

UC Riverside

UC Riverside Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Title

Poisoned Sugar Cubes: The Absence of California's Indigenous Genocide Within the California Department of Education's 2016 History Social Science Framework

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/2v20p3x2>

Author

Gilfillan, Jessica Michelle

Publication Date

2022

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
RIVERSIDE

Poisoned Sugar Cubes: The Absence of California's Indigenous Genocide Within the
California Department of Education's 2016 History Social Science Framework

A Thesis submitted in partial satisfaction
of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

Education

by

Jessica Michelle Gilfillan

December 2022

Thesis Committee:

Dr. Begoña Echeverria, Chairperson
Dr. Rita Kohli
Dr. John Wills

Copyright by
Jessica Michelle Gilfillan
2022

The Thesis of Jessica Michelle Gilfillan is approved:

Committee Chairperson

University of California, Riverside

Acknowledgements

I'd first like to express deep gratitude for my graduate advisor and thesis chairperson Begoña Echeverria. Your wisdom and thoughtful guidance were indispensable resources for me both in and out of class, and I thank you very much for sharing them. I would like to thank Dr. Rita Kohli. Your classes expanded my awareness and helped me sharpen my skills as a writer and a researcher, and I appreciate you accepting a position on my committee. Thank you to Dr. John Wills, for your feedback and willingness to be a part of this thesis process. I would also like to express gratitude for Dr. Amos Lee. Your classes provided me space to discover the lines of inquiry that were truly meaningful to my passions. Dr. Alice Lee also deserves my recognition. Thank you for your valuable instruction, you demystified many elements of the process of writing at the graduate level for me. Many thanks to Dr. Rose Borunda, for taking time to encourage me and reply to my inquiries. I'd also like to thank Gary Robinson for his correspondence and helpfulness. Your work fills me with hope.

Thank you to my husband Ian. Your support during my studies was invaluable, and I could not have completed this work without you. Many thanks to my young daughter, Liliana, for your patience as I spent long hours reading, writing, and editing. Thank you to my mother Lisa, father Berin, and sister Christina for the moral support I needed to finish this project. I love you all.

Table of Contents

Introduction1
Literature Review.....4
Theoretical Framework.....13
Positionality.....15
Methods.....17
Findings and Analysis.....17
Conclusion.....32
Bibliography.....35

List of Figures

Figure 1.118

Introduction

When I think of the term “penetrate” or “penetration,” I think of the coming of the first western Europeans and the subsequent invasion, land theft, the occupation, and the transformation of the Americas. Of course, this refers to Columbus and the Spanish, initially, then the French, the Dutch, and the English, et. al. The “penetration” process of Indigenous lands began in the islands of the Caribbean, then spread to the East Coast of the United States. Then, the process crossed the Appalachian mountains into the lands of the Native Peoples living in the Ohio River Valley; then further west into the land of the Aboriginal Peoples of the Great Plains, extending from North and South Dakota down to Oklahoma and Texas; then through the Rocky Mountains and Southwest deserts; and, finally into the West Coast, from the states of Washington and Oregon, down to California. This invasion took about four centuries (the 1500s, the 1600s, the 1700s, and the 1800s); during that time the colonizers, invaders, exploiters, and land-grabbers stole the approximately three billion acres of land within the continent of the United States. By the end of the 19th century, the massive land theft was complete; the conquest was complete. As was the genocide project.

-Chris Mato Nunpa

The Great Evil: Christianity, the Bible, and the Native American Genocide (2020, p. 2)

What I ask of all people, native and non-native, is that they insist that the true history of California be told. Don't allow the history that was told in our schools, the history that was told by state parks, by markers, by the Catholic church, that false history... don't allow that to continue. Insist that the true history be told.

-Valentin Lopez, Chairman of the Amah Mutsun Tribal Band

Telling the Truth about California Missions (2020, 22:00)

In spite of a wealth of sources, the California Department of Education denies the genocide of its first people, and publishers and authors of social studies texts almost entirely ignore the killing (of) thousands of Indians and enslavement of thousands of others (California State Board of Education, 2000).

-Clifford Trafzer and Michelle Lorimer

Silencing California Indian Genocide in Social Studies Text (2014, p. 65)

The devastating theft of land which colonizers now call the United States of America occurred over several centuries, as Indigenous scholar Chris Mato Nunpa articulately condenses above. Before European contact, around 16 million Indigenous people inhabited this land. In 1900, the U.S. Bureau of Census counted merely 237,000 Indigenous people remaining (Nunpa, 2020, p. 2; Smith, 2017, p. 7). Many historians, scholars, and Indigenous leaders define this loss of over 15.5 million as an Indigenous Genocide. Indigenous people not murdered outright were subjected to physical and mental harm, indoctrination, cruelty, violence, slavery, and attempted

culturicide (Deloria Jr., 2003; Trafzer & Lorimer, 2014; Smith, 2017; Nunpa, 2020; Lindsay, 2012, Castillo, 2015).

Yet California's public K-12 social studies curriculum barely mentions these truths (Keenan, 2019; Norton, 2013; Trafzer and Lorimer, 2014, Nunpa, 2020). Harper Keenan, an Assistant Professor of Curriculum and Pedagogy at the University of British Columbia, muses: "Perhaps this curricular avoidance of the atrocities done in the name of colonization merely reflects a dominant societal avoidance of our collective histories on colonized land" (2019, p. 22). Indigenous scholar Brian McKinley Jones Brayboy asserts that "the goal, sometimes explicit, sometimes implicit, of interactions between the dominant U.S. society and American Indians has been to change ('colonize' or 'civilize') us to be more like those who hold power in the dominant society" (Brayboy, 2005, p. 430). Since contact, European colonizers have used Christianity as a vehicle of this domination (Nunpa, 2020; Deloria Jr., 2003; Castillo, 2015). Nunpa refers to these efforts as an "unholy trinity" of Church, State, and Capitalism (2020, p. 6). In *American Indian Education: A History*, John Reyhner and Jeanne Eder describe how early missionary efforts influenced the formation of boarding schools for Indigenous children:

For most Indian students being taught by missionaries, the influence of the children's extended family far outweighed the influence of missionaries. Since this frustrated their efforts at conversion to Christianity and the European way of life, missionaries soon sought to separate Indian children from their parents by placing them in white homes or boarding schools (Reyhner and Eder, 2017, p. 19).

Little thought was given to the physical and emotional damage which would emerge from the kidnapping, enslaving, and brainwashing of Indigenous children. In *Christian Imperialism: Converting the World in the Early American Republic*, Emily Conroy-Krutz states: "missionaries and their supporters were committed to a kind of Christian imperialism that they thought would make the world a better place by spreading the Kingdom of God" (Conroy-Krutz, 2015, p. 207). Missionaries and government officials using this settler model were fueled by their perception

that God permitted, even demanded, that they colonize Indigenous people. The colonizers' worldview, religion, historical perspective, and iconography have been forcefully, thoroughly, and unquestioningly copied and pasted throughout American society. Textbooks and curricular standards developed and recommended by the California Department of Education echo the tired and refutable lies told by colonizers and colonizer apologists to justify the occupation of Indigenous land (Keenan, 2019).

For this thesis, I add to this research by conducting a document analysis of the 2016 History-Social Science Framework for California Public Schools: Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve. I analyze passages relating to the colonization and genocide of the Indigenous people of the region that colonizers have renamed California, and weigh their accuracy against the counternarratives contained within a large body of texts on the subject written by Indigenous historians, scholars, and leaders, as well as the work of non-Indigenous fellow travelers committed to truth telling about the Indigenous Genocide absent from our history books. This analysis addresses two research questions:

- 1) To what extent has the ideology of Christianity been used as a tool of settler colonialism to (mis)educate Indigenous children from the land which colonizers now call California?
- 2) How is this history (mis)taught in California K-12 public schools?

I view the 2016 California History Social Science Framework (2016 CA HSS Framework) through the lens of Tribal Critical Race Theory (TribalCrit), a primary tenet of which states that "...European American thought, knowledge, and power structures dominate present-day society in the United States" (Brayboy, 2005, p. 430). I demonstrate how the ideology of Christianity has been used as a tool of settler colonialism, "the specific formation of colonialism in which the colonizer comes to stay, making himself the sovereign, and the arbiter of

citizenship, civility, and knowing” (Tuck & Gaztambide-Fernández, 2013, p. 73), to intentionally miseducate and harm Indigenous children. My analysis demonstrates how the 2016 California History Social Science Framework upholds white supremacy by denying the Indigenous Genocide and imprinting an inaccurate master narrative about the origins of our state onto impressionable students.

Literature Review

It is said that people read and write history to learn from the mistakes of the past, but this could certainly not apply to histories of the American Indian, if it applies to history at all.

-Vine Deloria Jr.

God is Red: A Native View of Religion (2003, p. 33)

A heavy curtain of denial regarding the Indigenous Genocide remains draped over the eyes of American politicians, US History curriculum, well-meaning teachers, and society at large. In *Lies My Teacher Told Me: Everything Your American History Textbook Got Wrong*, James Loewen concludes that “textbooks rarely present the various sides of historical controversies and almost never reveal to students the evidence on which each side bases its position” (2007, p. 302). Loewen points out mainstream US history textbooks are unscholarly, disconnected from the truths displayed in primary and secondary texts, and largely devoid of basic scholarly elements such as a bibliography (2007, p. 302). Tuck and Gaztambide-Fernández argue that “the field of curriculum studies has played a significant role in the maintenance of settler colonialism” (2013, p. 76). Tuck and Gaztambide-Fernández specifically theorize what they call the “settler colonial curricular project of replacement, which aims to vanish Indigenous peoples and replace them with settlers, who see themselves as the rightful claimants to land, and indeed, as indigenous” (2013, p. 73). Scholars have demonstrated that California’s fourth grade curriculum erases Indigenous people by centering colonizers and misrepresenting European mistreatment (Keenan, 2019;

Keenan, 2018; Trafzer and Lorimer, 2014; Lorimer, 2016; Miranda, 2013; Nunpa, 2020; Schneider, Allender, Margarita, Berta-Ávila, Borunda, Castro, Murray, & Porter, 2019). In the literature review that follows, I first summarize some of the scholarly work documenting inaccurate Indigenous history within textbooks, class instruction, and societal depictions. Second, I look at past and present efforts at reforming this inaccurate representation.

Previous Scholarly Analyses of Inaccurate Indigenous History in CA’s History Textbooks, Class Instruction, and Embedded Societal Lore

Textbooks

According to Trafzer and Lorimer, “The general public knows little or nothing of the California genocide, in large part because textbooks silence genocide of California Indians” (2014, p. 67). Keenan’s article “Selective Memory: California Mission History and the Problem of Historical Violence in Elementary School Textbooks” analyzes textbook passages about Spanish mission era violence across all four California state-recommended textbooks (2019). He does so for three reasons. First, because “California is the most populous state in the United States,” so “its textbooks have a large sphere of influence” (Keenan, 2019, p. 9). Second, because studying California’s colonial past has been interpreted as a “celebratory rite of passage in becoming a Californian” which fuels “an entire economy of supplies” including “mission model-making kits, libraries with children’s literature, fourth grade classrooms with social studies textbooks, and museums with exhibits and cartoon-illustrated activity booklets” (Keenan, 2019, p. 9-10). Third, Keenan asserts that “the case of the California mission curriculum highlights a discord between history as it is generally agreed upon by historians and history as it is taught in schools” (Keenan, 2019, p. 10).

Keenan concludes that “data suggest that regardless of which United States colonial ancestor is being discussed (e.g., Spanish or British), the treatment of violence follows a similar

pattern, foregrounding the portrayal of colonists as victims and Indigenous people as aggressors, despite that colonists aggressively invaded and dispossessed Indigenous people” (2019, p. 19). Keenan asserts that “by obscuring the questions that lie at the heart of colonial history and the information necessary to its open inquiry, the authors of these textbooks have failed to meet the criteria for history education in a democratic society according to California’s own State Department of Education” (2019, p. 20). Keenan quotes an excerpt from the 2005 CA HSS Framework: “In tightly controlled societies the historical record may be altered to redefine public consciousness of the past and to regulate the public’s loyalties; in democratic societies the historical record is open to debate, revision, conflicting interpretations, and acknowledgment of past mistakes” (California State Department of Education, 2005, p. 13). Keenan notes that “the state has approved the kind of narrative that it associates with ‘tightly controlled societies’ rather than democratic ones” (2019, p. 20).

In the article “Silencing California Indian Genocide in Social Studies Texts,” Trafzer and Lorimer reviewed Gold Rush era content in several “state of California approved... texts for school districts to select from as part of their adoption process” (2014, p. 74). Among these was Harcourt’s *Reflections* series, titled *California: A Changing State* (Trafzer and Lorimer, 2014, p. 74). The Harcourt text “noted that the largest California Indian populations occupied the central valley and mountains region—the same region affected by the Gold Rush—but the text does not address the dramatic impact of the Gold Rush to Native populations” (2014, p. 75). Further, the text’s description of the Gold Rush era “does not address the intentional slaughter of Native Californians. Rather, it points to deforestation, the destruction of inland waterways, and intrusion of Americans on Native lands as sources of conflict between Americans and California Indians,” a description which “does not account for the violent deaths suffered by thousands of Native Californians during the era and removed accountability from American settlers who murdered

thousands of Indian people” (2014, p. 75). Trafzer and Lorimer conclude their analysis of the Harcourt text matter-of-factly by asserting that it “participates in the silencing of genocide” (2015, p. 75).

Classroom Instruction

Harper Keenan’s article “The Mission Project: Teaching History and Avoiding the Past in California’s Elementary Schools” closely examines a mission unit in a California classroom “across 30 school days” and “26 instructional blocks” (2021, p. 116). He describes an observation on the unit’s second day, after teacher Mr. J “explained that one goal of the missions was to teach California Indian children to be Christians” (Keenan, 2021, p. 119). An Indigenous student named Edward asked the teacher, “Do you know which tribes it was that burned down the missions?” (Keenan, 2021, p. 119), adding that “If it was the Chumash, it might be my tribe, because I’m a little bit Native American” (Keenan, 2021, p. 119). The teacher did not engage the student’s inquiry which Keenan calls an example “of ritual avoidance that obscured not only the lived experience of California Indians in Spanish missions but Edward’s contemporary knowledge as a Chumash student in the classroom” (Keenan, 2021, p. 126). Toward the end of the unit, Edward “seemed to have developed a new sense of what type of historical narrative was appropriate for his school context, or perhaps more specifically, what to say to an adult about mission history” (Keenan, 2021, p. 125).

Keenan concludes that “the status quo, in which children quite literally reconstruct a prefabricated historical narrative, is maintained by a complex set of factors within the ecosystem of elementary education” (Keenan, 2021, p. 126). This ecosystem encompasses “the California State Department of Education, to the profit driven companies that publish the textbooks, to even, however distantly, the oil industry that produces the petrochemicals used to make the Styrofoam modeling kits” (Keenan, 2021, p. 127). In this case study, Keenan observed that “Mr. J’s initial

interest in teaching history through inquiry and research eventually gave way to a well-worn path of ritual avoidance maintained by the convenience of the existing curricular infrastructure” (Keenan, 2021, p. 128).

Miseducation through Inaccurate Societal Lore

Kryder-Reid asserts that “the contemporary conventions of making, displaying, and consuming mission models have a long history that is embedded in the complex construction of California heritage” (2015, p. 65). According to Gutfreund, “this idealized image of a Spanish fantasy past was a conscious creation by Anglos - an image that southern Californians have continually developed and reshaped since the first bucolic mission paintings by William Keith and Edward Deakin in the 1870s and the popular novel *Ramona* by Helen Hunt Jackson in 1884” (2015, p. 163). Historian Michelle Lorimer notes that “Jackson viewed the missions as a protective force in the lives of Native peoples” and “viewed the Franciscan priests with great reverence” (Lorimer, 2016, p. 38). Lorimer states that “Euro-Americans adopted California’s Spanish history for themselves through *Ramona* - marking the beginning of a relatable “American” history in the region that tended to silence Native experiences” (Lorimer, 2016, p. 39). Jackson’s “poetic description of California’s landscape” also created an exodus of Euro-American settlers following Helen Hunt Jackson’s death in 1885 (Lorimer, 2016, p. 39).

According to Lorimer, “the glorification of *Ramona* did not end at the turn of the twentieth century” (2016, p. 40). Garnet Holme adapted *Ramona* into a play, promoted by “the Automobile Club of Southern California, *Los Angeles Times*, Motor Transit Company, and Pacific Electric Railway Company... in the 1920s and early 1930s” (2016, p. 40). Other media and plays glorified the mission era and boosted the myth of a romantic Spanish past. John McGroarty, a poet and writer at the *Los Angeles Times*, “published a comprehensive history of California entitled *California: Its History and Romance*” which “compared Spanish culture in the Southwest

to the romance of the founding of the United States, noting that ‘her tiled rooftrees and Christian shrines received the salutes of the booming tides before the Declaration of Independence was signed...’” (Lorimer, 2016, p. 47) Another promoter of the Spanish fantasy past was Frank A. Miller, “of the famous Mission Inn in Riverside, California,” a city-block long hotel designed in Spanish mission style that demonstrates the dedication that boosters had to use “newspapers, literature, poetry, theater arts, and architecture as venues to popularize early California history at the local and national levels” (Lorimer, 2016, p. 48). These regional boosters of myth “amplified the European components of California’s early history in popular depictions of the period and contributed to unhistorical representation of the past in California” (Lorimer, 2016, p. 51).

Past and Current Efforts to Reform Inaccuracy in State-Sponsored History Curriculum

This [mission] story has done more damage to California Indians than any conquistador, any priest, any *soldado de cuera* (leather-jacket soldier), any smallpox, measles, or influenza virus. This story has not just killed us, it has taught us how to kill ourselves and kill each other with alcohol, domestic violence, horizontal racism, internalized hatred.

-Deborah Miranda
Bad Indian (2013, p. xix)

Even though “Historians of California Indian history, many teachers, and the state’s former governor, Jerry Brown, determined that the violence and deprivation [committed against Indigenous people] must be called genocidal,” California’s history curriculum contains no trace of this (Schneider et. al, 2019, p. 64). Activists and Indigenous scholars have been documenting these inaccuracies and fighting the lies within California’s history curriculum for decades (Schneider et. al, 2019; Gutfreund, 2010; Trafzer and Lorimer, 2014; Keenan, 2019; Keenan, 2018; Keenan, 2021; Lindsay, 2012). Zevi Gutfreund, Associate Professor of History at Louisiana State University, details early efforts at curriculum reform in the 1960s and 1970s in his article “Standing Up to Sugar Cubes: The Contest over Ethnic Identity in California’s Fourth Grade Mission Curriculum” (Gutfreund, 2010, p. 163). Rupert Costo and Jeanette Henry Costo played key roles in these efforts.

Rupert Costo (Cahuilla) and his wife Jeanette Henry Costo (Cherokee), founders of American Indian Historical Society (AIHS) in 1964, were two prominent activists fighting for the reform of Indigenous representation within California's fourth grade curriculum (Gutfreund, 2010, p. 165). Rupert Costo, formerly a semi-professional baseball player, established himself as a "civil engineer and Cahuilla spokesman" before committing to "integrated education" (Gutfreund, 2010, p. 171). In the 1950s, the Costos "lobbied for the University of California to establish a campus in Riverside, because, according to a fellow founder, he 'appreciated what education could do to remove the barriers of race and place'" (Gutfreund, 2010, p. 171). In 1965, the AIHS staged "the first public protest of California history textbooks" (Gutfreund, 2010, p. 164), and in the same year Rupert Costo accepted an "appointment as chairman of the state's Indian History Study Committee" from California's new conservative republican superintendent of public instruction, Maxwell Rafferty (Gutfreund, 2010, p. 171).

While Rafferty initially made some moves offering hope for curricular reform, such as appointing Costo, these moves conveniently aligned with the election cycle (Gutfreund, 2010, p. 171). Rafferty ultimately dismissed "all requests for textbook revision from the Indian History Study Committee" (Gutfreund, 2010, p. 174). According to Gutfreund, "In 1962, after two decades of white flight to the suburbs, California's middle-class Anglos embraced Max Rafferty... and his romantic version of the Spanish missions as the cornerstone of his promise to restore traditional values to the classroom" (2010, p. 163-164). Gutfreund asserts that "Rafferty's election gave Republicans a powerful voice in state education and may have induced John Caughey to include the traditional view of the Spanish fantasy past in his 1965 textbook" (2010, p. 169). Rafferty "relied on cold war rhetoric" and "defended the romantic mission stories that publishers loved to print" (Gutfreund, 2010, p. 165). According to Gutfreund, "His [Rafferty's] new office gave him the power to appoint like-minded Californians to the Curriculum

Commission charged with compiling the list of textbooks for the state Board of Education to consider” (2010, p. 166).

Gutfreund states that “After three years of submitting detailed reviews to the state Board of Education and sending requests for revisions to publishing companies, the Costos lost their earlier optimism in the Indian History Study Committee” (2010, p. 166). They eventually gave up on getting through to Rafferty and published their own curriculum and accompanying activities instead (Gutfreund, 2010, p. 178). Despite opposition and lack of cooperation from the CA Department of Education, the Costos’ legacy of “initiating and sustaining venues for California Indian voice” lives on through contributions such as “the *Indian Historian Press*, American Indian Historical Society, Costo Library of the American Indian and Costo Archive, and Costo Chair of American Affairs at the University of California, Riverside” (Schneider et al., 2019, p. 67).

Jack Norton, a Hupa/Cherokee “emeritus professor of Native American Studies at Humboldt State University and author of *Genocide in Northwestern California, When Our Worlds Cried* (1979), was the first California Indian to be appointed to the Rupert Costo Chair in American Indian Affairs at University of California, Riverside” (Schneider et al., 2019, p. 67). Norton and other scholar-activists led efforts through “the 1970s and 1980s to change the California state curriculum framework and standards and to present more inclusive and collaborative histories” (Schneider et al., 2019, p. 68). Jack Norton, along with other scholar-activists like UCR history professor and Rupert Costo Chair in American History Affairs Clifford Trafzer, participated in efforts to reform California’s framework and standards which resulted in Assembly Bill 1273 in 1985, “requir(ing) the development of a model curriculum” that portrayed a more honest picture of the European colonization of Indigenous people (Schneider et al., 2019, p. 68). Jack Norton wrote the model curriculum, “but the California State Department’s

Board of Education did not publish it or fund its dissemination, rendering the efforts moot and the celebration short-lived” (Schneider et al., 2019, p. 68). Norton, like the Costos, decided to self-publish the curriculum, as “If The Truth Be Told: Revising California History as a Moral Objective” (2013).

Modern efforts at curricular reform have faced similar roadblocks. Trafzer and Lorimer note that for-profit “textbook publishers would lose sales if they presented the [Indigenous] genocide” (Trafzer and Lorimer, 2014, p. 80). States like California and Texas have a huge market, meaning that conservative publishers will exclude genocide to increase their sales (Trafzer and Lorimer, 2014, p. 68). Trafzer and Lorimer further state:

Some program authors, including internationally acclaimed scholars, have knowledge of genocide against California Indians, and many historians listed as textbook consultants, including Clifford Trafzer and others, know of the genocide. But publishers will not allow the word genocide or any deep discussion of genocide within the pages of any school text and know that review committees within the states and school districts would never approve a text addressing the genocide of Native Americans. To do so would harm the companies economically and brand them un-American” (2014, p. 68).

The California Indian History Curriculum Coalition (CIHCC) is a modern group of activists, scholars, and educators “whose primary focus is to promote California Indian-vetted curriculum and resources for immediate adoption” (Schneider et al., 2019, p. 59). CIHCC members acknowledge that “Over the years, efforts to integrate California Indian perspectives in the curriculum have met with limited success,” (Schneider et al., 2019, p. 68) but it is still worthwhile to acknowledge the successes that have come from “decades of state-wide activism by California Indians and allies in politics and education” (Schneider et al, 2019, p. 60). In 2016, the work of CIHCC and other activists fueled some revisions within the framework (Schneider et al., 2019, p. 60). It now recommends (albeit in a non-mandatory fashion) against overtly problematic projects such as constructing a romanticized mission model, acknowledging that “building missions from sugar cubes or popsicle sticks does not help students understand the

period and is offensive to many” (CA Dept. of Education, 2016, p. 76). Still, some scholars criticize the lack of elaboration and strength to these new recommendations (Schneider et al., 2019; Keenan, 2021). In “More Than Missions,” the researchers note that the 2016 CA HSS Framework recommends “all California students have access to carefully designed, research-based instructional materials” (Schneider et al, 2019; CA Dept. of Education, 2016, p. 3). The article also mentions that the framework itself recommends “discontinu[ing] practices that promote a false narrative,” (Schneider et al., 2019, p. 69) quoting the below excerpt:

...Students should have access to multiple sources that identify and help children understand the lives of different groups of people who lived in and around missions, so that students can place them in a comparative context. Missions were sites of conflict, conquest, and forced labor (CA Dept. of Education, 2016, p. 97)

The CIHCC and other activists have fought to get language such as this included in the 2016 CA HSS Framework. While activists and scholars have referenced the framework and worked to successfully change portions of the framework, I did not find any scholarly analysis focused specifically on the portrayal of Indigenous Genocide within the current 2016 CA HSS Framework. I build on the research by demonstrating that this most recent 2016 CA HSS Framework still contains problematic and inaccurate language far removed from current research’s understanding of the relationship between Indigenous people and Spanish, Mexican, and American colonizers. Below, I use the lens of Tribal Critical Race Theory to unpack these problematic passages.

Theoretical Framework

Counterstories are a mixture of evidence and imagination, the combination of which is designed to spur people to act, to strike an emotional chord and to inspire educators to sketch a new society rather than paint themselves into a corner.

-Zeus Leonardo

The Story of Schooling: Critical Race Theory and the Educational Racial Contract (2013, p. 605)

Critical Race Theory

Tribal Critical Race Theory (TribalCrit) emerged as an offshoot of Critical Race Theory (CRT). As such, a brief summary of the theoretical framework of CRT provides a useful foundation for understanding TribalCrit. CRT is rooted in Critical Legal Studies (CLS), a legal framework designed to examine how racism is weaved into every facet of our legal system (Ladson-Billings, 1998; Brayboy, 2005). While scholars have offered varying definitions and explanations of CRT, they include these five tenets: racism is an ordinary feature of society; dominant ideologies are inherently racist and must be challenged; race is socially constructed, and provides tangible material benefits to those who are labeled as white; storytelling and counter-storytelling are powerful tools that can challenge the dominant ideology; and finally, intersectionality, which acknowledges that every individual is experiencing overlapping and intersecting obstacles including race, gender, religion, socioeconomic status, and political identity (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001; Ladson-Billings, 1998; Brayboy, 2005). While CRT on its own is a powerful theoretical framework, Brayboy asserts that “it does not address the specific needs of tribal peoples because it does not address American Indians’ liminality as both legal/political and racialized beings or the experience of colonization” (Brayboy, 2005, p. 428-429). For this reason, I utilize the theoretical framework of TribalCrit to more narrowly address issues unique to the Indigenous community.

Tribal Critical Race Theory (TribalCrit)

Bryan McKinley Jones Brayboy, an Indigenous scholar, introduced TribalCrit after acknowledging that “CRT was originally developed to address the Civil Rights issues of African American people” (Brayboy, 2005, p. 429) and therefore has some limitations in fully addressing Indigenous issues. Brayboy replaces the primary tenet of CRT, that racism is endemic and ordinary in society, with a new primary tenet specific to TribalCrit: “colonization is endemic to

society” (Brayboy, 2005, p. 429). Brayboy introduces 8 additional tenets of TribalCrit to this primary tenet: imperialism, greed, and white supremacy drive US policies toward Indigenous people; Indigenous identities have been racialized and politicized; Indigenous people have a desire for Tribal sovereignty and autonomy; an Indigenous lens provides new insights into issues of power, culture, and knowledge; government policies and education policies surrounding Indigenous people have had (and continue to have) the overt goal of assimilation; the perspectives, practices, traditions, beliefs, and customs of Indigenous people must be acknowledged to understand their lived reality; stories cannot be separated from theory, and are therefore legitimate sources of data; and finally, theory and practice have deep, inseparable connections (Brayboy, 2005, p. 429-430).

I utilized all of TribalCrit’s tenets as I examined the framework, but applied the eighth tenet most strongly: “Stories are not separate from theory; they make up theory and are, therefore, real and legitimate sources of data and ways of being” (Brayboy, 2005, p. 430). The counterstories that I found during my research, which had been patiently and meticulously gathered by Indigenous scholars, authors, and storytellers, provided the light that illuminated the inaccuracies within the 2016 CA HSS Framework.

Positionality

I am a white bisexual pagan woman who was raised as an Evangelical Christian. My ancestors were Italian, Ashkenazi Jewish, Spanish, Irish, and Scottish. My ancestry is a tangled web that tells many stories of colonialism (creating it, upholding it, fleeing it, benefiting from it) simultaneously. My European ancestors have a long history of obsession with empire, religion, power, domination, patriarchy, and genocide. The Crusades (which displaced my Ashkenazi Jewish ancestors), the Inquisition, and the Indigenous Genocide of North America (among countless other devastating atrocities) all contain the lethal combination of Christian faith and the

wealth and power of empire. The loss of life and culture that unfolded from the violent Crusades, baseless witch burnings, false Inquisition hearings, and other religiously-fueled terror is not lost on me.

I acknowledge my privilege as a white person, and I understand that these are the sins of my ancestral line. I know that white people today, myself included, are allowing white supremacy to remain deeply embedded in all facets of American society through inaction, silence, and apathy. As a white elementary educator, I find myself continually unraveling and reknitting my own misconceptions surrounding US history and geography. I understand that I have found myself residing on the land of the Cahuilla and Maara'yam people, and studying on the land of Cahuilla, Tongva, Luiseño, and Serrano people. I am grateful to this land for nurturing me to adulthood, but am simultaneously aware that I never had permission to occupy it. I owe a significant debt to the rightful stewards of these lands. I feel an obligation to my own ancestors as well, to be an active participant in the abolishment of the harmful power structures they have erected.

In his concluding paragraphs, Chris Mato Nunpa says: "As you can see, what ought to be done is relatively straightforward and simple and obvious. Euro-American society needs to engage in truth-telling, and to work for justice, particularly economic justice, and to begin to work on developing respect for those who are not white folk, who are dark skinned, and perhaps wear their hair long, speak other languages, or have different religions" (2020, p. 173). I feel that lending my scholarship to these truth-telling efforts is a straightforward and simple and obvious response to my growing understanding of the immense loss and tragedy that Anglo-European culture has imposed upon, and continues to impose upon, Indigenous people.

Methods

I began this qualitative document analysis of the 2016 CA HSS Framework by reading and re-reading the entirety of its contents in search of the story it tells about Indigenous people in California. I then gathered and indexed passages that felt relevant to my research questions. As I saw patterns emerging, I used keywords such as Serra, Portolá, genocide, California Indian, native, enslave, gold rush, mission, and other relevant keywords related to my research questions, to search the framework for pertinent passages. I compared the content of these passages to the history presented by the scholars included in my literature review. I found that stories which emerged from my literature review differed considerably from the stories told within the 2016 CA HSS Framework. Viewing the 2016 CA HSS Framework through the lens of Tribal Critical Race Theory, I took note of what was – and was not-- mentioned. Using my indexed passages as a guide, I organized my analysis into four distinct sections. First, I address the framework's refusal to name Indigenous Genocide. Second, I analyze passages within the framework that glorify the colonizers and captors of the mission era. Third, I address the framework's inaccurate representation of the Gold Rush era and its toxic effect on Indigenous communities. Finally, I discuss the framework's muted and minimal representation of Indigenous resistance.

Findings and Analysis

Bold-Faced Denial of Indigenous Genocide within the 2016 CA HSS Framework

Indeed the genocide is still ongoing if one concedes that its suppression, its silencing in mainstream U.S. history indicates complicity across time and space.

-Brendan Lindsay

Murder State: California's Native American Genocide, 1846–1873 (2012, p. 23)

The 2016 CA HSS Framework only uses “genocide” 20 times. It defines genocide as “...the systematic killing of members of an ethnic or religious group” (CA Department of Education, p. 355). The brutal colonization and attempted extermination of Indigenous people

that occurred on the North American continent plainly fits this definition, yet the 842-page framework never uses it in relation to Indigenous people.

Figure 1.1:

Specific Genocide discussed	# of times the word genocide used	Page numbers of mentions
Indigenous	0	
Armenian	10	343, 344, 344, 344, 344, 344, 344, 344, 344, 364, 732
German	5	354, 355, 364, 365, 646
Other (Darfur, Rwanda, Cambodia, etc.)	2	364, 759
Genocide broadly (preventing genocide, sensitivity to genocide)	3	364, 365, 453

Not naming Indigenous Genocide is in and of itself disturbing, and demonstrates Trafzer and Lorimer’s assertion that “publishers, politicians, and officials of the California state Department of Education do not want to disclose the historical reality of Indian genocide” (Trafzer and Lorimer, 2014, p. 67). Further the framework explicitly states that no genocide occurred during the sixteenth through nineteenth centuries, implying that only other countries commit genocide. One passage reads:

In the sixteenth century, the Indian population in the Americas dropped catastrophically primarily due to contact with people from Eurasia and Africa who introduced infectious diseases previously unknown in the Western Hemisphere and employed weapons and means of transportation previously unknown in the Americas in patterns of conquest and settlement. In the twentieth century, wars, revolutions, genocides, epidemics, and famines carried off tens of millions of people. None of those disasters, however, offset the accelerating population of recent centuries (California Department of Education, p. 646).

This passage hastily explains away Indigenous Genocide. While it does mention a catastrophic population decrease, it is tucked away with a blanket of excuses. It describes the brutal and systematically orchestrated theft of Indigenous land and enslavement of Indigenous people as “patterns of conquest and settlement,” and the loss of a massive number of Indigenous

people as an unintentional byproduct caused accidentally by disease and the fortune of having more advanced weapons. Phrasing the population decrease passively buries the perpetrators. Naming “people from Eurasia and Africa” as the cause of this decrease further hides the genocidal Anglo-Europeans within the entire eastern hemisphere, and positions those from Eurasia and Africa as equal protagonists in the genocide, obscuring how Africans got here as slaves.

Another passage within the framework states: “Students should understand that genocide is a phenomenon that has continued throughout the twentieth and into the twenty-first century” (CA Dept. of Education, 2016, p. 364), but never mentions the Indigenous Genocide as part of this phenomenon. The framework incorrectly names the Armenian Genocide of 1915 as the first notable genocide to occur in human history, although historians note that genocide occurred as early as the destruction of Carthage in 146 BC (Kiernan, 2004, p. 27), and in doing so asserts multiple times over that previous centuries contain no genocide (CA Dept. of Education, 2016, p. 364, 646, and 344). This direct misinformation exemplifies “ritual avoidance,” which Harper Keenan coined to signify “a repeated social practice that relies on the designed obscuring of known information that would threaten a narrative central to the identity of a dominant group” (Keenan, 2021, p. 110). Historian David Stannard, in *American Holocaust, the Conquest of the New World*, noted that:

...by focusing almost entirely on disease, by displacing responsibility for the mass killing onto an army of invading microbes, contemporary authors increasingly have created the impression that the eradication of those tens of millions of people was inadvertent—a sad, but both inevitable and “unintended consequence” of human migration and progress... In fact, however, the near-total destruction of the Western Hemisphere’s native people was neither inadvertent nor inevitable (Smith, 2017, p. 9).

By claiming that “genocide is a phenomenon that has continued throughout the twentieth and into the twenty-first century...” (CA Dept. of Education, 2016, p. 364) the framework insinuates that genocide did not occur during the centuries of United States’ formation. Instead, it attempts to frame the United States as a concerned outside party, ready to stop genocide when it happens abroad: “Students may examine the reactions of other governments, including that of the United States, and world opinion during and after the Armenian Genocide” (CA Dept. of Education, 2016, p. 344). The framework asks that 10th grade teachers discuss “the profound effect the Armenian Genocide had on the American public,” such as how the Red Cross’s first international aid mission was to help its survivors, but says nothing about teaching lessons on the long-lasting devastation and lingering societal injustice stemming from the Indigenous Genocide in North America (CA Department of Education, 2016, p. 344).

The framework also states that students “should examine the effects of the genocide on the remaining Armenian people, who were deprived of their historic homeland, and the ways in which it became a prototype of subsequent genocides” (CA Dept. of Education, 2016, p. 344). This passage hints that Hitler modeled his genocidal actions after the Armenian Genocide, but fails to mention “how Hitler and the Nazis studied American laws, were unquestionably influenced by American precedents, and relied on these American examples as justifications for Germany’s enactment of similar measures” (Miller, 2021, p. 752). Legal scholars suggest that they’ve identified “at least three instances in which American law [toward Indigenous people] was too harsh even for Nazis to adopt” (Miller, 2021, p. 752), and assert that “United States federal and state laws and policies regarding Indians and Indian nations influenced Hitler and Nazi officials in formulating and enacting Nazi race laws” (Miller, 2021, p. 751-752). Keenan argues that “this kind of curricular avoidance risks foreclosing opportunities to engage with authentic historical inquiry, as well as pressing questions about the continued structures of

colonialism today” (2019, p. 21). Brayboy, in contrast, urges “naming colonization as a persistent problem,” and says that “TribalCrit seeks to begin moving toward constructing measures to directly confront and dampen the effects of colonization” (Brayboy, 2013, p. 93).

The 2016 CA HSS Framework Glorifies and Centers Mission Era European Colonizers

The stories of Junipero Serra, Juan Crespi, Juan Bautista de Anza, Gaspar de Portolá, and Juan Cabrillo are told as part of this narrative. Students learn about the presence of African and Filipino explorers and soldiers in the earliest Spanish expeditions by sea and land. The participation of Spaniards, Mexicans, Indians from northern Mexico, and Africans in the founding of the Alta California settlements are also noted (California Department of Education, 2016, p. 73).

The CA HSS Framework clearly states that teachers should tell the stories of the five prominent colonizers above, thereby “rationaliz[ing] and legitimiz[ing] their [white settlers] decisions to steal lands from the Indigenous peoples who already inhabited them” (Brayboy, 2005, p. 431). The HHS Framework uses neutral language, describing the “participation” of many ethnicities in California’s founding. In reality, the 1542 arrival of Spanish sailor Juan Rodríguez Cabrillo to the land of the Kumeyaay people (now known as San Diego) sent out a ripple of carnage which reverberates to this day (Lorimer, 2016, p. 4). Cabrillo was one of many European colonizers following the call of recent Papal bulls (edicts given by the pope) which asserted that Spain had a rightful claim to steal the land, freedom, and labor of any non-Christian people (Lorimer, 2016; Nunpa, 2020; Castillo, 2015; Deloria Jr., 2003). The late Indigenous author and historian Vine Deloria Jr. asserts that one of these Papal bulls, Pope Alexander VI’s *Inter Caetera* on May 4th, 1493, “laid down the basic Christian attitude toward the New World” (2003, p. 258).

Part of the *Inter Caetera* reads:

Among other works well pleasing to the Divine Majesty and cherished of our heart, this assuredly ranks highest, that in our times especially the Catholic faith and the Christian religion be exalted and everywhere increased and spread, that the health of souls be cared for and that barbarous nations be overthrown and brought to the faith itself.

-Pope Alexander VI, *Inter Caetera*, May 4th, 1493 (Deloria Jr., 2003, p. 258)

Papal bulls issued for both Portugal (*Romanus Pontifex*) and Spain (*Inter Caetera*) created a bit of an issue for these early colonizers. Apparently, God had double-booked permission for global domination. On June 7th, 1494, the Treaty of Tordesillas aimed to remedy this divine dispute by promising all non-Christianized land “370 leagues west of the Cape Verde Islands” to Spain, and all land east to Portugal (Nunpa, 2020, p. 45). At that moment, the land of all non-Christian Indigenous peoples on all continents was pledged to European colonizers, with all but a small sliver of what we now know as North and South America going to Spain. According to Nunpa the Papal bulls “helped establish the basis for white supremacy and racism in the Western Hemisphere,” (2020, p. 49) and justified the “genocide of the Indigenous Peoples of the Americas, imposing/forcing Christianity upon them, making war upon them, terrorizing them, and enslaving them” (Nunpa, 2020, p. 45).

The Papal bulls began shortly after the birth of *La Santísima Inquisición*, The "Most Holy" Inquisition. Spain's King Fernando and Queen Isabella had just successfully conquered the Moors in their region, but remained paranoid about them returning to destroy their monarchy (Castillo, 2015, p. 29). Fernando and Isabella demanded that all residents of Spain convert to Catholicism, prompting many non-Catholics to flee, and they also ordered all Moorish and Jewish libraries destroyed (Castillo, 2015, p. 30). According to UC Riverside Historian Steven Hackel, who has studied Indigenous responses to colonization, the royals dominated their territory by forming what is known as *municipios* (townships), legally obligating an area's population to live only within a community established by the crown (Hackel, 2005, p. 229-230). Royal governance would forcefully integrate their victims into the economic and religious order established by the royals. King Fernando and Queen Isabella continued this policy of forced *congregación* as they asserted their dominance over “New Spain's” Indigenous communities (Hackel, 2005, p. 230).

Over two centuries later in 1750, a fanatical friar named Junípero Serra convinced the Spanish Inquisition that a region named Cerro Gordo, now known as Mexico, desperately needed an inquisitor due to the presence of *maleficas* (witches) (Castillo, 2015, p. 61). Serra had significant involvement in a case there against a woman named Maria Pasquala de Nava, accused of murdering another woman and then further accused by Serra of being a witch. Convicted of being a witch after a yearlong trial, she then “died suddenly” inside Mexico City’s Inquisition building (Castillo, 2015, p. 62). In 1767, the Spanish took over several abandoned Jesuit missions of Baja California, seeking Serra to carry out this task. While inspecting the Jesuit missions in Baja California, Serra and Spanish Visitor General Don José de Gálvez planned the settlement of the region (Castillo, 2015, p. 66). Previous missions in the region had allowed Indigenous people to work on their own land as long as they attended daily masses, but Junípero Serra planned to force Indigenous people to live and work at the mission, keeping unmarried women strictly apart to “protect” them from sin. Serra’s obsession with forcefully converting Indigenous people to Christianity led him to envision a large and powerful series of mission settlements, and Serra would go to any length to achieve his goal (Castillo, 2015, p. 74-75). Junípero Serra played a significant role in the establishment the Spanish missions, which remain permanent fixtures of the California coast, as sites of torture, oppression, slavery, and genocide (Nunpa, 2020; Miranda, 2013; Castillo, 2015; Lorimer, 2016). Yet, regarding Junipero Serra, the 2016 CA HSS Framework simply reads:

Under the guidance of Fray Junipero Serra, 54,000 Indians became baptized at the missions where they spent anywhere from two to fifty weeks each year, laboring to sustain the missions (California Department of Education, 2016, p. 75).

“Guidance” here goes beyond neutral language and ventures into the territory of blatant academic dishonesty. Serra enacted a systematic plan to enslave Indigenous people on mission compounds (Castillo, 2015, p. 76), treating them “worse than slaves” (Castillo, 2015, p. 80),

according to Spanish California governor Felipe de Neve [1779]. Neve petitioned for the Indigenous people to have elected officials and the right to be released after 10 years of education. But Serra simply rigged the elections, hid the ruling regarding the 10 year maximum education period from the Indigenous people, and extended the lifelong enslavement of indigenous people another two generations. (Castillo, 2015, p. 80-81). The framework acknowledges a large loss of life during the mission era, but continues to neutralize this systematic genocide in its language:

The death rate was extremely high; during the mission period, the Indian population plummeted from 72,000 to 18,000. This high death rate was due primarily to the introduction of diseases for which the native population did not have immunity, as well as the hardships of forced labor and separation from traditional ways of life” (CA Dept of Education, 2016, p. 75).

This passage blames these high death rates on disease, and does not name any specific individuals or groups of individuals as responsible for these high death rates at the missions. The framework mentions forced labor, but does not name the padres as the force behind this enslavement. In reality, Spanish padres like Serra created unhealthy, unsanitary, and unnatural conditions at the missions that directly caused a high number of Indigenous deaths. Elias Castillo summarizes Serra’s actions this way:

The diminutive friar’s fanatical zeal to serve the Christian God would lead him to establish a policy of packing each mission with as many Native Americans as he could, heedless of the quality of life within those compounds. For the sake of possibly saving their souls, his actions most certainly did make material life difficult and often miserable for the Indians, through the forced daily attendance of mass, the separation of boys and men from girls and unmarried women, and the severe punishment meted out to those who violated mission rules and restrictions (Castillo, 2015, p. 75).

Serra had an explicit goal of “harvesting” as many pagan souls as possible (Castillo, 2015, p. 74). The nine missions which Serra erected with the stolen labor of Indigenous people, along with the twelve subsequent Spanish missions founded using the same model, stole the freedom of generations of Indigenous people, forcing them and their descendants to live and die

on the mission compound (Castillo, 2015, p. 77). Spanish missionaries crafted a daily routine for Indigenous people explicitly to assimilate them into European culture and hierarchies of power and domination. The padres classified all baptized Indigenous people as neofitos, or neophytes, meaning that padres “held complete temporal control over Native peoples as childlike wards, leading indigenous converts both spiritually and in their duties as laborers” (Lorimer, 2016, p. 21). Adults and children alike were indoctrinated in part through the memorization of simplistic catechisms (summaries of Christian principles), the Ten Commandments, or common prayers (Hackel, 2005, p. 146). Hackel states that “to Serra, the indoctrination of adults through their own children seemed as natural as a babe suckling milk from a mother’s breast.” (2005, p. 144).

Deborah Miranda describes the mission system artfully as a:

Massive Conversion Factory centered around a furnace constructed of flesh, bones, blood, grief, and pristine land and watersheds, and dependent on a continuing fresh supply of human beings, specifically Indian, which were in increasingly short supply. Run by a well-meaning European religious order (see PADRE) convinced that they were doing the work of their Supreme Deity, aka God, a mission was meant to suck in Indigenous peoples (see NEOFITO), strip them of religion, language, and culture, and melt them down into generic workers instilled with Catholicism, Spanish values, and freshly overhauled, tuned-up souls (Miranda, 2013, p. 16).

Serra employed a model of colonial control “with the intention of converting California Indians to Spanish subjects through cultural erasure” (Keenan, 2019, p. 12). The missions were not, as the above quote from the framework suggests, a place where Indigenous people willingly chose to spend their time from “two to fifty weeks each year” (CA Dept. of Education, 2016, p. 75). The padres were, as UCLA PhD candidate Stephanie Lumsden articulated at UCR’s “Still Bad Indians” Symposium, the first police and wardens of the carceral state in what is now known as California (Lumsden, 2022). Brute force, manipulation and fear fueled the Indigenous “laboring to sustain the missions” CA Department of Education, 2016, p. 75).

Colonizers Centered and Indigenous Genocide Absent Within the Framework's Gold Rush

Era Content

We desire only a white population in California, even the Indians amongst us, as far as we have seen, are more of a nuisance than a benefit to the country; we would like to get rid of them.

-B.R. Buckelyew

From the newspaper The Californian, published March 1848 (Madley, 2016, p. 66)

On July 7th, 1846, the U.S. military seized California from Mexico. This change of hands ushered in the Indigenous Genocide's "most pervasive physical form" (Lindsay, 2012, p. 271). In 1848, gold nuggets were unearthed in California. The framework describes it like so:

Unfortunately for Mexico, just as the war was ending, James Marshall discovered a little nugget of gold in California. Students study how the discovery of gold spread throughout the world and affected the multicultural aspects of California's population. Students can compare the long overland route over dangerous terrain to the faster sea route, either via Panama or around Cape Horn" (CA Dept. of Education, 2016, p. 78)

The framework fails to mention unsavory aspects of the Gold Rush era. It does not mention that it was a group of Indigenous people, including Maidu and Nissinan individuals, who guided James Marshall to Maidu territory where his sawmill for John Sutter was built. The framework mentions that "John A. Sutter... acquired land grants from the Mexican government..." (CA Dept. of Education, 2016, p. 77), but leaves out that firsthand accounts from the era assert that John Sutter kept enslaved Indigenous women and underage girls for his own personal harem, and also enslaved Indigenous men and women for labor. According to Sutter's employee, Heinrich Leinhard, at least one of these rapes of an underage Indigenous girl caused her death (Hurtado, 2006, p. 115-116). The framework also fails to mention that Indigenous people were the ones to initially find gold nuggets at the sawmill and present them to James Marshall, even as Marshall's own firsthand accounts acknowledged their role in the gold's discovery (Trafzer, 1999; Trafzer and Lorimer, 2014). While the above passage neutrally describes California's changing cultural aspects, it neglects to mention that US citizens and their

lust for gold perpetuated the Indigenous Genocide of an estimated 70,000-120,000 people over the 20 years between 1848 and 1868 (Trafzer and Lorimer, 2014, p. 71). The framework instead tells the story this way:

Another clear example of conflict during the Gold Rush era and early statehood was the loss of property and autonomy for many of the state's earlier Mexican and Indian residents. Great violence was perpetrated against many Indian groups who occupied land or resources that new settlers desired. Additional harm came by way of the Indian Indenture Act of 1850, which forced many Indians—mostly Indian youths—into servitude for landowners (CA Dept of Education, 2016, p. 80).

This section mentions Indigenous Genocide in a strangely muted fashion. It places genocidal acts (great violence, additional harm) on opposing ends of the sentence from the alluded antagonists (new settlers, landowners). It does not specifically say who perpetrated the violence, only that settlers' covetousness caused it. It does not specify who caused additional harm, only that it happened to benefit landowners. The use of a passive voice in this description protects the reputation of the US government and US citizens who committed emboldened acts of genocide against Indigenous people. The US government sanctioned the murder of Indigenous parents, and the kidnapping and enslavement of their children. Castillo summarizes the aforementioned Indian Indenture Act, formally called the Act for Government and Protection of Indians, less passively:

The kidnapping of Indian children was being committed under a legal loophole of a California law - the Act for Government and Protection of Indians - which had been passed in 1850 and amended in 1860. It allowed children to be taken from their Indian parents for training as "apprentices" so long as the parents consented. It was, in reality, a license for kidnappers to first kill the parents, seize their children, and then claim to have obtained parental consent. No one questioned them (2015, p. 199).

While the U.S. government signed a series of treaties in the 1850s promising land to Indigenous people, the greed of the California Gold Rush wiped those promises from memory. Senator John Weller, who later became the governor of California, argued against ratifying the treaties to his colleagues in 1852, saying, "[the commissioners] knew that those reservations

included mineral lands and that, just as soon as it became more profitable to dig upon the reservation than elsewhere, the American man would go there, and the whole army of the United States could not expel the intruders” (Lindsay, 2012, p. 275). Deloria Jr. describes the violent fallout:

The miners embarked on a program of systematic genocide against the Indians of California, going so far as to have Sunday ‘shoots’ in which bands of whites would attack Indian villages killing as many people as they could. Tribes were massacred to prevent them from holding their lands intact and out of reach of the gold-crazed miners (Deloria Jr., 2003, p. 2).

In 1853, a group of Tolowa people gathered at a Northern California village named Yontocket. They had stored their food sources for winter and gathered for a sacred ceremony of prayer and song. White citizens surrounded their village and murdered the men, women, and children there indiscriminately. A Tolowa man relayed the story to Indigenous scholar Jack Norton with great sadness:

The whites attacked and the bullets were everywhere. Over 450 of our people were murdered or lay dying on the ground. Then the white men built a huge fire and threw in our sacred ceremonial dresses, the regalia, and our feathers, and the flames grew higher. Then they threw in the babies, many of them were still alive. Some tied weights around the necks of the dead and threw them into the nearby water. Two men escaped, they had been in the sacred sweathouse and crept down to the water’s edge and hid under the lily pads, breathing through the reeds. The next morning they found the water red with blood of their people (Norton, 2013, p. 84).

In this account, armed US citizens interrupted a sacred ceremony with senseless massacre and violence. They burned infants alive without remorse. The 2016 CA HSS Framework, in contrast, does not offer even a single story from the era told from an Indigenous perspective. Instead, the framework offers suggestions like this for instruction on the Gold Rush era:

To bring this [Gold Rush] period to life, students can sing the songs and read the literature of the day, including newspapers. They may dramatize a day in the goldfields and compare the life and fortunes of a gold miner with those of traders in the gold towns and merchants in San Francisco (CA Dept. of Education, 2016, p. 79)

Perhaps the fourth grade children can act out a “Sunday shoot,” where miners

indiscriminately shot and murdered Indigenous people for genocidal purposes (Deloria Jr., 2003).

They might read a newspaper article describing the era such as this one from the *San Francisco Bulletin* mentioned by Trafzer and Hyer:

According to the San Francisco Bulletin, "bands of white men, armed with hatchets ... [,] fell on the women and children, and deliberately slaughtered them, one and all." One witness to these atrocities counted twenty-six bodies of women and children in one camp. The Bulletin discussed the victims of this mindless assault. "Some of them were infants at the breast:" one editor wrote, "whose skulls had been cleft again and again" (1999, p. 29).

Jack Norton shares another newspaper article that students might use to bring this period to life:

Earlier, the Yreka Herald newspaper made its position unequivocally clear: Now that general hostilities against the Indians have commenced we hope that the government will render such aid as will enable the citizens of the north to carry on a war of extermination until the last Redskin of these tribes has been killed. Extermination is no longer a question of time—the time has arrived, the work has commenced, and let the first man that says treaty or peace be regarded as a traitor (August 7, 1853) (2013, p. 93).

The most recent framework acknowledges the problematic nature of projects like constructing a mission model, yet continues to encourage joyful re-enactment of the genocidal Gold Rush era. Gold miners did not discover gold; they stole Indigenous land to acquire gold. The US government was wholly complicit in the systematic genocide of Indigenous people during the Gold Rush era, but you won't learn that from the framework.

The CA HSS Framework Minimizes and Generalizes Indigenous Resistance

Students can use the stories of individual explorers and settlers to connect to broader historical questions and themes such as the following ones: Why did Europeans come to California? What was the region like when they arrived? and How did they change it? In mapping the routes and settlements of these diverse explorers, students observe that access to California was difficult because of the physical barriers of mountains, deserts, and ocean currents and the closing of land routes by Indians defending their territories from foreigners (CA Dept. of Education, 2016, p. 73).

This passage contains one of only a handful of sentences in the framework's fourth grade curricular recommendations that discusses Indigenous resistance. It describes this resistance simply as a difficulty and a barrier to accessing California. The framework recommends here that educators tell the stories of individual settlers and explorers, but offers no recommendations for

telling the stories of Indigenous individuals resisting hostile and cruel colonizers. This excerpt presents the rebellion of Indigenous communities as side note, a fact to throw in while taking students on the supposedly more important journey of mapping the routes and settlements of European colonizers. In the passage above, European settlers are the sun that the rest of the story orbits around. Only one other section in the framework's fourth grade chapter discusses fighting between the Indigenous defenders of their homeland and European colonizers:

Some mission Indians sought to escape the system by fleeing from the padres, while a few Indians openly revolted and killed missionaries. Sensitizing students to the various ways in which Indians exhibited agency in the mission system provides a more comprehensive view of the era for students. It also allows them to better understand change and continuity over time, as well as cause-and-effect. Students can also gain broader contextual knowledge of missions by learning about how they operated like farms (for example, Mission San Luis Rey) and the roles played by different groups of people in such settings" (CA Dept of Education, 2016, p. 75).

This passage offers a legitimate mention of both passive resistance in the form of escape and active resistance by killing their captors. Still, included adjectives like "some" and "few" shrink the information's importance, as does the fact that resistance at the missions was not deemed significant enough even to have its own paragraph. The framework's lack of elaboration protects the reputation of the Franciscan captors of Indigenous resistors, who labeled "all absentee Indians as *huidos*, or fugitives," and "flogged Indians who repeatedly left without permission" (Hackel, 2005, p. 90-91). According to Hackel, historians estimate that between 5 and 10 percent of Indigenous people held captive across the missions were documented as absent (Hackel, 2005, p. 95). The framework also neglects to mention that many Indigenous people fled the missions because of starvation, mistreatment, sickness, and high death rates (Hackel, 2005).

The framework alludes to the murder of missionaries but provides no details or context. This affirms Lindsay's perspective that Euro-Americans have a history of "never admitting their own complicity in bringing Native peoples to violent agency in order to resist genocide"

(Lindsay, 2012, p. 27). For example, in 1812 Indigenous resistors murdered a priest named Father Andrés Quintana for allegedly using an iron-tipped whip to keep Indigenous men and women in separate dorms and punish neophytes for perceived sexual sin (Lorimer, 2016). Hackel's review of firsthand indigenous testimony describes how at least eight Indigenous resistors removed Quintana's testicles one at a time before killing him, with one named Donato allegedly mentioning that they would bury his testicles "in the outdoor privy" (Hackel, 2005, p. 212). After his death, the resistors allegedly unlocked the dorm doors, and men and women made love freely in defiance of the padre's strict control of their sexuality (Hackel, 2005, p. 212).

Indigenous resistance to this level of control was frequent, and uprisings and revolts were consistently documented (Hackel, 2005; Madley, 2016; Keenan, 2018; Castillo, 2015; Nunpa, 2020; Miranda, 2013). The Kumeyaay people burned down the first mission in what is now called San Diego a mere six years after its construction (Keenan, 2018, p. 53). In 1776, Indigenous resistors "fired flaming arrows into the reed roofs of Mission San Luis Obispo, burning down buildings. Further incendiary attacks on San Luis Obispo eventually led to the universal adoption, from Sonoma to San Diego, of the California missions' iconic red-tile roofs" (Madley, 2016, p. 24). In other words, the iconic red roof tiles of the missions were created as a direct reaction to Indigenous rebellion. A female Temajasaquichí and healer named Toypurina led a rebellion at Mission San Gabriel in 1785, which led to the poisoning or killing of padres (Hackel, 2005, p. 53). Padres met these moments of resistance with increased violence; they believed it was their Christian duty to bludgeon the souls of the enslaved Indigenous people into submission to their strict and unreasonable rules. These cruelties included beatings, whippings, shacklings, public humiliation, and other morbidly creative punishments (Hackel, 2005; Castillo, 2015; Miranda, 2013; Madley, 2016; Keenan, 2019). The framework invites misunderstanding from teachers and

students alike by leaving out key details and context about the cruelty of the priests and enslavement of Indigenous people at the mission compounds.

Conclusion

Indigenous counterstory can provide educative experiences that support children in more rigorously analyzing the narrative of colonization embedded in state-recommended history curriculum by engaging with the meaning of decolonization and Indigenous sovereignty on colonized land (Haynes Writer, 2010; Tuck & Yang, 2012) and examining colonization as a structure endemic to society rather than as an isolated historical period (Brayboy, 2005; Grande, 2004; Lomawaima & McCarty, 2002) (Keenan, 2019, p. 56).

The last tenet of Tribal Crit states that “theory and practice are connected in deep and explicit ways such that scholars must work towards social change” (Brayboy, 2005, p. 430). One way we can work toward social change is by resisting these inaccurate master narratives embedded within California’s social studies curriculum. One tool of resistance introduced to me during my research is the concept of curriculum mining, which University of Texas researcher Justin Krueger describes this way: “Instead of accepting curriculum narratives as is, the process of curriculum mining dictates that teachers dig deeper for more meaningful examinations of peoples and places” and asks teachers to “approach curriculum critically” (2021, p. 82). Krueger combines the tools of curriculum mining and Tribal Crit, asserting that “the use of TribalCrit means normative history can be taken to task by privileging Native American epistemologies and lived experiences to engage Indigenous perspectives” (2021, p. 85). Keenan suggests teachers “might work with students to annotate the textbook with information it leaves out, to strengthen their sense of chronology by constructing a timeline of Indigenous history that continues through the present, or create a new tool altogether” (2019, p. 70). Educators have an obligation to reject historically inaccurate lies that obscure and hide the truth of California’s Indigenous Genocide.

Generations of scholars have been lending their voices to correct the inaccurate narratives that remain prevalent in California’s social studies curriculum. Dr. Rose Borunda, Professor Emeritus at California State University Sacramento and member of the California Indian History

Curriculum Coalition, recommends a book series called *Lands of Our Ancestors* by Indigenous author Gary Robinson. This series is published in three separate books, as well as in one volume called *Lands of Our Ancestors: Three Generations*. The first book follows a Chumash boy named Kilik as he and his family are kidnapped, baptized against their will, and enslaved at a mission by Spanish priests. The engaging narrative covers realities such as beatings, shackling for trying to escape captivity, and systematically planned resistance (Robinson, 2016-2018). The second book continues to follow Kilik's story as California transitions out of the mission era and into the era of Mexican occupation. Through his eyes you read about the mistreatment of Indigenous mission survivors by Mexican vaqueros and the bravery of many Indigenous agitators to stand up to their callous treatment (Robinson, 2016-2018). The third book discusses the third disruptive historic transition from the Mexican era to the Gold Rush era, primarily following Kilik's eldest son Malik. Through story, Robinson reveals the greed of the Gold Rush, the decisions by newspaper publishers to demonize Indigenous people and stifle news documenting their murder and mistreatment, and the continued and unending resistance in spirit and action that never left the Chumash people (Robinson, 2016-2018).

Educators have vetted this series as being appropriate for fourth grade readers, and an educator-created teacher's guide accompanies each book. The teacher's guides are rich resources which contain vocabulary lists, common core aligned hands-on project alternatives to building missions, timelines, geography, historic summaries for educators, additional sources, and more (Robinson, 2016-2018; Robinson, 2018; Robinson, 2019). California fourth grade educators and parents who adopt Robinson's curricular materials can immediately expose the students in their care to a counternarrative that is standards aligned, written from an Indigenous perspective, and vetted by Indigenous scholars. The *Lands of Our Ancestors* trilogy provides a pathway toward classroom truth-telling that requires minimal educator effort to enact. Further Indigenous-vetted

curricular resources can be accessed through the CIHCC's website.

In his article “Visiting Chutchui: The making of a colonial counterstory on an elementary school field trip,” Keenan demonstrates the efficacy of “counterstory to provide educative experiences that support children in more rigorously analyzing the narrative of colonization embedded in state-recommended history curriculum” (2019, p. 56). Scholars, educators, and activists must continue the work of de-colonizing our textbooks, frameworks, curricular guides, and educator understandings of Indigenous history. Indigenous-created resources that are forged outside of the capitalistic textbook factories are an indispensable tool in the fight for truth-telling. Keenan states that “the project of dismantling curricular hegemony must include support for Indigenous educators in schools, museums, and other educational spaces” (2019, p. 70). Education policymakers must fight to mandate input from Indigenous scholars when deciding what students learn about Indigenous history. The children of California —Indigenous or otherwise-- deserve to know the truth.

Bibliography

- Brayboy, B. M. K. J. (2005). Toward a tribal critical race theory in education. *Urban Review*, 37(5), 425-446. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11256-005-0018-y>
- Brayboy, B. M. K. J. (2013). *Handbook of Critical Race Theory in Education*. Tribal Critical Race Theory: An Origin Story and Future Directions. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203155721>
- California Department of Education. (2005). *History-social science framework for California public schools: kindergarten through grade twelve*. Sacramento.
- California Department of Education. (2016). *History-social science framework for California public schools: kindergarten through grade twelve*. Sacramento. <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/hs/cf/documents/hssframeworkwhole.pdf>
- Conroy-Krutz, & Levine, S. (2015). *Christian imperialism : converting the world in the early American republic*. Cornell University Press.
- Deloria Jr., V. (2003). *God is red: a native view of religion, 30th anniversary edition*. Fulcrum Publishing.
- Hackel, S. W. (2005). *Children of coyote, missionaries of Saint Francis: Indian-Spanish relations in colonial California, 1769-1850*. University of North Carolina Press.
- Hurtado, A. L. (2006). *John Sutter: A life on the North American frontier*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Keenan, H. (2018) Visiting Chutchui: The making of a colonial counterstory on an elementary school field trip. *Theory & Research in Social Education* 47(1), 52-75.
- Keenan, H. (2019). Selective Memory: California Mission History and the Problem of Historical Violence in Elementary School Textbooks. *Teachers College Record* (1970), 121(8), 1-28. <https://doi.org/10.1177/016146811912100805>
- Keenan, H. (2021). The Mission Project: Teaching History and Avoiding the Past in California Elementary Schools. *Harvard Educational Review* 91(1): 109-132. doi: <https://doi.org/10.17763/1943-5045-91.1.109>
- Kiernan, B. (2004). The First Genocide: Carthage, 146 BC. *Diogenes*, 51(3), 27-39. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0392192104043648>
- Kryder-Reid, E. (2015). Crafting the past: mission models and the curation of California heritage. *Heritage & Society*, 8(1), 60-83. <https://doi.org/10.1179/2159032X15Z.00000000038>
- Krueger, J. (2021). TribalCrit, curriculum Mining, and the teaching of contemporary

- Indigenous Issues. *Multicultural Perspectives*, 23:2, 78-86, DOI: 10.1080/15210960.2021.1914048
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1998). Just what is critical race theory and what's it doing in a nice field like education? *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 11(1), 7–24.
- Leonardo, Z. (2004). The Color of Supremacy: Beyond the discourse of “white privilege.” *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 36(2), 137-152.
- Leonardo, Z. (2013). The story of schooling: critical race theory and the educational racial contract. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 34(4), 599-610. DOI: [10.1080/01596306.2013.822624](https://doi.org/10.1080/01596306.2013.822624)
- Loewen, J. W. (2007). *Lies my teacher told me: Everything your American history textbook got Wrong* (2nd ed.). Touchstone.
- Lindsay, B. (2012). *Murder state: California's Native American genocide, 1846–1873*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press
- Lorimer, M. (2016). *Resurrecting the past: the California mission myth*. Great Oak Press.
- Madley, B. (2016). An American genocide: The United States and the California Indian catastrophe, 1846-1873.
- Miller, R. (2021). Nazi Germany's race laws, the United States, and American Indians. *St. John's Law Review*, 94(3), 751-817.
- Miranda, D. A. (2013). *Bad indians: a tribal memoir*. Heyday.
- Norton, J. (2013). If the truth be told: revising California history as a moral objective. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 58(1), 83-96 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764213495033>
- Nunpa, C. M. (2020). *The great evil: Christianity, the bible, and the Native American genocide*. See Sharp Press.
- Reyhner, J., & Eder, J. (2017). *American Indian education, 2nd edition : A history*. University of Oklahoma Press.
- Robinson, G. (2016-2018). *Lands of our ancestors: three generations*. Tribal Eye Productions.
- Robinson, G. (2016-2018). *Lands of our ancestors book one teacher's guide*. Tribal Eye Productions.
- Robinson, G. (2018). *Lands of our ancestors book two teacher's guide*. Tribal Eye Productions.
- Robinson, G. (2019). *Lands of our ancestors book three teacher's guide*. Tribal Eye Productions.
- Schneider, K., Allender, D., Berta-Avila, M., Borunda, R., Castro, G., Murray, A., & Porter, J.

- (2019). More Than Missions: Native Californians and Allies Changing the Story of California History. *Journal of American Indian Education*, 58(3), 58+. <https://link.gale.com/apps/doc/A659376872/CWI?u=ucriverside&sid=bookmark-CWI&xid=0acdec99>
- Smith, M. (2017). Counting the dead: estimating the loss of life in the Indigenous holocaust, 1492-present). *Proceedings of the 12th Native American Symposium*. Southeastern Oklahoma State University.
- Tuck, E., & Gaztambide-Fernández, R. (2013). Curriculum, Replacement, and Settler Futurity. *Journal of curriculum theorizing*, 29, 72.
- Tuck, E. & Yang, K.W. (2012). Decolonization is not a metaphor. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education and Society*, 1(1), 1-40.
- Trafzer, C. E., & Hyer, J. R. (Eds.). (1999). *Exterminate them : Written accounts of the murder, rape, and enslavement of native americans during the california gold rush*. Michigan State University Press.
- Trafzer, & Lorimer, M. (2014). Silencing California Indian Genocide in Social Studies Texts. *The American Behavioral Scientist (Beverly Hills)*, 58(1), 64–82. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764213495032>