resulted in the recording of three prehistoric sites, CA-SON-1459, CA-SON-1460 (which extends into JLSHP), and CA-SON-1461, several isolated finds, and several historic period sites and features, discussed below. Obsidian sourcing and hydration analyses were conducted for materials collected from each prehistoric site’s surface; this work is relevant to the present study.
Bramlette and Hale used obsidian source and hydration data as a basis to suggest that: (1) CA-SoN-1460 is the most recently used of the three sites; (2) all three sites were used in the period represented by 1.4 to 2.8 microns, Napa Valley obsidian; (3) a concentration of Napa specimens from 1.4 to 2.8 microns exists at CA-SON-1460; and (4) there is a preponderance of Napa specimens greater than 3.1 microns. CA-SoN-1460, in particular, could be contrasted with the other two sites since it was the only site used during late Phase II, even though all three sites were virtually adjacent to one another. They noted that “while these results are intriguing thus far, these propositions all need further testing and should be regarded as speculative until better samples from this and adjoining areas have produced similar results” (Bramlette and Hale 1985:9). Of particular interest was the presence of substantial quantities of Napa Valley obsidian as compared with the small number of obsidian specimens from the much closer Annadel source. It was considered possible that this over-representation of Napa obsidian is indicative of strong social ties between prehistoric inhabitants of the Jack London Ranch area and Napa Valley inhabitants. Bramlette and Hale also noted that, although all three sites were adjacent to one another, use of Annadel obsidian was dominant at CA-SON-1459, while Napa obsidian appeared to be dominant at CA-SON-1460 during the same time period. It also appeared that the earlier dominance of Napa obsidian over Annadel obsidian at CA-SON-1460 was reversed to a dominance of Annadel obsidian during the latest occupations of the site. These observations prompted the speculation that “the differential inter- and intra-site source representations represent overlap of catchment areas used by two distinct human groups” (Bramlette and Hale 1985:9). The need for further testing was stressed.

The second study (Benson 1986) included an intensive survey of 31 acres adjacent to the southeastern corner of the SHP. Benson did not identify any prehistoric materials within the parcel but did identify historic resources important to the present study; these historic resources are discussed below.

**Ethnography**

This study included a review of ethnographic information for the Southern Porno, Coast Miwok, Wappo, and Patwin language groups; these groups’ respective territories abutted each other in the general vicinity of the study area during either the protohistoric or early historic period, perhaps much earlier. Maps published in Barrett (1908), Kroeber (1925), Stewart (1943), and Kelly (1978) were examined. None of these maps are produced at a large enough scale to accurately locate Jack London State Historic Park, but there appears to be agreement between the various researchers that the general vicinity of the Sonoma Mountains served several groups as a boundary area and possibly a boundary marker. On the other hand, there appears to be some disagreement as to who occupied the area just east of Sonoma Mountain where the study area lies. Both Kroeber (1925:Plate 34) and Kelly (1978:415) indicate a possible boundary between the Coast Miwok to the west and the Patwin to the east that extends north to south, presumably along the hills which form the western slopes of Sonoma Valley; this line evidently passes through the general study area. Barrett (1908:Map 1), however, maps and describes the entire area southwest of Glen Ellen as being Coast Miwok, and Johnson (1978:350) also indicates that the Patwin did not extend as far west as Sonoma Valley.
It has been suggested, based on ethnographic research for the Geysers area, that ethnographic boundaries in that vicinity changed very rapidly during the early historic period (David Peri, personal communication 1986); this may have also occurred in the study area. Because the SHP is situated within what may have served as a boundary area, it is possible that more than one ethnic group regularly used the SHP lands simultaneously. It is also possible that more than one social subdivision of the same ethnic group used the area. Although the present obsidian sourcing and hydration analysis indicates that one or both of these possibilities may have been the situation in the late prehistoric Emergent Period, these propositions should be considered preliminary.

History

Although a great deal has been written about the literary accomplishments of Jack London himself, few studies have focused on the history of, or cultural resources within, his Beauty Ranch. In 1985 an archeological survey was conducted of portions of the land owned by the Trust of Irving Shepard (Bramlette and Hale 1985), where some important historic features were reported. These included a stone spring house that is said to have supplied water for Glen Ellen, a hillside originally terraced by Jack London, and a refuse dump (CA-SON-1462H), part of which is believed to be associated with the London household (Bramlette and Hale 1985:10-11). In his archeological survey of private land to the east of Jack London State Historic Park, Benson (1986:2-3) discovered a stone and wood barn constructed by Jack London in 1905-1907 and a dwelling that was used by London’s ranch hands.

The history of winemaking in what is now Jack London SHP is the subject of a research paper by DPR intern Alan Clukey (1981). Clukey traces the history of the Tokay Vineyard from 1824, through the tenure of Kohler and Frohling, and concludes with the purchase of the land by Jack London in 1911. Prior to stabilization work at the Jack London Cottage, a study was instituted to “determine historical developments in the project area and the evolution of the ranch cottage” as well as an “archeological survey and surface collection of the subfloor...” (Lortie and Felton 1982:1). The resulting paper contains much information about the architecture and recent history of the Cottage, which the authors gleaned from historical research and interviews with Milo Shepard, as well as recommendations for the treatment of the cultural resources within this SHP. The Shepard interview notes were transcribed by state Park Ranger Greg Hayes (Shepard 1982).

Finally, the Jack London Ranch Album (Haughey and Johnson 1985) is a valuable compilation of both historic and modern photographs of the Beauty Ranch and its various buildings and landscapes. Its scope is limited neither to the SHP nor to the “London era,” but includes features now on private property and those built after London’s death.
FIELD WORK

Preliminary Reconnaissance

A preliminary mixed strategy field survey of the 803.1 acres, which comprise the SHP, was conducted in mid-July and early September of 1986. The survey team was supervised by Allan Bramlette, and included, at various times, Susan Blue, Mark Gary, Marlene Greenway, Deborah McLear, Chuck Whatford, and Ed Winters. Topographic maps plotted with the estimated locations of potential historic-period deposits and the recorded locations of sites identified during the prefield records search and literature review, as well as previously recorded site records, were taken in the field.

In general, terrain of less than 35% slope was intensively surveyed on foot, with particular attention directed to the locations shown on the maps described above. Ridgetops, descending ridges, and knolls were inspected intensively. Where practical, transects ranging from 10 to 50 meters wide were covered by each team member. Since sites are rarely found on steep slopes, land that exhibited more than 35% slope was not intensively inspected unless potential water sources or other attributes indicative of archeological sensitivity were present. An area totaling approximately 600 acres was covered intensively.

Soils consist predominantly of loams and clay loams derived from weathering of the underlying Sonoma Volcanic formations. Naturally occurring chalcedony and opalite was observed in virtually every portion of the SHP; rarely were these materials determined to be obviously culturally modified (i.e., bifacially worked). Small numbers of naturally occurring obsidian nodules were also found in a few places; none of the nodules appeared to have been culturally modified nor were any of them large enough, being only a few centimeters in diameter, to have been a practical source for prehistoric tool-making.

Prehistoric sites were recorded in the field if a previous site record did not exist or if additional deposits were found (site records are presented in Volume II), and each site’s surface was closely inspected for cultural materials. Where available, a minimum sample of 10 obsidian flakes from each visually distinctive source was collected. Obsidian originating from Annadel Mountain and/or Napa Valley was present at all prehistoric sites except CA-SON-1196, CA-SON-1419, and CA-SON-1420.

All historic-period archeological sites found by the field team were recorded by the Historical Archeologist, Adrian Praetzellis, on standard DPR forms. Black-and-white photographs were taken of each site. No artifacts were collected. Standing structures were recorded by the Architectural Historian, Dell Upton, also on standard DPR forms. Construction details were described and measured floor plans were made. The Architectural Historian took black-and-white photographs and color slides of each building.

Laboratory Analysis

All the specimens that were collected at the prehistoric sites during field work were washed, counted, and weighed. Obsidian was visually inspected by
Thomas Origer and Allan Bramlette to determine the geological source of the glass, and samples were subjected to obsidian hydration analysis. Appendix II contains copies of the obsidian hydration catalogue; the obsidian hydration slides are on file at the Obsidian Hydration Laboratory at Sonoma State University. Appendix III contains catalogue sheets for all the collected materials that were accessioned as part of the collections housed in Sacramento at the Department of Parks and Recreation.
CULTURAL HISTORY

NATIVE AMERICAN HISTORY

This section draws primarily from a recent general discussion of the cultural history of the Russian River subregion (Fredrickson 1984). Because the present study area is on the border between this subregion and that of San Francisco Bay, the timing and nature of the cultural changes within this area may have differed from those outlined below; cultural influences from the San Francisco Bay region probably affected the North Bay area. In general, great complexity can be expected in the vicinity of the study area due to numerous population shifts that probably occurred over the past 3000 years or more.

With these caveats in mind, the following summary of possible influences on the prehistoric human groups that used Jack London State Historic Park area is offered. References to obsidian hydration results for the immediate area incorporate the findings of Bramlette and Hale (1985) with the findings of the present study; these findings are preliminary, and our current interpretations could be substantially altered with new data (Table 1).

Paleo-Indian Period

The Paleo-Indian Period is estimated to have lasted from about 12,000 years ago to about 8000 years ago. Very scanty and ephemeral evidence for use of southern Sonoma County at this time depth exists; there is no evidence, however, that the study area was used this long ago.

Lower Archaic Period

This cultural period is thought to have lasted from about 8000 years ago until about 5000 years ago. A single archeological site, CA-SON-20 in Santa Rosa, provides the only archeological context for focused use of the general vicinity during this time period. It is thought that people speaking a Proto-Yukian language occupied the region to the north of San Francisco Bay. Large, stemmed throwing and thrusting spear points used for killing game animals, bipointed bifaces, and the millingslab and handstone, thought to have been used primarily for seed grinding, are characteristic artifacts of this time period. In general, the North Coast Ranges was experiencing the effects of a warming climatic trend, but it is not known whether this warming trend had a significant effect in the study area vicinity. A single obsidian hydration reading for a Napa obsidian specimen found at CA-SON-1459 (located adjacent to the SHP) can be assigned to this time period; this single reading, however, is considered “noise” and does not constitute evidence of cultural activity in the area.

Middle Archaic Period

This cultural period is thought to have begun about 5000 years ago and lasted until approximately 3000 years ago. The Utian (ancestral Miwokan and Costanoan) linguistic groups may have occupied the San Francisco Bay Area by the beginning of this period. This is also the same period that Pomoan groups
Table 1: OBSIDIAN HYDRATION RIM VALUES FOR FLAKES AND BIFACES FROM SITES IN THE JACK LONDON STATE PARK AREA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERIOD</th>
<th>MICRON SITES</th>
<th>Annadel State Park Obsidian</th>
<th>NAPA VALLEY OBISDIAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>CR</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Equivalency of obsidian hydration rim readings between sources calculated from data in Origer (1982).

CR-11
are hypothesized to have begun radiating west out of their former Clear Lake
homelands into the upper Russian River Valley, thereby splitting the Proto-
Yukians into groups that became the Yuki to the north and the Wappo to the
south. Artifacts characteristic of north of San Francisco Bay during this
period include concave-base and side-notched bifaces, some of which probably
served as projectile points used to hunt game; the millingslab and handstone
persist in use into this time period. The warming climatic trend noted above
probably reached its peak within the Middle Archaic Period. Again, it is
unknown whether the effects on the local environment were significant although
resource productivity may have reached an all time high. A single Annadel and
10 Napa obsidian hydration readings from six of the sites in the immediate
study area are tentatively assigned to this period, suggesting that some human
activity may have occurred here, but we cannot extrapolate on the nature of
that activity.

Upper Archaic Period

This period, thought to be a time of considerable population growth and
movement, began about 3000 years ago and ended around 1500 years ago. A
Miwokan expansion from the Bay Area to the north and east is hypothesized for
this period, while at the same time, Pomoan groups continued their expansion,
now to the south and west of the upper Russian River Valley. The Miwok and
Costanoans are thought to have initiated the Berkeley Pattern, an adaptive
shift signaled by the introduction of the mortar and pestle, which were
presumably used to help process acorns. In addition, shouldered, leaf-shaped
projectile points as well as other broad and thin bifaces appear in great
numbers at some sites during this period, while other sites contain biface
forms more similar to those used in the preceding period. Saddle-shaped shell
beads, made from the Olivella biplicata mollusk’s shell, are also associated
with the Berkeley Pattern. The economic emphasis continues to be on hunting,
but the acorn economy grew in importance. A cooling climatic trend probably
began within this time period; its affects on the local environment may have
been minimal. Thirteen Annadel rim readings from five sites and 10 Napa rim
readings from five sites indicate that cultural activity was increasing at the
study area during this period.

Emergent Period. Phase I

Phase I of the Emergent Period is estimated to have begun around 1500 years
ago, with an ending date of the phase estimated at about 500 years ago. Coast
Miwok, Southern Porno, and Wappo groups probably assumed their basic
geographical relationships during this time, although their territorial
boundaries may have been significantly different from what has been recorded
ethnographically. The Patwin may have begun their move into the Napa Valley
from the east, bringing with them the bow and arrow. It is not known whether
the local use of the bow and arrow can be attributed to the direct
introduction of the weaponry by the Patwin or to the cultural diffusion of the
technology. In either case, as a result of this introduced technology,
projectile points from this time period are very small, corner-notched in
shape, and many have serrated lower lateral margins. The mortar and pestle and
attendant acorn-based economy was carried over from the previous period, as
were the shouldered and nonshouldered leaf-shaped bifaces. Sequin beads made
from Olivella biplicata shells appear at this time. In the study area, 27 Annadel rim readings from eight sites and 13 Napa readings from six sites tentatively indicate that cultural activity was gaining in its intensity. Moreover, it appears that Napa obsidian was dominant at some sites at this time, while Annadel obsidian was dominant at other sites. In addition, some Annadel-dominated sites and the Napa-dominated sites are virtually adjacent to one another.

**Emergent Period. Phase II**

Phase II of the Emergent Period, also known as the Protohistoric Period, is calculated to have begun 500 years ago and ended with the beginning of sustained Euroamerican contact, about 135 years ago. During the last part of this period, the Coast Miwok, Southern Pomo, Wappo, and Patwin probably occupied their approximate ethnographic territories, although population movements may still have been occurring. Small corner-notched arrow points dominate the stone tool assemblages characteristic of this phase. The hopper mortar was apparently introduced at this time. A total of 54 rim readings from Annadel obsidian specimens retrieved from nine sites and 36 rim readings from Napa obsidian specimens retrieved from seven sites indicates that cultural activity in the study area was more intense than during Phase I. Again, differential inter- and intra-site obsidian source representations are suggested. It is possible that these differences represent overlap of catchment areas used by two socially distinct human groups. Further data may change these preliminary observations.

**Ethnographic Period**

One last Native American cultural episode, commonly referred to as the ethnographic period, may be informally dated to the final century of the Protohistoric Period. It was to this period that Native Americans referred--based on their own recollections or those of their immediate ancestors--when they were asked by anthropologists to describe traditional lifeways. Coast Miwok village names in the vicinity of the study area that Native Americans remembered included Wukiliwa (near Glen Ellen), Huchi (at the town of Sonoma), Tuli (in the low foothills just southeast of the study area), and Temblek (at the base of the hills southeast of the study area) (Kelly 1978:415).

Many Native Americans are concerned about their heritage, particularly the remains of their ancestors. To many Native Americans, archeological sites are the only monuments that attest to their history in the area. Two such individuals who have been actively involved in local cemetery protection and heritage preservation are Mr. Grant Smith, Pomo elder, and Mr. Paul Martinez, Wappo elder.

**EUROAMERICAN ERA HISTORY**

Lands in Jack London SHP trace their title back to the governments of both Mexico and the United States. From the 1840s, Mexican rancheros claimed the land as part of their vast holdings. Following the U.S. Land Commission decisions on these claims, settlement began in earnest in the 1860s and 1870s,
when vineyardists cultivated land on the foothills and ranchers grazed livestock on the slopes of Sonoma Mountain.

Vallejo’s Petaluma Rancho

On 22 October 1843, Mexican Governor Manuel Micheltorena granted General Mariano G. Vallejo 10 square leagues of land. This property, known as the Petaluma Grant, was bounded by “Sonoma creek on the east, San Pablo bay on the south, and Petaluma creek on the west, possessing the most fertile soil in the county, if not in the entire state” (Munro-Fraser 1880:56, 155). On 22 June 1844, Micheltorena sold Vallejo 5 square leagues (Munro-Fraser 1880:155). Together these land claims came to comprise the Petaluma Rancho. With the addition of this land to his other holdings, Vallejo owned more than 150,000 acres in the area (McKee 1948).

From 1834 General Vallejo had been in charge of the Mexican troops stationed at the pueblo he established in Sonoma. Vallejo’s orders were to secure Mexico’s northern frontier; this he did by encouraging settlement in the valleys and by subjugating the native peoples. Vallejo used his large holding extensively, primarily for grazing cattle, although he also cultivated grain with the use of Native American labor and, in the pueblo of Sonoma, maintained a small vineyard.

At the close of the Mexican War in 1848, the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo officially ceded California to the United States. Under these terms, the rights of landowners to privately owned tracts were to be respected and their titles confirmed, but undeeded property became part of the public domain. In 1851 the U.S. Land Commission was established to examine the title to all Spanish and Mexican land in California and to determine which of these claims were valid and which lands should be opened for settlement.

The claim of Mariano G. Vallejo to the Petaluma Rancho was confirmed by the Commission in 1855 and by the District Court in 1857; in the same year, an appeal was dismissed, giving Vallejo clear title to 66,622.17 acres, the largest confirmed land claim in Sonoma County (Munro-Fraser 1880:155). The portion of the Petaluma Rancho that later became part of Jack London SHP was located in a remote corner of Vallejo’s ranch. There is no evidence that Vallejo developed this section of his holdings, although by 1856, he had constructed a sawmill not far away on Sonoma Creek. As settlers made their way into Sonoma County in the mid-1850s, Vallejo subdivided his property and sold off much of his vast acreage. By 1864 only about 1450 acres of the original Petaluma Rancho remained in Vallejo’s possession. He sold these left-over parcels to a San Francisco banker, Alfred Borel, on 12 November 1864 for $19,000 (Deeds 16:195 in Clukey 1981; Finley 1937 in Clukey 1981).

Mariano Vallejo also filed a claim with the Land Commission for the Yulupa Rancho, which bordered the Petaluma Rancho on the northwest. This claim, which lay between the Petaluma, Cotate, Santa Rosa, and Los Guilicos ranchos, had been granted by Micheltorena to Miguel Alvarado on 23 November 1844. In the Mexican Period, neighboring grant owners established their boundaries by riding around their mutual borders together. Thus, all landowners knew the limits of their land. Although the boundaries of the Yulupa Rancho had been
established and perpetuated in this way, Vallejo’s claim to this land was
denied in 1854 because the rancho could not be easily segregated from its
neighbors. Vallejo appealed the case; after testimony concerning the
legitimacy of Alvarado’s original claim and the general acceptance of the
rancho’s boundaries, the claim was confirmed by the District Court in 1857.
This decree was later reversed by the U.S. Supreme Court (Munro-Fraser
1880:152-153), and the land became public domain, of which 400 acres in
Section 19 eventually became part of Jack London SHP.

Subdivision of Land: Rancho and Public Domain

Rancho portions of Jack London SHP were included in two land transactions: On
31 December 1859, Vallejo sold 500 acres to Major Louis Csomortanyi for $2500
(Deeds 9:738); Alfred Borel sold 128 acres to Julius A. Poppe in 1871 (Clukey

Encouraged by a friend and fellow Hungarian, Agoston Haraszthy, Csomortanyi
planned to grow grapes on his new property, which he named the Tokay Vineyard
after the most famous of Hungarian wines. Haraszthy had established himself in
the township a few years before; here he developed the Buena Vista Vineyards
into a model property. Haraszthy’s important influence in the development of
dry-farming techniques led to increased settlement in the foothills. His
widely circulated treatise on grape growing and winemaking (Haraszthy 1859)
provided the novice with sufficient detail to start his own vineyard, along
with a cost analysis to stimulate his economic interest.

As a result, in part, of Haraszthy’s widespread proselytizing, the amount of
land in the Sonoma Valley planted in vines rose from 50 acres in 1856 to 2,282
acres in the spring of 1863 (Haraszthy 1888). Vineyard plantings filled the
valley and began to move up the hills, as Haraszthy’s son wrote:

And this recalls Tom Nau ... and Csomontanyi [sic.], who went and
perched themselves and their modest plantations on the lofty hills
around and smilingly and peacefully looked down on the beautiful valley
below, contented with their work and happy in their homes (1888).

Although Csomortanyi quickly lost financial control of his vineyard, by 1863
he had planted 60 acres (Haraszthy 1888), and wine production had commenced by
1866.

Csomortanyi was not, apparently, a rich man when he became a vintner.
Immediately upon purchasing his 500 acres, Csomortanyi sold half his interest
to two partners--Henry Carlton and John Sweet (Deeds 9:741). Carlton sold his
interest to Sweet in November of 1866, and Sweet and Csomortanyi sold the
entire parcel to Jackson Temple a month later (Deeds 18:579, 19:556). Temple
took Csomortanyi on as a partner to oversee the vineyard and the winemaking
there.

Following Csomortanyi’s death in 1869, Temple found a new vintner to manage
his property with its 40,000 vines (Daily Alta California: 20 May 1870, cited
in Lortie and Felton 1982:5). On 5 July 1873, Temple sold the 500-acre
“Vineyard called Tokay” to Charles and Henry Kohler for $12,000 (Deeds 44:211-
213). The previous August, the Kohlers had purchased 119 acres in the area from Alfred Borel (Deeds 43:110 in Clukey 1981).

Meanwhile, with the rejection of Vallejo’s claim to the Yulupa Rancho, settlers filed patents with the General Land Office for this reservoir of government land between the four ranchos. Government land to the west of Jack London SHP in T6N/R7W was surveyed in 1865, officially opening those parcels to private claim. Bowers’ map (1867) shows many owners/homesteaders in this area (Map 2). The public land in Section 19 of T6N/R6W that became part of the SHP was not surveyed and opened for settlement until 1871. Bowers’ map indicates one settler—W. Campbell—in this section, while the General Land Office surveyor noted no homestead-associated improvements (McKarny 1871). This rugged area on Sonoma Mountain was settled following the 1871 survey, and over the next decade the land was patented under the provisions of the Homestead Act and the Pre-Emption Act, both of which required settlement and cultivation. Many of the original patentees in this upland area were Irish immigrants.

Kohler & Frohling’s Tokay Vineyard

The firm of Kohler & Frohling, whose name at times included the names of various other partners, was conceived in San Francisco in 1853, with a scheme to bring winemaking to the west coast. A professional flutist, John Frohling was born in Prussia in 1827; Charles Kohler, also an accomplished musician, was also born in Germany in 1830. In 1854 the firm purchased a small vineyard in Los Angeles, which Frohling managed. Meanwhile, in 1855, Kohler opened a 500-gallon wine cellar—the first for the sale of California wines—in San Francisco to distribute the firm’s products. Both men continued their musical careers to subsidize the incipient concern (Kohler 1886). By 1858 the firm of Kohler & Frohling had established a reputation for excellent wines; in that year, they were awarded the prize for the ‘Best Wine’ at the California State Agricultural Society’s annual fair (Friis 1976 in Clukey 1981). In 1858 they commenced the production of grape brandy, which they shipped to New York, where, in 1860, they opened their own wine cellar dealing exclusively in California wines (Kohler 1878; Friis 1976 in Clukey 1981). Kohler & Frohling became very successful wine merchants: By 1860 they occupied 10 cellars in the basement of the Montgomery Block in San Francisco and seven large cellars in Los Angeles, including the entire basement of the City Hall building. They shipped wine to all the states in the Union and many foreign places, including Mexico, Central and South America, the Sandwich Islands, Japan, China, Russia, Europe, and India (Kohler 1878).

Two years after John Frohling’s death in 1862, Charles Kohler took on a new partner, Henry Kohler—his brother-in-law (Kohler 1886). Before buying the Tokay Vineyard, Kohler & Frohling had purchased grapes from various Sonoma vineyards for use in their winery. With the purchase of the Tokay Vineyard in the early 1870s, the firm had a center for its northern California winemaking operation. They immediately constructed new winery buildings and planted more vines until, in 1881, the vineyard covered 200 acres. The Kohler & Frohling vineyard and winery became a model property.
While Charles Kohler managed the wine export business from San Francisco, Henry Kohler oversaw the development of the Tokay Vineyard, where he and his family resided. In July 1884 Henry Kohler sold his share of the Tokay Vineyard to Charles Kohler (Deeds 92:283 in Clukey 1981), and in April of 1887, Charles Kohler died. Although Charles’ heirs continued to manage the vineyard until 1894, no further winery-related development appears to have taken place after Charles Kohler’s death. In 1894 Kohler’s heirs sold the Tokay Vineyard to the California Wine Association, of which the firm of Kohler & Frohling was a founding member, in two separate transactions. The 10-acre parcel containing most of the buildings was sold separately from the remainder of the property (Deeds 156:151, 156:148 in Clukey 1981). Less than one year later, the California Wine Association sold the large 500-acre vineyard parcel back to Elise Kohler, but kept the small winery parcel (Deeds 161:307 in Clukey 1981). Elise Kohler then sold the Tokay Vineyard to Joshua Chauvet, owner of a neighboring winery, in November of 1895 (Deeds 159:578 in Clukey 1981). Jack and Charmian London purchased the large parcel from Chauvet in 1910 and the 10-acre parcel from the California Wine Association in 1911 (Haughey and Johnson 1985:13).

Small-scale Agriculturalists

While Kohler & Frohling’s winery grew to become one of the largest producers in the state, properties bordering the Tokay Vineyard and later purchased by the Londons were developed by small-scale farmers and ranchers (Map 3). Generally, land-grant property was settled before government land. However, the 12B-acre parcel on the Petaluma Rancho on which the Wolf House would be built was not inhabited until 1876, when Julius Poppe deeded it to John Greenlaw (Clukey 1981). With a partner, Greenlaw tilled 25 acres and planted a 2-acre vineyard. Most of their livelihood, however, came from the sale of firewood, and their land was mortgaged for its top value.

The government land in Section 19 began to be purchased or homesteaded in the 1870s. These settlers lived for a short time on the land before patenting and then moved on. By 1880 only one family--the Crillys--resided in the Section 19 portion of Jack London SHP; they ran a small dairy and were heavily encumbered by debt. Neither the Greenlaws nor the Crillys were successful and both had left the area by the late 1880s, their property passing to nonresident owners until its purchase by the Londons.

Jack London’s Beauty Ranch

Jack London’s move to Glen Ellen from an Oakland suburb in 1905 was precipitated by two factors: the disintegration of his first marriage and entrance of a new love, Charmian Kittridge, into his life; and a feeling of weariness with city life and city people. Not yet thirty, London was at the height of his literary career. In the seven years after the publication of his first story, London had risen from the ranks of the urban poor to become America’s best-paid author. His short stories and novella, The Call of the Wild, brought London wide critical acclaim and instant popularity among the reading public.
Jack London had met Charmian Kittridge in the summer of 1903, while vacationing with his wife and children in Glen Ellen in one of the several cottages rented to tourists by Charmian’s aunt, Netta Eames. His marriage was already failing, and he separated from his wife, Bessie, who filed for divorce in June of 1904. Bessie London was granted an interlocutory decree of divorce on 11 November 1904; this meant that Jack and Charmian could marry one year later, which they did on 19 November 1905, the day after the judge signed the final decree.

While awaiting the final decree, Jack and Charmian planned their future. In the spring of 1905, Jack moved into the annex of Wake Robin Lodge, where Charmian lived with her aunt and uncle in Glen Ellen. Tired of city life, Jack wanted to settle down with Charmian in a house in the country. In May 1905, London wrote to his publisher asking for an account of his earnings:

For a long time I have been keeping steadily the idea in mind of settling down somewhere in the country. I am in a beautiful part of California now, and I have my eyes on several properties, one of which intend to buy, so I want to know how much money I possess in order to know to what extent I may buy (letter to George Brett, 26 May 1905, in Hendricks and Shepard 1965:170).

A few days later, Jack and Charmian rode up to the old Greenlaw Place, a 128-acre ranch owned by Robert Hill, and found the property they wanted and where they would eventually build Wolf House. On June 5th they met with the owners, and two days later Jack put $500 down on the property; he also paid the tenants $600 for their livestock and farm equipment (Kingman 1979:151-152). Again Jack wrote to his publisher for money:

I have found the land I want, and have closed the deal by paying $500.00, binding the bargain for a few days, when I must pay the balance, $6,500.00. The place was a bargain, one of those bargains that a man would be insane to let slip by. . . . There are 130 acres in the place, and they are 130 acres of the most beautiful, primitive land to be found in California. There are great redwoods on it, some of them thousands of years old--in fact, the redwoods are as fine and magnificent as any to be found anywhere outside the tourist groves. Also there are great firs, tan-bark oaks, maples, live-oaks, white-oaks, black-oaks, madrona and manzanita galore. There are canyons, several streams of water, many springs, etc., etc. In fact, it is impossible to really describe the place. All I can say is this--I have been riding allover these hills, looking for just such a place, and I must say that I have never seen anything like it.

Woodchoppers were already at work when I snapped up the place. It had to be snapped up. Twenty years from now I'll wager it will be worth twenty times what I am now paying for it.

My lasting regret, in case the thing fell through, would be not the loss of the money already advanced, but the loss of the place itself. I could never find another place like it again, and I who am a Californian, tell
you this (letter to George Brett, 7 June 1905 in Hendricks and Shepard 1965:174).

London requested a $10,000 advance with which to purchase the ranch and to put up a barn where he might live until he got together the money to build a house. London's publisher obliged and London bought the ranch, hiring Werner Wiget as his foreman. London immediately commissioned Martin Pasquini to do the stone and concrete work for a new barn. Work on the barn was halted when the money ran out; this delay turned out to be fortunate, for the 1906 earthquake revealed that the stone walls, supposedly solid and 2-feet thick, were hollow.

The barn was rebuilt in the summer of 1906 and is currently (January 1987) located outside of Jack London SHP on land belonging to the estate of Miriam Smith (Benson 1986).

Jack and Charmian made other plans as well. Less than one month after the Hill property was transferred, the two conceived their idea to sail around the world on a boat of their own design (letter to George Brett, 1 August 1905, in Hendricks and Shepard 1965:177). Initially, Jack and Charmian planned to spend five years or so on the ranch before going around the world. By the spring of 1906, however, work had begun on Snark, which cost over $25,000 to build.

Jack, Charmian, and crew set sail for Hawaii on 21 April 1907, returning to California in July of 1909. They had been unable to complete their voyage as planned; money had run short, and Jack, along with the rest of the crew, suffered from a myriad of tropical diseases. Snark was sold at auction in Australia and Jack London never regained his health.

While the Londons were away, Netta Eames managed their ranch and purchased some adjoining properties for them. In 1910 Jack's stepsister, Eliza Shepard, became his ranch superintendent. After the voyage of Snark, Jack continued to enlarge their holdings, which increased to approximately 1400 acres by February 1913 (Map 4). In 1911 the Londons moved from Wake Robin to the old Kohler & Frohling cottage located on a newly acquired property. From here, they directed the construction of Wolf House and agricultural improvements on the ranch.

Having achieved success, London wrote for money: money to finance the building of Snark, for expansion and improvement of the ranch, and for building his fantasy home, the Wolf House. London drew heavily from personal experience for his writing. After moving to Glen Ellen, the inspiration for his work came in part from his travels, his relationship with Charmian, his studies of agriculture, and— at least for the first few years— from his conviction in the inevitability of a Socialist Revolution. However, London's responsibilities and diverse interests produced a cash flow problem of immense proportions; he took and spent cash advances long before producing final copy. A friend once lamented that Jack had "mortgaged his brain." He had to write just to make good on these cash advances. Throughout his career, London's writing habits were very strict and regimented. He set himself a goal of one thousand words a day, which he reached each morning before socializing or attending to ranch business. By 1912, London was tiring of the pressure of having to write just to keep the ranch going; and he came to hate writing (Watson 1983:3). Never-
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theless, London continued to meet his quota, often filling his work with events and scenes close at hand. Thus, the ranch contributed to London's fiction as scene and plot, while the fiction brought cash to invest in his agrarian vision. At the core of London's philosophy were principles that linked his ethics and his aesthetics, allowing him to comprehend the landscape like a morality play--its features the products of the playing out of human qualities: greed and dishonesty, or altruism and stewardship. Thus, his Marxian-socialist perspective shaped his reading of the landscape; his belief in scientific agriculture provided the techniques to redeem the land; and his artistic vision, wedding beauty and utility, designated the form and materials for his improvements.

Jack London died on 22 November 1916 at 40 years of age. Following his death, there was some disagreement among his friends and family over what they believed characterized London's goals and, hence, how best his estate could carry out his unfinished plans. Upton Sinclair suggested that Charmian sell the ranch and use the proceeds to offer a Jack London prize each year for the best piece of revolutionary literature (Silet and Silet 1971:32). Charmian, on the other hand, felt that a Jack London school of agriculture or something of that sort would be the greatest memorial to her husband. As she wrote to Sinclair,

...what I want to work towards is to let the world of men KNOW WHAT AGRICULTURE MEANT TO JACK LONDON...

.................................................................

The land, the land--that's the thing! At least he thought so; and what he thought is what we should all be concerned with in our interpretations of him to the public--not in what we think he thought(letter dated 13 December 1916 in Silet and Silet 1971:31).

Possibly in an attempt to show her determination to carryon Jack London's agricultural experiment, Charmian decided to build a stone house for herself on the property: The House of Happy Walls.

Jack London State Historic Park

Eliza Shepard continued to manage the ranch and, after her death in 1939, the property was managed by her son, Irving Shepard. Charmian London died in 1955; her will directed that her House of Happy Walls become a memorial to Jack London and herself. Charmian's heir, Irving Shepard, immediately began exploring ways to establish a state park on the Jack London Ranch in fulfillment of this last wish. In 1956 Senator F. Presley Abshire prepared a bill calling for the creation of a state park at the Jack London Home, and a year later the legislature authorized $50,000 for site acquisition and improvement on the state's first "State Historic Park." Official dedication ceremonies were held for the original 39-acre Jack London State Historic Park on 24 September 1960, at which time the House of Happy Walls Museum was partially opened (Culwell 1968). Over the years, additional land was added to the Jack London SHP, until it reached its present size of just over 800 acres.