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Introduction

Five consecutive summer field seasons of scientific archaeological excavation at Palomar Mountain have pinpointed the nineteenth-century living quarters of San Diego County’s first African-American homesteader—Nate Harrison, a former slave from the American South. Students participating in annual San Diego State University (SDSU) field schools in historical archaeology from 2004 to 2008 uncovered the foundation of the stone cabin and unearthed over 20,000 artifacts from the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. This article presents temporal and spatial studies of the site’s features and artifacts; together they confirm the excavated area as Harrison’s frontier home. In addition, the work discussed here details the analytical methodologies used to reach the singular conclusion that Harrison lived at this particular Palomar Mountain site ca. 1865-1920. Overall, the ongoing Nate Harrison Historical Archaeology Project uses multiple lines of evidence—including photographs, maps, documents, oral histories, and archaeological artifacts—in its endeavors to scrutinize mythical accounts of this legendary Palomar pioneer, broaden existing portraits of the local multi-ethnic past, and offer insight into everyday life in Southern California during the region’s early U.S. American Period.

Historical background

Discerning fact from fiction regarding the details of Nate Harrison’s life is no simple matter; even apparently reliable primary sources present oppositional information. Nonetheless, multiple contemporary documents and maps establish a somewhat cohesive chronology for Harrison that includes his birth during the
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1820s or ‘30s in the American South, his migration to Northern California during the Gold Rush in the late 1840s, and his eventual settlement at Palomar Mountain during the second half of the nineteenth century. Harrison’s final years are well-chronicled, concluding with his death in 1920. Various oral histories and popular articles recorded and written after Harrison’s passing offer a wealth of additional description regarding the Palomar pioneer’s life and times, yet many of these accounts contain obvious exaggerations and fabrications. The article presented here focuses on comparisons between the contemporary historical sources and the archaeological record, leaving Harrison’s local apotheosis for subsequent discussion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1820s/30s:</th>
<th>Born in the American South</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1849:</td>
<td>Travels as a slave with owner to Northern California during the Gold Rush</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850-75:</td>
<td>Ventures to San Diego County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875:</td>
<td>Listed on San Diego County Great Register; residence at Montserate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877:</td>
<td>Listed on San Diego County Great Register; residence at Montserate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879:</td>
<td>Listed on San Diego County Great Register; residence at Montserate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879:</td>
<td>Patents land in Rincon (at base of Palomar Mountain)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880:</td>
<td>Listed separately in two San Diego County censuses (Bear Valley and San Jacinto)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880:</td>
<td>Listed on San Diego County Great Register; residence at San Jacinto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1882:</td>
<td>Sells Rincon property to Andres Scott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1882:</td>
<td>Listed on San Diego County Great Register; residence at San Jacinto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888:</td>
<td>Listed on San Diego County Great Register; residence at Pala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889-90:</td>
<td>Listed on San Diego Ownership map on west side of Palomar Mountain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890:</td>
<td>Listed on San Diego County Great Register; residence at Pala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892:</td>
<td>Filed water claim for spring on west side of Palomar Mountain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892:</td>
<td>Listed on San Diego County Great Register; residence at Pala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1893:</td>
<td>Completes homestead certificate for property on west side of Palomar Mountain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894:</td>
<td>Registers to vote in Pala Precinct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894:</td>
<td>Listed on San Diego County Great Register; residence at Pala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896:</td>
<td>Name appears on west side of Palomar Mountain on survey map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897:</td>
<td>County consent form for widening road on west side of Palomar Mountain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900:</td>
<td>Listed in San Diego County census (Smith (Palomar) Mountain Township)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919:</td>
<td>Leaves mountain and taken to San Diego County Hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920:</td>
<td>Listed in San Diego County census (San Diego Township, County Hospital)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920:</td>
<td>October 10, 1920: Dies in San Diego County Hospital</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nate Harrison timeline.

When ordered chronologically, the primary sources provide a general outline of Harrison’s time in Southern California. Existing historical censuses, registers, and land grants do not list Harrison in San Diego County until 1875 and do not specify him as a Palomar Mountain resident until the late 1880s/early 1890s. Overall, these
records reveal that Nate Harrison was very mobile. He was listed in the 1875, 1877, and 1879 volumes of the San Diego County Great Register as residing in Montserrat, an area southeast of Fallbrook. On November 10, 1879, Harrison received a United States land patent for 112.15 acres in lots 2, 3, and 4 of Section 22 in Township 10, South Range One West of the San Bernardino Meridian. This land is in Rincon near the base of Palomar Mountain. The 1880 San Diego County census recorded Nate Harrison twice, once in the San Jacinto Township and once in the Bear Valley Township. Both townships were in what was San Diego County in the late nineteenth century, but neither included Palomar Mountain. The San Jacinto record listed Harrison as a single 48-year-old black male farm laborer from Kentucky; the Bear Valley inventory labeled him a single 50-year-old black male farm laborer from Alabama. In addition, both the 1880 and 1882 volumes of the San Diego County Great Register noted Harrison as a native Kentuckian residing at San Jacinto. According to the deed of sale, Harrison sold his Rincon property to Andres Scott on June 19, 1882 for $300.

The San Diego Union published a story on March 21, 1884, incorrectly reporting that Harrison had died. The newspaper article noted that, “Poor ‘Nate’ Harrison was drowned in the San Luis Rey River during the recent storm. He was a Southern slave and has resided here many years.” Unfortunately, the brief account did not specify where “here” was, or how long “many years” constituted. Less than a month later, the newspaper recanted the story, asserting that, “Nigger Nate is not drowned as was reported in the Union; he still lives to vote the Republican ticket and beat his way through the world.” Although neither of these articles placed Harrison on the mountain, they did situate him in northern San Diego County, near the San Luis Rey River. In addition, they intimated that he was widely known in the local region and had likely lived in San Diego County for an extended period of time.

Multiple historical records verify Harrison’s presence on or near Palomar Mountain in the late 1880s and early 1890s. He is listed in the 1888, 1890, 1892, and 1894 volumes of the San Diego County Great Register as residing at Pala. The town of Pala is just west of Palomar Mountain, and the Pala Indian Reservation—established in 1903—includes parts of Palomar Mountain. An 1889-1890 San Diego County Ownership Map places the name “Harris” near the top of Palomar Mountain in lot 1 of Section 1 in Township 10, South Range One West of the San Bernardino Meridian. On May 26, 1892, Harrison filed a water claim for the spring associated with this same tract of land. Harrison then completed a homestead certificate on March 27, 1893, for this 45.55-acre Palomar Mountain property. His October 22, 1894, voter registration listed his residence and post-office address as Pala. A December 1896 survey map entitled, “Survey No. 94 Map of Road from a point in the Pauma Townsite to the Summit of Palomar Mtn.,” shows a section of the west grade demarcated with “N. Harrison.” On February 12, 1897, the County of San Diego asked for Harrison’s consent to turn the aforementioned road leading up the mountain past his property into a public highway. The consent form from the County also specified the township and range coordinates of the Harrison property. Thus, historical and cartographic evidence confirms that Harrison was living on Palomar Mountain in the late 1880s. Furthermore, the 1900 San Diego County Census for the Smith (Palomar) Mountain Township included an entry for Nathan Harrison.
On October 22, 1919, the *San Diego Union* published an article entitled, “Aged Negro, Owner of Mountain Spring, Enters County Hospital for the Remainder of His Days.” The story reported that a man named Ed Quinlan brought Harrison from Palomar Mountain to the County hospital after finding him destitute and in ill health. The 1920 San Diego County Census for the San Diego Township included an entry for Nathan Harrison; it stated that Harrison was an inmate of San Diego County General Hospital as of January 1920. Harrison died in the hospital on October 10, 1920. His death certificate indicated that he had been in the hospital’s care.
since September 12, 1919, and that his passing was the result of “articular rheuma-
tism” and “chronic myocarditis.” The death certificate stated that Harrison was 97
years old when he died.

Two primary records from 1921 also mention the location of the Harrison home-
stead. Soon after Harrison’s passing, the California State Superior Court recorded a
deed of sale for his property. On July 5, 1921, Edwin Reed, the Administrator of the
Nate Harrison Estate, sold Harrison’s 45.55 acres to Frank Salmons for $607.50. The
following day, Reed completed an administrator’s deed to finalize the transfer of
property to Salmons. It reiterated much of the information from the deed of sale.

Overall, the primary documents offered a broad range of details—some con-
tradictory and some consistent—regarding Nate Harrison and his Palomar Moun-
tain homestead. For example, Harrison’s birth year varied dramatically in these
records; he was allegedly born earlier and earlier with each year that transpired.
As his mythical status in San Diego County grew, his age was significantly exag-
gerated. This led to numerous false claims that he lived to be over 100 years old,
resulting in the inscription on the cairn atop the grade that was dedicated to his
memory in 1924 that stated: “Nathan Harrison’s Spring; Brought here a slave about
1848, Died October 10th, 1920, aged 101 years; A man’s a man for a’ that.”9 Whereas
Harrison’s burgeoning legend evolved during the tail end of his life and beyond,
exact descriptions regarding the location of Harrison’s properties in and around
Palomar Mountain were remarkably consistent. The 1879 land patent and 1882
deed of sale pinpoint his earlier Rincon residence at the base of Palomar Mountain.
Furthermore, the 1892, 1893, 1896, 1897, and 1921 records described above each
specified Harrison’s property on Palomar Mountain’s western slope in lots 1 and 3
of Section 1 in Township 10, South of Range 1, West of the San Bernardino Merid-
ian. While there is substantive historical evidence that Harrison lived on Palomar
Mountain from the late 1880s to 1919, primary records do not verify that Harrison
occupied his hillside homestead during the 1850s, ’60s, and ’70s as many secondary
sources claim.10 On the contrary, they suggest for the most part that he lived in and
around Bear Valley and San Jacinto during the 1870s and ’80s, Palomar Mountain
during the 1890s, 1900s, and 19-teens, and the city of San Diego during 1919-1920.

Archaeological overview

Members of the Nate Harrison Historical Archaeological Project developed a
plan to search for archaeological remains of the Harrison homestead in the spring
of 2001.11 Their initial research design attempted to establish whether the proposed
excavation area—on the basis of local lore, old maps, and a rocky palimpsest—was
indeed Nate Harrison’s former home12. It asked the following questions:

1. Does the proposed site have a date range of ca. 1850-1919 based on the ar-
chaeological remains?
2. Are the visible stones on the proposed site part of a stone foundation
comparable to the structure seen in historical photographs of the Harrison
cabin?
3. Is there archaeological evidence—artifactual or stratigraphic—of a pre- or
post-Harrison occupation at the site (assumed to be pre-1850 or post-1919)?
4. Is there evidence of multiple phases at the site within the main occupation?
5. How do insights gleaned from this site compare with the primary records regarding Harrison?

The first of five consecutive SDSU summer field schools in historical archaeology began in June 2004. Excavations centered on a group of protruding rocks that formed right angles on a hillside near the cairn that commemorates Harrison’s spring. The field crew first established a datum, enabling the placement of 5.0’ by 5.0’ grid units, aligned to true-north, across the site. The 2004 field school spent its first days on the mountain removing the grass, brush, and small trees from the site, revealing that the protruding rocks were, in fact, part of a surface-level 12.0’ by 15.0’ rectangle stone foundation. Treating the rectangular plan of assembled rocks as a large feature, it was excavated with respect to its own orientation and not the grid, with twelve 3.0’ by 3.5’ units. Excavating stratigraphically in natural layers up to 0.25’ in depth, the initial field school uncovered over 6,000 artifacts; subsequent field schools during the next four summers pushed the site’s recovered artifact total to over 20,000. By the end of the 2008 summer field season, students had completely excavated the cabin interior and exposed its original dirt floor, finished a set of 5.0’-wide cross-trenches across the artifact-rich patio area to the immediate west of the cabin foundation, and dug dozens of 2.5’ by 2.5’ shovel test pits in the
areas surrounding the site. Although the cabin foundation appeared at the outset of the project to be rectangular in shape, its complete excavation revealed that the large stones formed a nearly perfect 11.0’ square with matching 15.6’ diagonals. Overall, this scientific work on Palomar Mountain began with a set of explicit questions in a research design and included meticulous recordation of the vertical and horizontal context of each excavation area. Ultimately, these findings were used to evaluate the initial research queries and develop new questions.

**Temporal and spatial analyses**

Archaeological dimensions of time, space, and form guide the analyses presented here. In each case, the form of an artifact, feature, assemblage, or landscape is studied with respect to its variability over space and/or time. The most basic temporal analysis of the site’s material assemblage is an intersection of all production/use date ranges for each datable artifact. The date-range intersection offers both quantitative and qualitative insights into a site’s occupation. Quantitatively, a minimum date range is generated on the basis of the earliest end production/use date and the latest start production/use date gleaned from the complete artifact assemblage. Simply put, the range is from the earliest end-date to the latest start-date. Qualitatively, the nature of the occupation at the site can be inferred from the overall shape of the bar graph. If the bars stacked in the graph collectively form a gradual diagonal from top to bottom and left to right, then the site likely reflects a uniform and singular occupation without any signs of abandonment. Conversely, if there is a large gap or pronounced right angle in the graph’s bar stack, the site was most likely temporarily deserted or home to a series of occupations.
A graph of the production/use date-ranges for the datable finds from the 20,000+ artifacts recovered from the Nate Harrison site produces clear results. The site included 63 different artifact types with well-defined production/use date ranges. The site’s overall date-range intersection is 1865-1916. Numerous shell buttons with sunken panels, produced from 1837-1865, provide the 1865 occupation start-date as this artifact type has the earliest end-of-production date for all of the datable artifacts in the assemblage. Likewise, a 1916 Buffalo nickel and a 1916 Liberty dime collectively have the latest start-of-production date—1916—for all of the recovered artifacts. These two coins also serve as the terminus post quem (TPQ) for the site. The 1865 occupation start-date, like many attempts at a terminus ante quem (TAQ), is far from certain. Older items that are kept for extended periods of time or passed between individuals frequently skew archaeological data and dupe archaeologists into assigning their sites with premature start-dates. Buttons and bullets are notorious for making a site appear as if it was occupied at an earlier time, as these items are fairly durable and may have been transported to the occupation area long after they were no longer produced. The habit of handing down clothing extends the use life of many buttons. Likewise, bullets have an extended use life as they often remain fully functional long after the particular head stamp is no longer produced. Glass and ceramic wares are far more fragile—they often have a far shorter temporal range of use—and thus, provide more reliable use dates. Removing the clothing and fired cartridge data and relying more on dates from glass and ceramic sherds transforms the site chronology. If shell buttons with sunken panels (1837-1865), Levi Strauss rivets stamped with “L.S. & CO SF” (1874-1890), and all of the fired cartridges with datable head stamps are taken out of the artifact chronology, then the year 1890 becomes the site TAQ on the basis of the production/use end date for undecorated whiteware. Therefore, an all-inclusive date-range intersection for the site is 1865-1916, but a more strict sherd-based chronology is 1890-1916. Harrison may have occupied the cabin during the late 1860s, ’70s, and ’80s, but the archaeological artifacts in and around the site leave no doubt that he was there during the 1890s, 1900s, and 19-teens.

Measures of central tendency further emphasize that the site was occupied
during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The temporal medians of
the aforementioned artifact union, artifact intersection, and ceramic/glass intersec-
tion are respectively 1912, 1891, and 1903. Mean production/use dates that take into
account the frequency of occurrence of fragments are also informative.31 The mean
date for the entire datable assemblage is 1918, but this date is skewed by the thou-
sands of wire nails that are still being produced today.32 The ceramic/glass mean
date again proves to be far more reliable; it is 1885.

Regardless of which of these chronologies is used, the bar graph (see Figure 7)
reflects a singular occupation at the Nate Harrison site. There are no large gaps
in the artifact date ranges, and there are no striking right angles in the bar-graph
stack to indicate multiple occupations or successive periods of abandonment and
re-settlement. The dearth of any post-1920 artifacts at the site strongly suggests
that the cabin area was never re-occupied following Harrison’s 1919 departure and
1920 death. Although the Harrison property has passed through nine sets of own-
ers over the past century,33 none of them evidently engaged in any activities at the
original site that left datable debris.34

Preliminary spatial analysis of the site’s layers suggested slight temporal
distinctions in an expected and evenly stratified manner. For example, of the four
coins recovered from the site, the 1916 dime and the 1916 nickel were uncovered
in the top “A” stratum, the 1907 one-cent coin was from the middle “B” stratum,
and the 1899 quarter was found in the lower “C” stratum. However, this later-to-
earlier/top-to-bottom spatial gradient was undermined by a subsequent thorough
examination of the site’s cross-mends, which revealed that nearly every spatial
context, vertical and horizontal, dated to the same time period. Following the 2006
summer field season, students identified cross-mends35 in the ceramic and glass
assemblages and created a master list of cumulative mends from the 2004-2006
summer field seasons. The cross-mend list was used to connect the site’s different
contexts; the underlying assumption is that layers with parts of the same vessel
were deposited at the same time and thus date to the same time period.36 On the
basis of cross-mend co-temporality and the Law of Superposition, less than 10% of
the site’s 100+ spatial contexts remained potentially distinct in time from the rest
of the site, and these differences do not appear to be significant.37 Overall, the site
appears to be a singular occupation with no internal temporal distinction.

The substantial number of cross-mends has important ramifications for the
interpretation of the site and its depositional sequence. The cross-mends strongly
suggest that the entire site—both the exterior western patio area and interior cabin
area—is united in time. This deduction, combined with the stratigraphic uniform-
ity of the patio area, gives support to the idea that the patio was significantly
impacted and transformed following Harrison’s demise. Otherwise, there should
have been a distinct vertical spatial gradient. The apparently mixed layers and ar-
tifacts support the premise that the patio-area had been bulldozed and terraced, as
was claimed by one of the later landowners.38 This interpretation helps to explain
why the subsoil base of the patio deposit today is so much lower than the dirt floor
of the cabin, even though historical photographs suggest that they were at ap-
proximately the same level. Lower natural subsoil strata were likely mixed in with
Harrison’s cultural debris during the grading, resulting in a patio deposit that was
temporally unstratified, rife with unmodified cobbles, and markedly deeper than
other contemporaneous living surfaces.
Dozens of historical photographs of Nate Harrison exist. There are more photographs of Harrison than any other nineteenth-century San Diegan, including City founder Alonzo Horton and famed lawman Wyatt Earp. These images of Harrison are significant for many reasons. They reveal that he was a touristic highlight for San Diegans, an exotic “other” with ties to the Antebellum South and slavery, and a burgeoning legend. Archaeologically, these photographs are important time capsules that showcase both the local landscape and some of Harrison’s many material possessions. The images enable the SDSU archaeological team to draw one-to-one correspondences between certain items found at the site and those historically captured on film.

One of the old photographs is an undated picture, likely ca. 1910, of Harrison sitting by his cabin with the Palomar hillside in the background. It was taken from the west and shows his patio in the foreground. It is possible to line up the historical image—the slope of the land in the foreground, the near background to the east of the cabin, the distant mountain slope in the far background, and a few of the trees to the immediate north and south of the structure—with the modern archaeological excavations. These reference points enable past and present images to be matched up, even superimposed, providing supporting evidence of the spatial concordance between the cabin in the historical image and the current archaeological location of the stone foundation. In addition, this historical photograph and many others like it reveal Harrison’s structure to be primarily made of stone, square in plan, with a stone chimney opposite the doorway on its gable end. All of these architectural criteria have been verified by the archaeological record.

Archaeologists rarely pinpoint an exact historical day with an artifact, but they often effectively capture everyday activities of the past. For example, smoking played an important role in Harrison’s daily life. Edward Harvey Davis wrote in 1938 that Nate Harrison’s “inseparable
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“companion” was “a short-stemmed black pipe.” Two separate accounts claimed that Harrison’s pipe was so well-used and caked with residue “that tobacco was not even needed in it (coal would do just as well).” Many of the historical photographs show Harrison with a black pipe. Student excavators uncovered five of Harrison’s black rubber tobacco-pipe mouthpieces at the site from 2004-2008. The archaeological crews also located three pipe bowls and nearly a dozen flat tobacco tins. In addition to numerous buttons, rivets, and snaps, excavators uncovered a nearly complete leather shoe in 2004. It measures 9” in length and is complete except for the front upper portion and the tongue. The small size of the shoe corresponds with Harrison’s diminutive stature in the old photos and his recorded height of 5’ 3” on the 1894 voting registration form. The shoe appears to match Harrison’s footwear in many of the historical photographs.

Indirect artifact/historical photograph parallels

Other artifacts found at the site, although not identical to items in the historical photographs, are strikingly similar. For example, students uncovered a nickel watch fob in the top layer of the site’s patio area and the back plate to a watch at the western edge of the cabin’s interior fill. Multiple historical photographs show Harrison wearing a watch chain. The chain in the photographs is thicker and longer than the one recovered archaeologically. Furthermore, none of the images show the watch to which the chain was likely connected. Nonetheless, the fob and back plate strongly resemble some of Harrison’s known possessions.

A northeastern patio-area unit contained four metal suspender clips stamped with the word “PRESIDENT.” An advertisement describing these same suspenders appears on page 997 of the 1902 edition of the Sears, Roebuck and Company Catalogue. It states:

SDSU students Sarah Stroud (left) and Onika Miyashiro (right) admire a leather boot moments after it was excavated. Author’s collection.

This 1916 image from the Kirby Collection (Kirby Collection Image #5) depicts Harrison posing next to Escondido jeweler Frank Reynolds.

The nickel watch fob uncovered at the site in 2004. Author’s collection.
The President Suspender. No. 34R746. A new style recently patented suspender with improved back which equalizes the strain on all parts with every attitude. Relieves the strain on shoulders and not likely to pull off buttons. Made with strong non-elastic web cord in back and high grade elastic webbing in main parts. Every pair warranted to wear to the entire satisfaction of the purchaser. Made in fancy webs or plain colors. Price, per pair $0.45; Per dozen ... $5.40; If by mail, postage extra, per pair, 5c.

One of the photographs of Harrison from the Escondido Historical Society shows him wearing metal suspender-like buckles on his overalls. They are similar, but not identical, to the suspender clips uncovered at the site.

In some cases, artifacts were able to clarify the identity of certain items in the historical photographs. For years, the crew debated what was stacked in the foreground of Figure 8. On the final day of the 2006 field school, students working at the northeast edge of the patio uncovered a series of intertwined leather strips that helped solve this mystery. Field cleaning of the leather revealed that they were three strips of varying length and uniform width, each tapered at the end. The strips were likely off-cuts from hides that Harrison processed. An additional historical photograph from ca. 1910 shows Harrison with a pile of hides off to one side. Multiple lines of archaeological evidence suggest that Harrison ran his own cottage industry at the site, which included regularly hunting deer, processing carcasses, and preparing hides for tanning. Spent rifle cartridges were one of the most common artifacts found at the site, indicating that Harrison was an avid hunter. In addition, the patio area units were especially rich in deer bones. The numerous deer remains found at the site are from Odocoileus hemionus (mule deer), the predominant species of deer in the area. The bones are primarily...
those of young kills, as evidenced by the unfused long bones, small skulls with open sutures, and the dental patterns of juveniles 1-2 years of age. This faunal pattern suggests Harrison’s hunting strategy, as juveniles make easy targets. Many of the remains show signs of butchery, but there are few meat-bearing elements. The number of mandibles and cranial fragments dwarf the number of long bones and ribs, hinting that the meat was transported away from the site. The leather off-cuts and historical photographs of processed hides further support the notion that Harrison was an active skinner.\textsuperscript{50}

Conclusion

Each of these artifactual studies addresses temporal, spatial, and formal qualities of the archaeological assemblage; together they emphasize that the materials uncovered at the site correspond with Harrison’s historically and photographically documented time on Palomar Mountain. Many of the artifacts were household and industrial goods, common to a rural homestead of Harrison’s era. Quantitatively, over 20,000 artifacts from the 1865-1916 time period were found on the land Harrison homesteaded—associated with a stone foundation that was physically identical to that pictured in historical photographs. Qualitatively, the site produced multiple direct parallels—the black pipe mouthpieces, the pipe bowl, and the leather boot—and additional indirect parallels—the watch fob, watch back plate, suspenders, and leather off-cuts and other deer-processing materials—that were also evident in the historical photographs. Therefore, according to archaeological dimensions of time, space, and form, these recent scientific excavations have successfully located and unearthed Nate Harrison’s Palomar Mountain cabin.

The excavations provided answers to the first set of research questions posed at the outset of the project.

1. The site’s date range is ca. 1865-1916, strikingly close to the anticipated ca. 1850-1919 time frame. It is important to note that the artifacts undermine the often repeated claim in the secondary sources that Harrison’s cabin predated Joseph Smith’s 1859 settlement on Palomar Mountain.\textsuperscript{51}
2. The stones that protruded out of the main site area were, for the most part, on top of the original stone foundation and were likely part of the cabin walls. The east-west axis of the structure was elongated during its destruction due to the fall of the chimney at the gable end. The chimney debris made the plan of the square structure appear to be more rectangular prior to excavation.
3. There is no archaeological evidence, either artifactual or stratigraphic, of a
pre- or post-Harrison occupation at the site.
4. There is no evidence of multiple phases within the main Harrison occupation; it was most likely one continuous occupation.
5. The archaeological record supports the chronology generated from the primary sources regarding Harrison’s life. The records established that Harrison lived in and around Palomar Mountain during the 1870s and ‘80s, and at his hillside homestead from the late 1880s to 1919. Archaeologically, the entire material assemblage place the site occupant(s) at the cabin from 1865-1916, but a more reliable sherd-based chronology suggests that the site was occupied from 1890-1916.

As analysis continues on the archaeological assemblage, new insights into the region’s early U.S. American Period are becoming evident. For example, the site has produced many individual artifacts that reflect much larger issues of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, like medicinal fraud and snake-oil salesmen (a Murine eye remedy bottle), time-zone standardization and its impact on rural settings (the watch fob, back plate, and numerous pieces of an alarm clock), and the Early Prohibition Movement (multiple alcohol and Welch’s grape juice bottles). Studying the history of these artifacts, among many others, helps to situate Harrison’s life in greater social context. These sorts of analyses prompt just as many new questions as they have answered, especially concerning the status, ethnicity, and social identity of the site occupant(s). Thus, the article presented here confirms the recently excavated area as Harrison’s late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century hillside homestead, and serves as a springboard for further studies into his life and legend.

Endnotes

1. This article makes the following general distinctions regarding primary and secondary sources. First, primary sources are based on unique data; they are not drawn from other accounts. Second, primary sources are contemporary with the individual or event being described. Third, the account is authoritative and based on personal knowledge of the individual or event being described. In this article, the primary/secondary distinction does not apply to a dichotomy between written histories and oral histories; it also does not apply to differences between firsthand (eye-witness) and secondhand (word of mouth) knowledge of an individual or event. See Sebastian Olden-Jørgensen, *To the Sources!: Introduction to Historical Source Criticism.* (København: Gads Forlag, 2001), 74.

2. Nate Harrison had various aliases in the primary documents, including Nathan Harrison, Nathan Harris, and Nate Harris.

3. Some of the later Great Register entries (1877 and 1879) may have been copied from earlier volumes. This brings into question their qualification as a primary source according to the criteria related above. However, unless there is definitive evidence of duplication, all Great Register listings are treated as primary sources.

4. Isidro M. Alvarado patented over 13,000 acres southeast of Fallbrook in 1872 and named the area Montserate. The “Montserrat” post office was established in 1874, discontinued in 1876, and then re-established in 1889 as “Monserrate.”

5. This land in Rincon is not the property on which the recent archaeological excavations have taken place.

6. This racial epithet was used often during the first half of the twentieth century to describe Harrison. In fact, the name of the county road up the west side of Palomar Mountain was officially called “Nigger Nate Grade” until the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) successfully lobbied to have it changed to “Nate Harrison Grade” in 1955.

7. This is the property on which the recent archaeological excavations detailed in this article have been undertaken.

8. Although censuses were taken every ten years, there is no census information on Nate Harrison for 1890 and 1910. The 1890 records were reportedly destroyed by fire, and the 1910 documents failed to mention Harrison. Whereas the 1880 census listed Harrison as single, the 1900 census stated that he was a widower, suggesting that he had married and been widowed between 1880 and 1900. No marriage certificate for Harrison and his wife has been found.

9. See Laura M. James, “Palomar’s Friendly Hermit,” *San Diego Historical Society Quarterly*, 4, no. 1 (January 1958), 8. The quote at the end of the inscription—“A man’s a man for a’ that”—is from a Robert Burns poem/song written in 1795. It speaks of the righteousness of an egalitarian society and is a frequent battle cry against tyrannical and oppressive institutions, like slavery. The “a’” is a Scottish abbreviation for “all.”

11. General research on the Nate Harrison Historical Archaeology Project began in 2001. SDSU Department of Anthropology Professor Seth Mallios and graduate student Sarah Stroud visited the land owners of the former Harrison property, James and Hannah Kirby, on multiple occasions in 2002 and 2003. This property was assumed to be Harrison’s historical homestead on the basis of the aforementioned township and range designations in the primary records. During these visits, the Kirbys showed the archaeologists the remains of what, according to local lore, was thought to be the Harrison cabin. The only apparent signs of the historical structure were a few dozen stacked cobbles amongst waist-high grass and brush. Once the Kirbys gave SDSU permission to undertake archaeological excavations on their land, an historic resource record search for the proposed survey area was completed at the South Coastal Information Center (SCIC). The SCIC record search produced only one report, a 1959 survey that mentioned neither the Harrison cabin nor the presence of any archaeological materials in the immediate area. The State of California Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) was then contacted to request a record search of the sacred land file. The record search failed to indicate the presence of cultural resources in the proposed project area. A letter to every indigenous group on the NAHC list was also sent in an attempt to ascertain any additional information regarding cultural resources in the project area. None responded to the inquiry. There was concern at the outset of the Nate Harrison Historical Archaeology Project that the cabin area had been looted. Journalist David Ross’s 1998 series of articles in *The Daily Roadrunner* revealed that non-archaeologists with metal detectors had repeatedly dug for artifacts at the site. Ross wrote, “It seems that for years he [a previous land owner] and his family have used a metal detector around the ruins of Nate’s house, and found scads of stuff… Most of it, of course, is of little interest. But, over the years they have come up with quite a collection of items that give fascinating little glimpses into life in another age” (Part IV, p. 4). The location of these artifacts is unknown. Accompanying Ross’s article were two modern photographs of a picnic table covered with historical artifacts that were likely from the site. In addition, there were multiple personal correspondences written in 1981 and 1982 from author Robert Melvin to a previous land owner detailing plans to dig for artifacts at the site. These letters were donated to the Nate Harrison Historical Archaeology Project as part of the Kirby Collection and are online in their entirety in the 2005 and 2006 technical reports at http://www-rohan.sdsu.edu/~histarch/publications.html.

12. The project’s research design is detailed in Seth Mallios, Sarah Stroud, Lauren Lingley, Jaime Lennox, Hillary Sweeney, Jason Maywald, and David Caterino, *Archaeological Excavations at the Nate Harrison Site in San Diego County, California: An Interim Technical Report for the Inaugural 2004 Field Season* (San Diego: San Diego State University Department of Anthropology, 2005). On file at the South Coastal Information Center and online at: <http://www-rohan.sdsu.edu/~histarch/publications.html>.

13. The cabin is oriented approximately 30° east of true north.

14. This image was first published in *Archaeological Excavations at the Nate Harrison Site in San Diego County, California: An Interim Technical Report for the 2006 Field Season* by Seth Mallios, Hillary Sweeney, Jaime Lennox, Kimberly Scott, Robert Tews, David Caterino, Anne Miller, Matthew Maxfeldt, and Sarah Stroud (San Diego: San Diego State University Department of Anthropology, 2007). On file at the South Coastal Information Center and online at: <http://www-rohan.sdsu.edu/~histarch/publications.html>.

15. The fall of the stone chimney to the east had exaggerated the apparent length of the structure’s east/west axis at the surface.

16. This image was first published in *Archaeological Excavations at the Nate Harrison Site in San Diego County, California: An Interim Technical Report for the 2007 Field Season* by Seth Mallios, Matthew Tennyson, Hillary Sweeney, Jaime Lennox, Brenda Cabello, Erika Kleinhaus, and David Caterino (San Diego: San Diego State University Department of Anthropology, 2008). On file at the South Coastal Information Center and online at: <http://www-rohan.sdsu.edu/~histarch/publications.html>.

18. Production and use ranges are often conflated in historical archaeology as the emergence of the modern world system enabled goods to be produced, transported, and used very quickly and in overlapping timeframes.

19. These dates are not for the same artifact; they span and unite the entire dated assemblage.

20. Top to bottom and left to right assumes that the dates are arranged from earliest on the left to latest on the right and that the datable artifact types are stacked from earliest start of production/use date to latest start of production/use date. The diagonal can also be seen graphically as the ellipse that is commonly showcased in archaeological presence/absence seriations. This ellipse itself a representation of the gradual variability of a cultural phenomenon over time that follows the normal curve.


22. These 63 datable artifact types represent approximately 9% of the entire assemblage (2,005 out of 21,513 total) as of the end of the 2007 field season.


24. This common archaeological term translates from Latin as “the date after which.”

25. This common archaeological term translates from Latin as “the date before which.”

26. Although any item can be handed down or recycled, remnants of slightly outdated clothing are common on archaeological sites.


29. Ibid.

30. The intersection of all of the date ranges focuses on the minimal occupation at the site. The union of all of the date ranges—1820-2004 (the start of excavation)—provides the maximal occupation duration. Thus, the site could have been occupied as early as 1820, but this maximal range is less informative and rarely used in historical archaeology.


32. The mean date for non-ceramic/glass artifacts is 1922. This is the only measure of central tendency that falls outside of the site’s occupation date range, further emphasizing the accuracy of artifacts with a shorter use-life, like those made of ceramic and glass.

33. The owners of the Nate Harrison estate over time are: 1) Nate Harrison (1893 (homestead date)-1921; 2) Frank and Hazel Salmons (1921); 3) Jean Nicholas (1921-1943); 4) Dorothy T. Bowman (1943-1946); 5) Thomas and Midge Colby (1946-1956); 6) Robert Dewey Kelley (1956-1969); 7) Richard and Lois Day (1969-2000); 8) James and Hannah Kirby (2000-2007); and 9) Elisa Kisselburg, Vicki Morgan, and Susie Silvestri (2007-present). See Seth Mallios, Sarah Stroud, Lauren Lingley, Jaime Lennox, Hillary Sweeney, Jason Maywald, and David Caterino, Archaeological Excavations at the Nate Harrison Site in San Diego County, California: An Interim Technical Report for the Inaugural 2004
34. In addition, there were other people who temporarily inhabited the immediate area but did not own it. These groups included an industrial prison camp that occupied the west grade of Palomar Mountain during 1933 and the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) unit that tore down the Harrison cabin in the 1930s as a safety precaution. J. H. Heath's September 24, 1933, *San Diego Union* article “Where Trees and Shade Replace Desert Heat/Move Industrial Camp to Palomar Site” details the industrial prison camp on Palomar Mountain (See Seth Mallios, Sarah Stroud, Lauren Lingley, Jaime Lennox, Hillary Sweeney, Olivia Smith, and David Caterino, *Archaeological Excavations at the Nate Harrison Site in San Diego County, California: An Interim Technical Report for the 2005 Field Season* (San Diego: San Diego State University Department of Anthropology, 2006). On file at the South Coastal Information Center and online at: <http://www-rohan.sdsu.edu/~histarch/publications.html>).  

35. Cross-mends are two or more artifacts from a single vessel that share a common edge and can be pieced back together.

36. The master cross-mend table is oriented with individual cross-mended vessels as rows and the site’s artifact-bearing layers as columns (Seth Mallios, Hillary Sweeney, Jaime Lennox, Kimberly Scott, Robert Tews, David Caterino, Anne Miller, Matthew Maxfeldt, and Sarah Stroud, *Archaeological Excavations at the Nate Harrison Site in San Diego County, California: An Interim Technical Report for the 2006 Field Season* (San Diego: San Diego State University Department of Anthropology, 2007). On file at the South Coastal Information Center and online at: <http://www-rohan.sdsu.edu/~histarch/publications.html>). Appendix B; Seth Mallios, Sarah Stroud, Lauren Lingley, Jaime Lennox, Hillary Sweeney, Olivia Smith, and David Caterino, *Archaeological Excavations at the Nate Harrison Site in San Diego County, California: An Interim Technical Report for the 2005 Field Season* (San Diego: San Diego State University Department of Anthropology, 2006). On file at the South Coastal Information Center and online at: <http://www-rohan.sdsu.edu/~histarch/publications.html>). Appendix B. Each cell contains the number of the row’s cross-mended vessel. Every context that includes a sherd from that particular vessel is shaded. Likewise, any other vessel with cross-mends to the layers that have been shaded are then also shaded. Linking layers through cross-mends follows a transitive logic. If sherds from A and B mend together and sherds from A and C mend together (and are thus temporally linked), then sherds from B and C date to the same time period as well. In the end, every column that shares a cross-mend with another column is shaded, meaning that these spatial contexts are linked by a cross-mend. The unshaded columns are not united with the others through cross-mends. Some of these rows, however, represent layers that stratigraphically rested above others that were connected through the cross-mends. For example, NH16B, C, and E did not contain artifacts that cross-mended with the other layers, but NH16F did. Since NH16F was sealed by NH16E and the other layers in that unit, everything above NH16F must date either to the same time period or later.

37. Each of these 15 unshaded contexts was not temporally distinct from the other strata; they merely contained very few artifacts. Artifact-poor contexts have a much smaller chance of containing cross-mends because of their lack of materials and can often be mistaken as a separate occupation period.


39. Many of these pictures are located at local historical societies in San Diego County, including the San Diego Historical Society and the Escondido Historical Society. A majority of the Harrison images, however, had been passed down by the successive property owners at the Nate Harrison estate. Former landowners Jamey and Hannah Kirby donated a box of these images and associated letters, articles, records, and maps to Dr. Mallios and the Nate Harrison Historical Archaeology Project in 2004. The images have been compiled in the first and third technical reports. See Seth Mallios, Sarah Stroud, Lauren Lingley, Jaime Lennox, Hillary Sweeney, Jason Maywald, and David Caterino, *Archaeological Excavations at the Nate Harrison Site in San Diego County, California: An...

40. Appreciating nuances in these images is essential to understanding Harrison’s legend, but this lengthy discussion is left for a subsequent article.

41. This technique has been used before in historical archaeology and was dubbed “Prince’s Principle” by archaeologist Ivor Noel Hume. Named after Gene Prince, a staff archaeologist at Flowerdew Hundred, Virginia, this process was used to locate Grant’s crossing of the pontoon bridge at Flowerdew Hundred in 1864. James Deetz celebrated the technique in his 1993 book, Flowerdew Hundred (Charlottesville, Virginia: University of Virginia Press), 150-51.

42. Edward Harvey Davis, “Palomar Mountain History,” (Unpublished manuscript in the California State Parks Collection, 1938).


44. This image was first published in Seth Mallios, Sarah Stroud, Lauren Lingley, Jaime Lennox, Hillary Sweeney, Jason Maywald, and David Caterino’s Archaeological Excavations at the Nate Harrison Site in San Diego County, California: An Interim Technical Report for the Inaugural 2004 Field Season (San Diego: San Diego State University Department of Anthropology, 2005). On file at the South Coastal Information Center and online at: <http://www-rohan.sdsu.edu/~histarch/publications.html>.

45. The tobacco cans, flattened tins with a hinged lid, were patented on July 30, 1907 by the R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Company. Many different tobacco brands were marketed in these particular cans, but they soon became widely known as “Prince Albert” cans after the leading brand. These metal cans held 1.5 ounces of shredded cigarette tobacco, measuring 4.0” in height and having an oval top that was 3.0” by 1.0”. These cans gained much fame in popular American culture during the 20th century. The joke— “Do you have Prince Albert in a can? Well let him out!”—was ubiquitously told. In addition, marijuana joints were often called "lids" because they were commonly rolled in the convenient flip-up lid of the Prince Albert can. Furthermore, asking someone if “Prince” [Albert] or “Red” [the can was bright red] was around became a common coded reference for someone attempting to obtain marijuana. Tobacco cans dwindled in popularity during the 1940s as far cheaper and less messy mass-manufactured, machine-rolled cigarettes became the norm. See Seth Mallios, Matthew Tennyson, Hillary Sweeney, Jaime Lennox, Brenda Cabello, Erika Kleinhans, and David Caterino, Archaeological Excavations at the Nate Harrison Site in San Diego County, California: An Interim Technical Report for the 2006 Field Season (San Diego: San Diego State University Department of Anthropology, 2007). On file at the South Coastal Information Center and online at: <http://www-rohan.sdsu.edu/~histarch/publications.html>.

46. This image was first published in Seth Mallios, et al, Archaeological Excavations at the Nate Harrison Site, 2005). On file at the South Coastal Information Center and online at: <http://www-rohan.sdsu.edu/~histarch/publications.html>.

47. This image was first published in Seth Mallios, Sarah Stroud, Lauren Lingley, Jaime Lennox, Hillary Sweeney, Jason Maywald, and David Caterino’s Archaeological Excavations at the Nate Harrison Site in San Diego County, California: An Interim Technical Report for the Inaugural 2004 Field Season (San Diego: San Diego State University Department of Anthropology, 2005). On file at the South Coastal Information Center and online at: <http://www-rohan.sdsu.edu/~histarch/publications.html>.

48. This image was first published in Seth Mallios, Hillary Sweeney, Jaime Lennox, Kimberly Scott, Robert Tews, David Caterino, Anne Miller, Matthew Maxfeldt, and Sarah Stroud, Archaeological Excavations at the Nate Harrison Site in San Diego County, California: An Interim Technical Report for the 2006 Field Season (San Diego: San Diego State University Department of Anthropology, 2007). On file at the South Coastal Information Center and online at: <http://www-rohan.sdsu.edu/~histarch/publications.html>.

49. Ibid.
Many of the written histories of Nate Harrison have undeniably racist overtones. Stories from the 1930s and ‘40s often employ the offensive stereotype of “the lazy black man” to describe Harrison. For example, Virginia Stivers Bartlett claimed in 1931 that, “Uncle Nate never did a solid day’s work in his life” (Virginia Stivers Bartlett, “Uncle Nate of Palomar.” Touring Topics, (October 1931), 22-25). Did Harrison work? The archaeological evidence strongly suggests that he ran his own cottage industry at the site, hunting deer and processing hides on a regular basis.


