Supplemental Text 2. Methods for Studying Sustained Colonialism.

Our investigation of settler colonialism in the Kashaya Homeland involved a more inclusive search to detect and date later indigenous archaeological remains that were associated with the later settler colonial period. This work focused on the Metini Village Site (CA-SON-175), a prominent Kashaya Pomo site on the Metini landscape (Figure 1). While a full discussion of this work and its origins is presented elsewhere (Lightfoot and Gonzalez 2018), we initiated fieldwork in collaboration with California State Park archaeologists and Kashaya Pomo elders and scholars. Metini Village occupies a prominent place in tribal history and is also recognized as a sacred site. As such, we devised a field and laboratory program that employs Kashaya cultural protocols for working on a sacred site (Parrish et al. 2000). We initiated a low impact, multistage field strategy that involved detailed topographic mapping, geophysical survey (e.g., gradiometer, soil conductivity), and intensive collection of surface deposits, which provided excellent information about the spatial structure of the site in a series of overlapping topographic, geophysical, and artifact isopleth maps (Gonzalez 2016). In close consultation with members of our collaborative research team, we then selected a few places for excavation that allowed us to evaluate the spatial structure of the site and specific geophysical anomalies. These archaeological investigations revealed a large pit feature and an extensive midden area containing lithic, glass, ceramic and metal objects, along with faunal specimens (shellfish, fish, mammals), and floral remains (Figure 2).

On the basis of these findings we initiated a detailed chronological investigation of the glass, ceramic, and metal artifacts. While the differences between this assemblage and other historical Kashaya Pomo sites previously studied were subtle, the analysis revealed a later age for the Metini Village assemblage. The most diagnostic of the materials proved to be the glass beads (Supplemental Figure 1) analyzed by Blair (2018), which indicated that the primary occupation at Metini Village took place in the 1850s and 1860s. Diagnostic ceramic and bottle glass artifacts substantiate this occupation date. These chronological evaluations indicate that Metini Village coexisted with the Benitz Ranch, although it may also have been used in the 1830s and early 1840s in the latter phase of the Russian-American Company’s tenure at Colony Ross.

The recognition that Metini Village was coeval with the Benitz Ranch stimulated the search for other indigenous places that were contemporaneous with settler colonization of the Metinilandscape. An investigation of nearby CA-SON-174 by Farris (1983) in Fort Ross State Historic Park revealed another mid-to-late nineteenth century site, which appears to have been occupied by Indian laborers at the Benitz Ranch. A comprehensive synthesis of the original Farris excavation materials, as well as subsequent mapping and surface collection of three large surface depressions by UC Berkeley researchers in 1990 (Lightfoot et al. 1991:69-76), was completed by Newquist (2002). Together, the analysis of material remains from Metini Village and CA-SON-174 offer a comparative view of indigenous residence at a critical point in time for Kashaya and other nearby Native peoples.

While our study of sustained colonialism built upon our previous investigation of Kashaya encounters with the RAC, the comparative approach we initiated underwent significant change. We employed an ethnographic baseline to examine transformations in the subsistence practices, technology, and spatial organization that took place among indigenous populations during their encounters with first wave colonists. The baseline provided expectations for precolonial cultural practices that were compared with those observed from our investigation of Russian-aged indigenous sites in order to measure the degree of change that had taken place (Lightfoot et al. 1991; Lightfoot et al. 1997; Lightfoot et al. 1998).

However, it became clear that the use of an ethnographic baseline for examining cultural transformations was of limited utility for the study of sustained colonialism. As Silliman (2009, 2012) discusses, this method may prove useful for examining change and persistence in initial encounter settings, but it is inadequate for undertaking investigations of later colonial entanglements. Use of these baselines can inadvertently promote a static perspective of indigenous populations as they looked at the time of first colonial encounters. Consequently, interpretations of native peoples in later historical times, when compared to these distant baselines, can distort the tempo and magnitude of transformations that had actually taken place in indigenous cultural practices and values. The degree of change observed between these distant baselines to recent times may also be so abrupt as to support interpretations that recent people were no longer “real” Indians, which feeds into terminal narratives and the myth of the “vanishing Indian.” Clearly, a more nuanced and sophisticated methodology is needed in examining change and persistence that transcends multiple colonial regimes and time periods. Consequently, we developed a new approach, as outlined in the main text of the *American Antiquity* article, which compared a series of indigenous sites that provided multiple temporal points across a timeline spanning from late precolonial, mercantile colonial, and settler colonial times. (see Supplemental Text 4 for references cited).