UC Riverside

UC Riverside Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Title

Reservation Empire: The Mission Indian Federation and Native American Conservatism

Permalink

https://escholarship.org/uc/item/8z693228

Author

Przeklasa, Terence Robert

Publication Date

2015

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation

eScholarship.org Powered by the California Digital Library
University of California

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
RIVERSIDE

Reservation Empire
The Mission Indian Federation and Native American Conservatism

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

Doctor of Philosophy

in

History

by

Terence Robert Przeklasa, Jr.

August 2015

Dissertation Committee:
Dr. Clifford E. Trafzer, Chairperson
Dr. Rebecca Kugel
Dr. Larry Burgess

Copyright by
Terence Robert Przeklasa, Jr.
2015

The Dissertation of Terence Robert Przeklasa, Jr. is approved:

Committee Chairperson

University of California, Riverside

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work would not be possible without the help and support of many, many people and institutions. First, I thank my parents, Cathy and Terry Przeklasa, as well as the rest of my family for their unending love and support through everything. I am thankful to my colleagues Hannah Brown, David Buhl, Kristen Hayashi, Benjamin Jenkins, Todd Luce, Moyses Marcos, Sean Milanovich, Natalie Anderson-Patch, Shawn Ragan, Nicolette Rohr, Santos Roman, Jennifer Thornton, Kevin Whalen, and many others who contributed to this work in any number of ways.

A great deal of thanks is due to the faculty and staff at Department of History at the University of California, Riverside, for all of their assistance throughout this project, particularly James Brennan who was always gracious with his support. I owe much gratitude to Professor Rebecca "Monte" Kugel for her wisdom, guidance, and willingness to wax philosophically for hours on end. I am similarly grateful to Professors Larry Burgess, Katherine Gudis, and Michelle Raheja for their sage advice and guidance on this project. Scholars of the Mission Indian Federation have been very helpful to this work, particularly Tanis Thorne and Richard Hanks. George Philips also made significant contributions to this understanding and I thank him for his help and support. Their books and articles have been of great help and are significant contributions to the understanding of Southern California Indian Country. I wish to thank Laurence Hauptman, Duane Champagne, and Judith Boughter who took time to share their specialized knowledge with me. I thank Professor Vanessa Gunther for being the first to introduce me to the

field and to Southern California Indian Country and the late Professor Gordon Bakken who trained countless historians, including myself, in the craft of history.

I wish to highlight the great work of the Cultural Resources Department of the Pechanga Band of Luiseño Indians, especially Lisa Woodward, Mark Macarro, Willie Pink, Raymond Basquez, Sr., and Raymond Basquez, Jr. Their support, especially Lisa's, has been especially helpful. The archives and archivists of the Agua Caliente Cultural Museum similarly provided support and assistance to this effort. I thank all of the tribal elders, scholars, and members, as well as my Indian friends who have graciously shared their knowledge, culture, and history with me, including: Raymond Basquez, Sr., Raymond Basquez, Jr., Edward Castillo, Patty Dixon, Patty Duro, James Fenelon, Raymond Huaute, Carmen Lucas, Anthony Madrigal, Sr., William Madrigal, Jr., Anthony Madrigal, Jr., Kim Marcus, Theresa Mike, Emanuel Olague, James Ramos, Carol Ray, Lorene Sisquoc, Ernest Siva, Katherine Siva-Saubel, Terria Smith, and Henry Vasquez.

Thanks is due to Brenda Buller Focht for being a supportive mentor as well as Kevin Hallaran and Director Sarah Suverkrup Mundy of the Riverside Metropolitan Museum for their contributions. I am indebted to the staff of the National Archives in Washington, D.C., San Bruno, St. Louis, and Riverside, California. The Smiley Library and the Special Collections at Bowling Green State University, the University of Washington, and the University of California, Riverside all graciously facilitated research for this project. The Huntington Library generously funded research into their collections,

as did the Bancroft Library at the University of California, Berkeley. I greatly appreciate the support of the California Studies Consortium, as well.

I am grateful for the support and assistance of the California Center for Native Nations and thanks is owed to the Rupert Costo Endowment for Native American Affairs, which has continuously and generously funded research for this and other projects. Finally, the utmost thanks is due to my friend and mentor, Distinguished Professor of History and Rupert Costo Chair in Native American Affairs, Clifford E. Trafzer. Without Cliff's guidance, knowledge, and friendship, I would be neither the historian nor person I am today. To all of these and to the many others I have failed to mention here, I give my utmost appreciation.

ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

Reservation Empire
The Mission Indian Federation and Native American Conservatism

by

Terence Robert Przeklasa, Jr.

Doctorate of Philosophy, Graduate Program in History
University of California, Riverside, August 2015
Dr. Clifford E. Trafzer, Chair

In 1919, traditional leaders from throughout Southern California Indian Country gathered in Riverside, California, and organized a group that became the Mission Indian Federation. The Federation gathered these leaders into a stronger, collective organization in order to protect and maintain their sovereignty and self-governance, home rule as they called it, from intrusions by the United States federal government through the Office, later Bureau, of Indian Affairs. The organization centered on a single president who unified the traditional leaders or captains of each reservation, a Federation-wide court that supported traditional reservation judges and a police force that sought to eliminate a corrupt and ineffective Indian Bureau police. This effort was inherently conservative as traditionalist fought to maintain the traditional forms of government, which they traced back to their very creation stories, from alteration and domination by the United States.

Their assertions of tribal sovereignty brought about strong resistance from the Indian Bureau throughout the 1920s, which at times boiled over into violence. When a new Commissioner of Indian Affairs, John Collier, betrayed a promise to the Federation to abolish the Indian Bureau, the MIF launched a national campaign against his plans to enlarge the powers and scope of the Bureau. This nation-wide campaign, the American

Indian Federation, eventually succumbed to internal politics and a concerted effort by the Indian Bureau to destroy it, as well as associations with far-right political groups. The failure of the national group effected the Mission Indian Federation, locally, as it turned toward support for the federal policy of tribal termination as the final solution to its struggle against federal interference and dominance. This support, however, eventually led to the downfall of the Federation, as termination became increasingly less attractive to tribal people. The effects of the MIF still resonate throughout the region, though, and its legacy lives on in some surprising ways.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE

These are the so-called captains of the Mission Indian Federation. All of them are captains of reservations that do not exist, never did exist, but anyway it is promised to them that they will get the reservation and be the rulers supreme, an empire of their own.

WINSLOW COURO, February 1938

The title of this work originated in a letter written by Winslow Couro, a traditional Kumeyaay leader from the Santa Ysabel Reservation, to his local congressional representative, Edouard Izak, after falling-out with the Mission Indian Federation (MIF). He characterized the Federation's goals of regaining, or at least retrieving compensation for, lands stolen through the Unratified Treaties of Santa Ysabel and Temecula of 1852 and their continuation of power in the hands of traditional leadership families as a nefarious and abusive plot.[1] It is a very cynical view that one must read with knowledge of his tumultuous association with the MIF. The Federation indeed attempted to unify control over the thirty reservations of Southern California, ostensibly to provide strength in numbers, although competition for limited resources and the personal ambitions of reservation and Federation leaders crept in over time. It also refers to the imperialism of the American reservation system itself, which, despite the best efforts of the MIF, continued through the Federation's existence. Colloquially, it also plays on the regional appellations of the areas forming Southern California Indian Country, the "Inland Empire" of Riverside and San Bernardino Counties, and the "Mountain Empire" of San Diego County.

[1] Winslow Couro to Rep. Edouard Izac, 6 February 1938, in United States House of Representatives, *California Indians Jurisdictional Act: Hearings on H.R. 3765* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. G.P.O., 1939), 373.

Couro's statement that the "reservations that do not exist, never did exist," is a reference to the Federation's claims for villages on lands represented by signatories on the Treaties of Temecula and Santa Ysabel, in 1852, due to the failure of the U.S. Senate to ratify these two agreements involving the Indians of Southern California, causing Native Americans in the region to lose lands and resources. The United States either excluded these villages from or never made into reservations. Sometimes the government combined the villages with others under a reservation of a different name. In an interesting letter from to Commissioner of Indian Affairs Charles Burke in 1921, Superintendent Paul Hoffman addressed a petition sent by the nascent Mission Indian Federation to the federal government claiming, "That this petition was drawn by someone unfamiliar with Indian matters is evident both from the spelling of the names of the supposed signers and of the reservations. I have never head of either the Santa Gertrudes, Matajuay, New, Grigsby, Puerta Cruz, or San Felipe Reservations."[2] The irony of Hoffman's statement is evident to anyone familiar with Southern California Indian Country since all of the historic Indian villages existed or had once existed, but Hoffman was unaware of the villages on the lands under his charge. The Native people of the region and the colonial bureaucracy simply did not think in the same manner, nor did they have access to the same knowledge.

Much confusion exists today about the Mission Indian Federation and its place in Native American history. I wrote this work in order to make sense of the amazing

[2] Paul Hoffman to Charles Burke, 31 July 1921, "Correspondence and Other Records Relating to the Mission Indian Federation, 1919," box 136, Records of the Mission Indian Agency, R.G. 75, National Archives and Records Administration, Riverside, California, herein after referred to as RMIA Riverside.

organization that was the Federation and some of its leaders and members. How, I wondered, could a group made up of conservative tribal traditionalists have supported termination and the transfer of legal jurisdiction on their reservations to the state of California? One answer is in the following pages, based on my research and interpretations. My hope is that future scholars will continue work on the MIF, particularly young Native scholars from the reservations historically represented in the Mission Indian Federation. They know the region and its people, the families who participated in the dramas that unfolded on the reservations throughout the twentieth century, the accomplishments, and failures of their people and the Federation. Many challenges remain in order for such scholars to come to the fore. Let this be an inspiration for them.

T. Robert Przeklasa
Riverside, California

INTRODUCTION
THE ONLY GOOD INDIAN COMMISSIONER IS A DEAD INDIAN COMMISSIONER

The Indian Bureau is horrible. It is the worst thing in the world. The worst.

-CARMEN LUCAS, 2013

There is slavery in America today, and has been for years. The most despotic arm of any government in the world is this Indian Bureau.

-J.P. HARRINGTON, 1936

On March 28, 1950, the *paxaa* of the village of Soboba, Adam Castillo, published an appeal to the American public to free the Mission Indians from wardship under the federal Indian Bureau.[3] In the treatise, Castillo quickly laid out the history of California Indians from the time non-Natives arrived in the area now known as California and "found Indians living as a free, happy people, enjoying the bountiful gifts of nature," to the events of that very month.[4] The narrative told the nation how "the atrocities endured by Indians at the hands of the white invaders" for more than a hundred years had not been forgotten and indeed, remained "fresh in the minds of scores of the older Indians still living." Tracing a lineage of resistance from the Luiseño chief Olegario to Helen Hunt Jackson and her book *A Century of Dishonor*, Castillo told the world "that the Indian Bureau is not a help, but has always been a primary factor in the losses of lands and rights sustained by our Indians,

---

Title: Felix S. Cohen, "The Erosion of Indian Rights, 1950-1953: A Case Study in Bureaucracy," The Yale Law Journal, vol. 62, no. 3 (February 1953), 389.

Epigraph: Carmen Lucas, personal interview with the author, 2 November 2013, Borrego Springs, California; J.P. Harrington to John S. McGroarty, 13 February 1936, Letters Sent 1904-1960, Accession #1976-95 [NMNH-Harrington_mf9_r12_0638], John Peabody Harrington Papers, National Anthropological Archives, Smithsonian Institution, hereinafter referred to as JPHP.

[3] Adam Castillo, "An Indian Appeals to the American Public," 28 March 1950, Coded Records, box 27, folder MIF, Sacramento Area Office, R.G. 75, National Archives and Records Administration, San Bruno California, hereinafter referred to as SAO, NARA SB. A *paxaa* is civil and spiritual leader who is second in command in Cahuilla society. Lowell Bean, *Mukat's People: Cahuilla Indians of Southern California* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974), 105-6.

[4] Adam Castillo, "An Indian Appeals to the American Public," 28 March 1950, Coded Records, box 27, folder MIF, R.G. 75, SAO, NARA SB.

and to this hour has done more to hold back our Indian race than any other factor." As president of the Mission Indian Federation, Adam Castillo had fought for decades to rid his people of federal interference in their lives, and finally had something to show for his efforts.

Only four weeks before, the leader had orchestrated a coup in Washington, D.C., when he and four other Federation members successfully lobbied the House Appropriations Committee to cut funding for the Indian Bureau in the state of California for the coming fiscal year. "This act marks an epoch in California Indian history," Castillo wrote. "Congress is now determined to halt this 'octopus' ere it is entirely too late."[5] The epoch to which the event belonged was the period of tribal termination in American Indian history. The Federation unabashedly supported the policy of termination which today one would say aimed to sever the special relationship between tribes and the federal government. However, to Federationists and many other Indian people of the time, termination meant freedom: from segregation, and from federal interference in their tribal politics and personal lives, and "the severing of the bonds of wardship for Indians."[6]

Conservative, traditionalist leaders from throughout Southern California Indian Country founded the Mission Indian Federation in 1919. The Federation quickly grew into an intertribal or, more accurately, inter-reservation Native government that sought to unite the thirty reservations of the region under a single, more powerful central authority controlled by the Native people, themselves. Replete with a court system and a police force, the Federation organized the traditional leaders in each community to ensure the

[5] Ibid.
[6] Ibid.

continuance of their leadership in the face of growing interference from the Indian Bureau. "We do not need the agents. The Federation can care for the Indians without the agents," Castillo told Bureau officials in the early 1930s.[7] From the very beginning, the Federation followed the call of the Yavapai physician and leader Wassaja, or Carlos Montezuma, and sought the abolition of the Indian Bureau. However, by the 1950s, opponents of the MIF, both Indian and non-Indian, labeled their politics dangerous and radical.[8]

Such labels were most certainly flawed and problematic, for the conservative Mission Indian Federation sought to conserve and maintain the Native political system that had evolved in Southern California over thousands of years. It was not some "radical" organization, but rather a conservative movement that fought the intrusions of a newcomer, the United States government, and its commissioners, superintendents, and agents. The Federation was an intertribal sovereignty movement of the early twentieth century that called for tribal control over all of their affairs. The advent of the American Indian Movement (AIM) in the late 1960s and into the 1970s gave Indian activism a radical image in the broader culture of the United States as people categorized AIM together with other organizations such as the Black Panthers and the Brown Berets. Most Indian peoples, however, were not and are not "radicals," even when they actively fought and fight for their tribal rights. Rather, as seen in the story of the Mission Indian

[7] Adam Castillo in San Diego County Board of Supervisors Report on the Conditions of Indian Reservations in San Diego County, 1932, quoted in B. W. Cohoon, "Supplementary Report," 18 August 1933, 33247-1933, 155 1/3, box 16, Central Classified Files 1907-1939 – Mission, R.G. 75, Bureau of Indian Affairs, NARA, Washington, D.C., hereinafter referred to as CCF 1907-39 – M.

[8] Bertha Stewart to Chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, 9 March 1950, Coded Records, box 27, folder MIF, R.G. 75, SAO, NARA SB.

Federation, many Indian people are politically and socially conservative in a unique, Native way in their demands to control their own lives and tribal affairs. A strong strain of anti-federalism and tribal autonomy or sovereignty runs through both tribal and extra-tribal politics, flowing side-by-side with a strong desire to conserve traditional cultures, ways of life, languages, religious and spiritual ways, and political structures, all of which are inexorably linked together and begin with tribal Creation stories. These stories taught the people who they were and how to interact with the various elements of their world. Traditional systems had guided Southern California Indians long before the arrival of the Spanish in 1769 or the Americans in 1846. The Mission Indian Federation fought outsider interference in their lives and struggled to regain indigenous control of all elements of Native American life in Southern California and beyond.

The Mission Indian Federation represents Native American conservatism in action in twentieth-century throughout Southern California Indian Country. Although federal officials and other critics often cast both it and its members as extremists, the Federation was at heart a profoundly conservative organization that sought to maintain traditional tribal governance throughout the region. The greatly increased involvement and interference from the federal government among the Mission Indian people around the start of the twentieth century fueled an anti-federalist sentiment on the reservations. Such sentiment was previously evident among the members of the Society of American Indians (SAI), an intertribal organization of Native American intellectuals founded in 1911 to

protect Indian rights.[9] This political stance gained the Federation support from many conservative, small-government, non-Indian politicians of the West. This support only increased in the years following the Second World War. Scholarship on twentieth century American Indian history often leaves a gap between the SAI and the post-World War II activism of groups such as the National Congress of American Indians (NCAI) that formed in 1944 to combat the federal policy of tribal termination.[10] However, the struggle of the Federation against federal domination bridges this scholarly gap between the demise end of the SAI in the early 1920s and the rise of groups like the NCAI and the even more prominent American Indian Movement of the 1970s.

Contrary to its Native and non-Native critics, the Mission Indian Federation was not merely a group of Indian people whom radical, scheming non-Indians led around by the nose. Rather, tribal people ran the Federation for most of its existence and in most of its work. While the group's two non-Indian "counselors," Jonathan Tibbet and Purl Willis, exerted a fair measure of influence, careful investigation reveals the inherently Native substance of the MIF. Rather, contrary to the line the federal government put out, Indian people both constituted and led the organization. Its structure evinced a system of government that had evolved over the centuries from pre-contact times to the twentieth century, and that presented an Indigenized form of federalism, no doubt influenced by the government of the United States. Rather than follow village-oriented forms of government, the MIF formalized traditional governance into a more cohesive, unified

[9] Hazel W. Hertzberg, *The Search for an American Indian Identity: Modern Pan-Indian Movements* (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1971), 36-7.

[10] Thomas W. Cowger, *The National Congress of American Indians: the Founding Years* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1999), 2-3.

system with police power and sovereignty in a way they hoped would make sense to the United States. The Federation sought to prove the capabilities of the Mission Indian people and strove to placate the fears of the colonizers as to their ability to both hold and govern themselves and their ancestral lands. Although no reference exists within files from or pertaining to the Federation connecting it to any other modern form of tribal government, their formation of a government with non-Native characteristics is reminiscent of the Cherokee Republic, which also sought to use the legal structures of the United States to solidify Native governance in a traditional Native territory. That, unlike among the Cherokees, tribal conservatives constituted and led the governmental model of the Mission Indian Federation made it unique.[11]

So just what is American Indian conservatism? As with any people, the period under examination had multiple strains of Native conservative political ideology, all uniquely Indian, but still in dialogue with the broader society of the United States. These strains included cultural and religious traditionalists, Christian conservatives, wealthy fiscal conservatives, and anti-government conservatives, all of which I explore in the body of this work. Eliminating government interference and dependence is *the* key hallmark of American Indian conservatism, however, and this goal of eliminating external interference in tribal lives and politics through smaller government held the many different veins of Native conservatism together in the twentieth century. While intrusions upon tribes from state, county, and local governments are generally just as unwelcomed by Indian

[11] The rise of republicanism among the Cherokee underscored and exacerbated deep divisions between traditionalists and progressives, mixed and non-mixed race tribal members. Sandra M. Gustafson, *Imagining Deliberative Democracy in the Early American Republic* (Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 2011), 127.

conservatives, the main target of opposition is the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Senator John C. Calhoun created the Office of Indian Affairs, known to its supporters as the Indian Service but more commonly as the Indian Bureau, in 1829.[12] The Interior Department officially upgraded it to the Bureau of Indian Affairs in 1947.[13] Since its inception, a wide range of critics have highlighted the corruption and misguided nature that plagued the Indian Bureau in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries as well as widespread discrimination against Indian wards, both before and after general Indian citizenship in 1924.[14] Indeed, the Indian Bureau represented the worst characteristics of the United States Federal Government: bureaucracy, corruption, un-Constitutional behavior, interference in private lives, red tape, and financial waste. It is therefore little wonder why people who dealt with the Bureau on a regular basis developed strongly anti-federal feelings and politics. The conservative, anti-federal politics of the surrounding region only bolstered such leanings.

Attorney Felix Cohen, himself a solicitor for the Interior Department who specialized in Indian law, coined the title of this Introduction in an article on bureaucracy

---

[12] Deborah Welch, *Political Issues: Contemporary Native American Issues* (New York: Chelsea House Publishers, 2006), 16. Although the Office of Indian Affairs only became the Bureau of Indian Affairs in 1947, scholarly sources refer to it as the "Indian Bureau." This and the blanket designation of records under Bureau of Indian Affairs by the National Archives and Records Administration have compelled the author to utilize "Office" and "Bureau of Indian Affairs" when appropriate as well as "Indian Bureau" and "Bureau" for variation. "Bureau Indian," synonymous with other pejoratives such as a "hang-around-the-fort Indian" and an "Uncle Tomahawk," became epithets for those Native people who worked for or cooperated with Indian Bureau. Mrs. Wade Crawford in United States Senate Subcommittee on Indian Affairs, *Klamath Indians, Oregon: Hearings before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Public Lands on S. 1222* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. G.P.O., 1947). 28.

[13] "Employees of the Bureau of Indian Affairs in the Official Register of the United States, 1849-1925," National Archives and Records Administration, http://www.archives.gov/research/native-americans/employment/official-register.html, accessed 1 August 2015.

[14] For a witty, scathing critique of early Indian Bureau activities, in California, see J. Ross Browne, *Crusoe's Island: A Ramble in the Footsteps of Alexander Selkirk* (New York: Harper & Brothers Publishing, 1867), 287-308.

that he began with the argument that American Indians were "probably the only racial group in the United States whose rights are more limited in 1953 than they were in 1950."[15] The Bureau had consistently restricted and interfered in tribal lives and governments on a partisan seesaw, with its official policies changing with each successive presidentially appointed Commissioner of Indian Affairs. Looking back at the Bureau from Indian Country, however, it was apparent that despite these shifts of the official paradigm pendulum, nothing or little of the government's paternalism ever changed as lower and mid-level employees remained in their positions despite changes at the top.[16]

Cohen wrote in the 1950s against the move toward tribal termination that pervaded post-World War II federal Indian policy. He had been a proponent of the Indian Reorganization Act of the 1930s and worked closely with Franklin Roosevelt's liberal Commissioner of Indian Affairs John Collier. Although he believed that termination was a road to disaster, it was obvious for Cohen why tribal people fought for it as a way to abolish the Indian Bureau: "It is not cynicism, but simple realism, to note that people whose freedom is being increasingly restricted want the assurance that some day [sic], somehow, the restrictors of freedom will be liquidated or withered away."[17] A number of Native people and organizations including the Mission Indian Federation advocated for tribal termination precisely for that reason. Following decades of struggle, termination was the only way to rid themselves of the entity that restricted their freedom. Supporting

[15] Felix S. Cohen, "The Erosion of Indian Rights, 1950-1953: A Case Study in Bureaucracy," *Yale Law Journal*, vol. 62 (1953), 348.

[16] Heather Ponchetti Daly, "'American Indian Freedom Controversy:' Political and Social Activism by Southern California Mission Indians, 1934-1958," (PhD diss., University of California, Los Angeles, 2012), 5.

[17] Ibid., 390.

termination was a controversial position at the time and that any tribal person might have supported it has become nearly unthinkable in reservation communities in the present day.

While Native American conservatives strove and strive to free tribes from dependence and restriction by eliminating ties to the federal government, those across the aisle claim such moves merely let the government shirk its trust obligations. The link between the federal Indian policy of termination and the lessening of the role of government in tribal lives today is unavoidable. Scholars must be careful to take off their modern spectacles, as it were, when looking at the past, lest they allow 20/20 hindsight and knowledge of a disastrous policy to obscure the picture and cast judgment upon those of that past. Both Indians and non-Indians widely vilify and view termination, which sought to end the special relationships between the federal government and tribes, today as a disastrous policy in which the federal government of the United States simply sought to "get out of the Indian business."[18] This is mostly due to the vantage historical perspective offers over the destructive impact of the policy. However, to many in Southern California Indians at the end of the Second World War, it was the only option left. "Reform" of the Indian Bureau during the previous decade only enlarged the bureaucracy and increased federal oversight of and interference in tribal lives and government. If California Indians were ever to regain control of their destinies and be able to compete economically with non-Indians on a level playing field, they needed to rid themselves of their unique relationship with the federal government. After all, that was what the Mission Indian Federation had fought for since its inception.

[18] Murray L. Wax and Robert W. Buchanan, *Solving "The Indian Problem:" The White Man's Burdensome Business* (New York: New York Times Books, 1975), 67.

Treaty rights and self-governance pervaded nearly everything the Mission Indian Federation did, and given the realities of colonization and the position of tribes as domestic dependent nations, more often than not, American Indian politics are more complex than the external binaries of Democrat and Republican, liberal and conservative.[19] Historically, tribal politics have dominated the political worlds of Native people and continue to do so today. However, this is certainly not to say that tribal people do not lead and have not led political lives beyond their nations or that their tribal politics do not, at times, intersect with, and find allies among the wider politics of the United States. Neither did or do tribal politics take place in a vacuum without impact from external politics at the federal, state, county, and even local level. At heart, this work is an examination of such intersections, exploring the innovative politics of Southern California Indian Country.

One cannot ignore the influence the non-Indian politics of the American West have had upon the Native peoples of the region. Indian boarding schools such as Riverside's Sherman Institute had worked for decades to inculcate a spirit of individuality, so prized by the United States and identified with the American West, among Native children.[20] This education went hand-in-hand with the policy of allotment that deeded sections of reservation lands to individual tribal members in the hopes of fashioning independent, productive farmers in the Jeffersonian tradition while ending tribal relations at the same time. Federal Indian boarding schools also instilled in their students heavy doses of

[19] Jerry D. Stubben, Native Americans and Political Participation: A Reference Handbook (Santa Barbara, CA: ABC CLIO, 2006), 168.

[20] Joel Pfister, *Individuality Incorporated: Indians and the Multicultural Modern* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2004), 13.

patriotism, which officials pointed to as contributing to high numbers of liberty bonds sold on reservations and to pupils, many of whom also enlisted in the armed forces during both the First and Second World Wars.[21]

Laurence Hauptman, the only scholar who has devoted any considerable work to the topic of conservative American Indians, noted that the generally conservative politics of their rural non-Indian neighbors greatly influences many American Indian communities that often absorb the values and outlooks of such communities.[22] Something approaching a scholarly consensus points to the locations from which non-Indian migrants to Southern California have come, pinning their Midwestern and Southern origins as a cause for the historic conservatism in the region.[23] Indeed, the work of many historians, including Kurt Schuparra's *Triumph of the Right* and Lisa McGirr's *Suburban Warriors*, recognize the Southland as an important bastion and even cradle of twentieth century conservatism. The antifederalism of Western conservatism held a deep attraction for American Indians and proved to be the central point upon which the two groups usually met. Although some claim the area lacked a conservative movement prior to the

[21] William Medina, "Selling Patriot Indians at Sherman Institute during World War I," *The Indian School on Magnolia Avenue: Voices and Images from Sherman Institute*, Clifford Trafzer, Matthew Sakiestewa Gilbert, and Lorene Sisquoc, eds. (Corvallis: Oregon State University Press, 2012), 69 &72.

[22] Laurence Hauptman, telephone interview with the author, 15 October 2013.

[23] Kurt Schuparra, *Triumph of the Right: The Rise of the California Conservative Movement, 1945-1966* (Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe, 1998), xxi-xxii. Schuparra points to the work of others, including historians Carey McWilliams and Lisa McGirr as well as political scientists Fred Greenstein and Raymond Wolfinger, who have noted the contribution immigrant backgrounds have made to the political makeup of the region. Indeed, the region and Southern California Indian Country in particular experienced a large number of pro-Confederate copperheads during the Civil War. See Steve Lech, *Pioneers of Riverside County: The Spanish, Mexican and Early American Periods* (Charleston, SC: History Press, 2012), 85-7. While the coastal counties of the region have shifted to the left on the political spectrum in recent history, the inland areas, including the reservations, have remained conservative. Larry Gerston & Terry Christensen, *California Politics and Government: A Practical Approach* (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning, 2003), 13 & John Micklethwait & Adrian Wooldridge, *The Right Nation: Conservative Power in America* (New York: Penguin Press, 2004), 243. Lisa McGirr, *Suburban Warriors: The Origins of the New American Right* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2001).

late-1950s, this study shows there were indeed strong conservative politics at play in the region that influenced its Native politics as well.[24] It is thus little coincidence that the Cahuilla intellectual and one-time Federationist Rupert Costo was a Republican. Costo and his wife were family friends of Richard Nixon with whom he played football at Whittier College in the 1920s under the tutelage of another Republican Southern California Indian with strong connections to the Mission Indian Federation, Wallace Newman.[25]

Scholars have long noted a division among reservation communities between "conservatives" or "traditionalists" and "progressives," "hostiles" and "friendlies," divisions that are often labeled "factionalism."[26] However, Cahuilla historian Edward Castillo noted, "when whites have political differences, they call it democracy, but when we have differences they call it factionalism."[27] Indian Agents first classified such political divides among reservation communities. Perhaps some such individuals held simplistic views of tribal life, and expected unity among the ranks, although they no doubt quickly identified the "friendlies" and the "hostiles" among the groups with whose oversight they were charged. Nonetheless, the majority of Indian Bureau agents and

[24] Schuparra, *Triumph of the Right*, xvi.

[25] Jeanette Henry Costo and Jan Erickson, "Transcription of Oral History Interview with Jeanette Henry Costo," July 27, 1998, Oral History Project, University of California, Riverside, http://www.ucrhistory.ucr.edu/pdf/costo.pdf, 13, (accessed February 13, 2015); Alexander Ewen and Jeffrey Wollock. "Costo, Rupert." *Encyclopedia of the American Indian in the Twentieth Century* (New York: Facts on File, Inc., 2014). American Indian History Online. Facts on File, Inc. http://www.fofweb.com/activelink2.asp. Wallace Newman was the nephew of the third president of the Mission Indian Federation, Jim Martinez. California Senate Interim Committee on California Indian Affairs, *Progress Report to the Legislature by the Senate Interim Committee on California Indian Affairs*, (Sacramento: Senate of the State of California, 1955), 245.

[26] Hertzberg, *The Search for an American Indian Identity*, 6.

[27] Edward Castillo, personal interview with the author, 19 December 2014, Riverside, California.

employees had trouble seeing the complex politics at play at the tribal or reservation level.

It can be tempting for scholars, no doubt as it was for bureaucrats at times, to draw sharp lines around each group or so-called "faction." In her seminal *Search for an American Indian Identity*, historian Hazel Hertzburg noted, "'Progressives' were those who attempted to cooperate with the government and adapt themselves to the way of life of the dominant society, while 'conservatives' were uncooperative and clung to old tribal ways."[28] This was indeed an apt definition in the broadest sense of things, although the rest of her lengthy volume attests to the complexities that quickly appear beyond such broad designations. As she noted, even most progressive Indians did not want to entirely abandon their Native identities and found many things, to varying degrees, useful to meld with new outlooks, beliefs, and learning from the non-Indian world.[29] This study shows even more complexity, with many progressive reservation residents who remained proud of their Native heritage and conservatives or traditionalists who, after hundreds of years of contact with non-Europeans, were mostly Catholic Christians who retained a number of traditional religious beliefs and practices, often spoke Spanish and/or English in addition to their Native languages, and often complained of their inability as government wards to purchase tractors for their farms.

[28] Hertzberg, *The Search for an American Indian Identity*, 6. Both Indians and non-Indians used such terms throughout the time under study and, as such, I use them throughout this work. The reader should bear in mind, however, the issues that accompany such terms, since many traditionalists accepted many aspects of non-Native life such as the use of modern technology. Being conservative or traditional did not indicate backwardness or a complete unwillingness to work with the modern, non-Native world, but rather a protectiveness of their tribal lands and lives.

[29] Ibid., 22.

Though this work argues for a broad label of American Indian conservatism at one level, it nevertheless does not presume to ignore the complex and fluid nature of culture and identity. As such, I avoid the terms "assimilated" and "assimilationist." Assimilationism implies the melting pot theory of the culture of the United States, a congealing of peoples into a common "American" identity while stripping away their differences. Many have labeled, and continue to label, Indian people who (have) adopted Euro-American clothing, language, and religion as assimilated and those who support the same for their people as assimilationists. However, the term is immensely problematic when examining the history of the Mission Indian people.

Longtime Federation president Adam Castillo is a perfect example of how such a term simply does not suffice in Southern California Indian Country. Castillo attended to a government day school as a child, was literate and eloquently spoke English and Spanish, was a Catholic Christian, often wore suits and a brown derby, successfully farmed hay and apricots, traveled across the country dozens of times to argue the Mission Indian Federation's cases in front of congressional committees, and passionately fought for termination and to be treated as an equal with his non-Indian neighbors. No doubt, many would dub such a man an assimilated progressive. However, Castillo was deeply and integrally involved in the tribal life of the Soboba reservation where he lived his entire life. He held traditional political and religious office in the village, spoke Cahuilla and Luiseño, knew Cahuilla and Luiseño culture very well, and fought to preserve that legacy. Likewise, he joined with conservative politicians at the local and national levels to fight for termination to remove government interference in and restrictions on tribal lives.

Castillo obviously was not assimilated into non-Indian society, nor was he an assimilationist. Some modern scholars identify a continuum of acculturation of which assimilation is the final phase.[30] In fact, some have identified a resurgence in Indian identities in the second half of the twentieth century as an unintended consequence of assimilative policies implemented by the federal government. Many of these, including a need for intertribal communication on political fronts, work on Claims Cases against the federal government for loss of lands and resources, the rise of non-Indian *lingua francas* among Native people, and off-reservation, urban contact, had worked among Southern California Indians several decades prior to their effects on Indian people in other parts of the United States.[31] Such analysis proves the ability of Indian people to retain their identity in the face of such assimilative pressures. It is therefore best to remember the sliding scale of acculturation and recall that culture is indeed very complicated instead of placing labels tinged with negative tones upon people who did their best to survive.

Another term requires explanation, as well: "Mission Indian." Once applicable to the Native peoples of California who had come under the influence of the Spanish mission system from San Diego up the coast to above San Francisco, it soon came to denote tribes of the southern-most counties of the state.[32] The moniker has generally been problematic as not all groups referred to as Mission Indians, especially those located well inland or in sufficiently inaccessible places, even had historic ties to or experiences with the Spanish

[30] Ricardo L. Garcia and Janet Goldenstein Ahler, "Indian education: Assumptions, Ideologies, Strategies" in Teaching American Indian Students, J. Reyhner, ed. (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1992), 24.

[31] Joane Nagel, *American Indian Ethnic Renewal: Red Power and the Resurgence of Identity and Culture* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), 113-26.

[32] Diana Meyers Bahr, *From Mission to Metropolis: Cupeño Indian Women in Los Angeles* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1993), 33.

missionaries who occupied the coast. The term Mission Indian is helpful, however, in that it provides a common identity to a number of different nations and subdivisions thereof who have strong cultural, familial, historic, and religious ties. Some scholars have used it to dub the region the "Mission Indian subculture."[33] The Federation appropriated the term as a source of unity. It did so by turning the designation back upon the United States government that had first imposed it to ease colonial administration with the creation of the Mission Indian Agency. Similarly, some Southern California Indians found it easier to use the generalized term in non-Indian situations instead of using their relatively unknown tribal designations of Cahuilla, Chemehuevi, Cupeño, Luiseño, Kumeyaay, and Serrano. "'Just say you're Mission Indian. That way then everybody won't foul it up. Just say you're a California Mission Indian,'" a Cupeño woman recalled her mother telling her.[34] Indeed, given the complex familial ties across tribal and racial lines, the very subject of identity among Southern California Indians alone deserves scholarly attention.

In this work, I use the terms Mission Indian, American Indian, Native American, and Native Californian for variety of word choice. Whenever the tribal affiliation of individual is available, I give preference to that designation, and as Native identity in the region is still tied very closely to the village level, I likewise use reservation residence or affiliation when available. Other terms are used for identification as well, most notably Federationists and non- or anti-Federationists, denoting either membership or non-

[33] Lowell Bean, "Morongo Indian Reservation: A Century of Adaptive Strategies," *American Indian Economic Development*, Sam Stanley, ed. (The Hague: Mouton Publishers, 1978), 191.

[34] Belva May Helm in Bahr, *From Mission to Metropolis*, 33. Throughout its existence in the twentieth century, the agency included the Chumash reservation of Santa Ynez. However, from the historical record, the members of the Santa Ynez Band do not appear to have had much of a connection, political or otherwise, with the rest of the reservations of the Agency.

membership in or even opposition to the Mission Indian Federation, as for many years to varying different degrees across the reservations of Southern California Indian Country such was often a pivotal point of identity. Although such terminology and affiliations divided the land, it is important to remember the ties between all of those involved and the divisions the heady politics of the twentieth century created and/or exacerbated. Still, when stepparents told a young Luiseño girl that she was "a different type of Indian," she recalled thinking that she "was not *different*. I thought of [sic] being *Human* was the same *everywhere*."[35]

In that spirit, I endeavor to humanize this history as much as possible throughout this study. Like all human history, this is one at times filled with decisions and behavior looked back upon from the present as both memorable and regrettable. However, reasons existed for the behaviors of those involved on all sides of the story as people lived in times and situations very different from present-day realities. Many government bureaucrats and politicians held sincere desires to help Indian peoples, although a paternalism that saw Natives as helpless children with a culture and way of life destined to fade from the world often colored their work. A cold reality of the near decimation of the hundreds of nations of what are now the United States and a racially tinged, ethnocentric nationalism that pervaded the country grounded such views. Of course, some people had less-than-noble intentions working in the Indian Bureau; people out for selfish gain and those who simply could not have cared less for the people on whose behalf they worked. Paternalism had a

[35] Wa Wa Chaw Calac Nuñez, *Spirit Woman: The Diaries and Paintings of Bonita Wa Wa Calachaw Nuñez*, Sam Steiner, ed. (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1980), 102.

more sinister counterpart in out-right racism that played an unfortunately large role in the history of Indian Country as well.

Likewise, the history of Southern California Indians is a very human history affected by familial problems, disputes among neighbors, and the competition for limited resources. During the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, American Indians struggled to maintain their Native cultures, languages, religions, and homelands. Native societies in Southern California developed chaotically with government involvement, forcing leaders to negotiate with the outside world at the same time. The difficult, and at times harsh, decisions made by those in the Federation show the difficult position in which they found themselves, attempting to navigate their way under the yolk of a colonial system designed to control them, their lands, culture, and religion. Native pragmatism is very often evident as people adopted various aspects of the new cultures and societies around them while holding on to their own, dynamic culture at the same time.

Native religious philosophy and beliefs, shaped by the land in which the people lived and continue to live, lie at the very heart of their cultures. My first chapter brings the reader into Southern California Indian Country to layout the setting from which the Mission Indian Federation arose and operated. Creation stories paint a vivid picture of the landscape that affected the politics of the various bands involved, most importantly around issues of water and farming and rangelands. In the second chapter, readers encounter the invasions of this landscape from the Spanish and Rancho eras to the turn of the twentieth century and the early stages of resistance from California Indians against

colonial powers. It examines the impact of Mexican independence and the secularization of the mission system on local Indian peoples, as well as the significance of the American invasion and takeover of California. Colonial effects upon the political systems of the region were profound and shaped the history of the region to this very day. I examine the crucial, early betrayal of the region's Indian peoples by the United States through its Unratified Treaties of 1852. The chapter analyzes the origin, nature, and functioning of the reservation system among Native Californians at the turn of the twentieth century. I provided this in order to show the difficult situation that led to the unique politics of the region and the origins of the Native sovereignty movement.

The third chapter examines the creation of the Mission Indian Federation in 1919 and its political positions that quickly developed into a conservative organization that worked with small-government politicians and supported the traditional leadership's control over reservation lands and resources. Analysis of this unlikely alliance helps to make sense of the Federation's seemingly contradictory opposition to the so-called progressive policy of allotment and its later support of tribal termination. The divide between younger, boarding-school-educated tribal members and the older traditionalists emerged, as did divisions between traditional leadership families and new leaders, including those who married non-Indians outside of tribal communities. Federation leadership in Claims Case suits brought against the federal government after 1946 for the theft of land, water, and other resources taken from tribes also highlights the long memories of the traditionalists. While Indian agents urged tribal members to work "progressively" with them for the future, the Federation refused to do so without the

government making amends for the wrongs the United States committed at the beginning of its relationship with Southern California Indians.

The next chapter explores the Federation's attempt at advocacy against federal control over tribal lives on a national level in the 1930s. Only two years after its founding of the national American Indian Federation (AIF) in 1934, most members of the Mission Indian Federation severed their ties with the AIF given the intrusion of far-right Nazi sympathizers and chaotic, often corrupt internal politics of the AIF. This chapter explains the involvement of some American Indians with far right extremists who courted various conservative Native groups as part of a wider anti-New Deal movement. It analyzes the effect such conservative alliances had on Native Americans, showing the disastrous results of the endeavor for the MIF both nationally and locally, as a crackdown upon dissent from the Indian Bureau severely hampered the operation of both Federations. The backlash from the Bureau against these conservative Indian organizations that found themselves involved with the far right ended the role of the Mission Indian Federation as a Native government on and among the reservations. The Indian Bureau did not defeat the MIF, however, as it transformed itself instead into the local Indian Country's conservative political party.

In the final chapter, I parse the Federation's controversial—and ultimately disastrous—support of the tribal termination policy. For the Federation and its members, termination of reservations and the ending of the special relationship with the federal government meant a final severing of ties with the Bureau of Indian Affairs. It also meant "freedom" for reservations, the end of federal paternalism, and independence for

American Indian people. Traditional tribal leadership that comprised the Federation controlled most of the meager lands and resources on the reservations, and as such, they had the most to gain from privatization. Conservative non-Indian politicians supported termination as a means of shrinking the government and opening reservations to economic development and the exploitation of tribal resources, as part of a larger, ongoing fight over federal ownership of land in the American West. However, many Southern California Indians balked once termination became a reality.

A realization of the nefarious aims of non-Indian supporters and the potential loss of all tribal lands through taxation brought about a backlash and an exodus of people from the Federation. Within a short period of time, the majority of Native Americans in the Mission Indian Agency, and the United States as a whole, did not support immediate termination, and instead advocated for a slower withdrawal of the federal government from Southern California Indian Country. The division between the older and younger populations on the reservations that first appeared in the 1920s continued into the 1940s and 1950s and the gulfs between the families who supported the Federation and those who opposed it widened. However, when the Federation opposed a final payout when their Claims Case suit against the federal government settled in 1958, it alienated it base of older traditionalists. The decline in membership their opposition precipitated eventually brought an end to the Federation's activities and political influence. Because of the political furor that the Federation's support of termination brought to Southern California Indian Country, the trust statuses of only two of the thirty reservations in the

region changed by the close of the period, leaving most officially unscathed by termination.

Even though it was not widely implemented in the region, termination did have a major impact on the Mission Indian people. My conclusion examines the memory and significance of the Mission Indian Federation in Southern California Indian Country. Deep divisions created by the MIF remain to this day and are found in the historical memory of the Federation in families of former members and of families of those opposed to the MIF. Today, the controversial, divisive, and negative aspects of Federation history are largely forgotten or elided, and it stands today as a thing of pride, its leadership honored as patriots for a people who still fight for their sovereignty. Held up as an example of resistance and continued sovereignty, tribes employ and honor the Federation in exhibits, websites, federal recognition petitions, museums, and in the speeches of modern tribal politicians. Just as the political divides that so greatly influenced the Federation are evident today, so are its conservative politics. These principles live on in the region, with organizations such as the American Indian Tea Party headquartered on the Soboba Reservation, once a stronghold of the Federation, the Tribal Alliance of Sovereign Indian Nations, and the Southern California Tribal Chairman's Association, both strong advocates of tribal sovereignty.

While this is first a work of American Indian history, its worth extends to the broader themes of the non-Indian history of the United States. Some may wonder why scholars should care about a relatively small regional group in American political history. In the 1950s, Felix Cohen said that it was, "a pity that so many Americans today think of

the Indian as a romantic or comic figure in American history without contemporary significance… Like the miner's canary, the Indian marks the shifts from fresh air to poison gas in our political atmosphere; and our treatment of Indians, even more than our treatment of other minorities, reflects the rise and fall in our democratic faith."[36] Although a man sympathetic to American Indians, the Cohen's statement still treated Indians as others in the domestic political sphere. However, one might find credence in Cohen's position of Indians as bellwethers in American society given the dramatic rise of conservatism in the 1950s and 1960s, particularly in Southern California and Arizona. One might easily perceive the red scare paranoia that overtook the American Indian Federation during its battle against the Indian New Deal in the 1930s as presaging McCarthyism and the paranoid style historian Richard Hofstadter identified in American history and applied specifically to post-War American conservatism.[37] However, the realities of Native American history provide Hofstader's "paranoid spokesman" with a very real conspiracy against which to guard. Indeed, as we shall see, his "demonic forces of almost transcendent power" take on a much more realistic face when viewed from Indian Country.[38]

I have endeavored to give a voice to tribal people in their history and to make a Native sense of history evident throughout this work, one that surveys a larger arch than that of non-Indian peoples in the United States. The people of Southern California Indian Country, whether pro-Federation or not, were always mindful of the entirety of their

[36] Felix S. Cohen, "The Erosion of Indian Rights, 1950-1953: A Case Study in Bureaucracy," *Yale Law Journal*, vol. 62 (1953), 390.

[37] Richard Hofstadter, *The Paranoid Style in American Politics, and Other Essays* (New York: Vintage Books, 2008), 29.

[38] Ibid.

relationship with the federal government, beginning principally with the signing of the Treaties of Santa Ysabel and Temecula, neither of which were ratified by the United States Senate, much less adhered to by the government. This betrayal began a bad relationship between the Mission Indian people and the United States, one marked initially by neglect and subsequently by unwanted interference in tribal affairs. They also viewed this relationship within a much broader framework of their interactions with non-Indians, whose arrival heralded massive upheaval within their worlds. Through it all, the people of the Southern California Indian Country looked back to their Creation stories wherein they drew their right to the land and their inherent tribal sovereignties.

CHAPTER ONE
"WE WANT THIS PLACE AND NOT ANY OTHER:"
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA INDIAN COUNTRY

You ask us to think what place we like next best to this place, where we always lived. You see the graveyard out there? There are our fathers and our grandfathers. You see that Eagle-nest mountain and that Rabbit-hole mountain? When God made them, he gave us this place. We have always been here…. Our children were born here – How can we go away? If you give us the best place in the world, it is not so good for us as this…. We cannot live anywhere else. We were born here and our fathers are buried here…. We want this place and not any other.

- CECILIO BLACKTOOTH/CELSA APAPAS, 1901

Southern California Indians enjoy a unique history in Native American history, one that laid the groundwork for politics during the twentieth century and organizing the Mission Indian Federation. For Native people, history begins at Creation, as Federation member Thomas Lucas of the Kwaaymii put it, "science says that the Indian comes from somewhere else, from over the Bering Straits. But that don't jive with the Indians themselves…. They feel that the creation put them here, that this was the place.... So the Indian was created right here."[39] Creation stories remain essential to the lives of Southern California Indian peoples. Through them, they trace their very origins and placement in their homelands and thus, their sovereignty. Native memory has surveyed a larger arch of history than those of the agents of the United States who sought to control the region since the mid-nineteenth century. The people of Mission Indian Country have never looked to such outside agents for their right to home-rule since they believe their creator

[39] Thomas Lucas in Lora L. Cline, *Just Before Sunset* (Jacumba, California: J and L Enterprises, 1984), 109-10.

made them sovereign peoples, a position they maintained throughout their history to the present day.[40]

The Serrano people of Southern California tell of their coming into this world at the Oasis of Maara' (Twenty-Nine Palms).[41] There, among the palm trees surrounding the bubbling water in the high, creosote and Joshua tree-studded desert, the Creator, Kruktat instructed them on how to conduct themselves and live. Kruktat divided the world and made territories for each tribe.[42] When he died, the people cremated him high in the mountains to the west of Maara', over the great mountain, Qwirriqaich (San Gorgonio) at Yuhaviat.[43] In their sorrow, the people turned into the towering pine trees that surround the environs of present-day Baldwin Lake, their nuts and acorns providing sustenance for their descendants.[44] The Yuhaviatam (People of the Pines) clan of the San Manuel Reservation came down from these lofty heights to reside at their present home in the yucca and sage scrub foothills below the mountain along the San Andreas Fault.[45]

Still other peoples called Maara' home. Following a war with the Mohave on the alternating red and blue-green banks of the Colorado River, a band of Nuwu (Chemehuevi) trekked west across the Mojave Desert and took up residence at the oasis. Serranos found them living there when they returned to the area in the winter of 1867-

---

[40] Sean Milanovich, "Tribal Sovereignty from Pálsewish," presentation, California Indian Conference, 11 October 2014, California State University, San Bernardino.

Title and Epigraph: Cecilio Blacktooth and Celsa Apapas in Zephyrin Engelhardt, *San Luis Rey Mission* (San Francisco: James H. Barry Company, 1921), 191-2.

[41] Dorothy Ramón and Eric Elliot, *Wayta' Yawa': Always Believe* (Morongo Indian Reservation, Banning, CA: Malki Museum Press, 2000), 198-9.

[42] Ibid., 8, 128.

[43] Ernest Siva, email message to author, 15 September 2014.

[44] Serrano, Accession #1976-95 [NMNH-Harrington_mf3_r101_0267], JPHP.

[45] James Ramos, personal interview with the author, 24 November 2014, San Bernardino, California; Clifford Trafzer, *The People of the Pines* (Patton, California: San Manuel Band of Mission Indians 2002), 68-9.

1868.[46] There these two peoples lived together in peace, farming with the water of the oasis and hunting Bighorn. For the Chemehuevi, Coyote brought the peoples of the Colorado River to Nivigantɨ (Snow-Having, Mount Charleston). There, among the pines nearly twelve thousand feet above present-day Las Vegas, Nevada, Wolf taught the people how to live in their desert and mountainous world and named all of the tribes of the surrounding region, including the Mohave and Quechan.[47]

The Aha Macav (Mohave) and the Kwaatsáan (Quechan or Yuma) both look to ʻAvíi Kwaʼamée (Spirit or Newberry Mountain) as the site of their creation. The Quechan tell how Kukwiimáat created people from clay high atop the rocky mountain that soars nearly six thousand feet above the burning desert near present-day Laughlin, Nevada.[48] Some Quechan stories place the death of Kukwiimáat far to the south, upon ʻAvíi Kwaʼlal (a man creeping around, Pilot Knob near Yuma, Arizona), a sacred place and creation site that today, lies just north of the Mexican line on the California side of the now-diminished Colorado River. Upon this seemingly barren, mass that rises nearly one-thousand feet above the sands and thorny ocotillos, the people performed the first kerook ceremony for the remembrance of the dead under the direction of Coyote.[49]

---

[46] Clifford Trafzer, *A Chemehuevi Song: A History of the Chemehuevi of the Twenty-Nine Palms Tribe* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2015), 115.

[47] George Laird and Carobeth Laird, *Mirror and Pattern: George Laird's World of Chemehuevi Mythology* (Morongo Indian Reservation, Banning, CA: Malki Museum Press, 1984), 43-4, 240, 349 n.8.

[48] George Bryant and Amy Miller, *Xiipúktan (First of All): Three Views of the Origins of the Quechan People* (Cambridge, UK: Open Book Publishers, 2013), 64-70; Clifford E. Trafzer, *Quechan Indian Historic Properties of Traditional Lands on the Yuma Proving Ground* (Riverside, CA: California Center for Native Nations, 2013), 38.

[49] Trafzer, *Quechan Indian Historic Properties*, 43-5.

Kumeyaay peoples from the region that is today San Diego and Tijuana, also look to ‘Avíi Kwa’amée, Wikami in their language, as a sacred creation site.[50] Indeed, Kumeyaays teach that their souls returned to the mountain in the afterlife.[51] The Kachawharr song cycle of the Kumeyaay speaks of the Creator, Tuchaipa, and his younger brother, Yokomat, coming forth from the hot springs at the village of Jacumba. From here, among the bolder fields north of the present Mexican frontier, the brothers traveled west into the chaparral and mixed-pine forests of the San Ysidro Mountains. They came down through the coastal sage scrub foothills east of present-day San Diego to the majestic shores of the Pacific Ocean and the estuaries of San Diego Bay in search of brides.[52] A great snake containing all of the knowledge in the world lived far out among the crashing waves, roaring sea lions, and black and white auks of Wicuwul (the Coronado Islands). The early people killed this snake near Wikami, thus spreading knowledge to the people.[53]

North of the Coronados, forty-one miles off the coast, lies Kíímki and Haráá$a (San Clemente and Santa Catalina Islands) where the Payómkawichum (Luiseño) believe

[50] T.T. Waterman, “The Religious Practices of the Diegueño Indians,” *University of California Publications in Archaeology and Ethnography*, vol. 8, no. 6, 341-2.

[51] Edward S. Curtis, *The North American Indian: Being a Series of Volumes Picturing and Describing the Indians of the United States and Alaska*, vol. 15 (1926), 50.

[52] Hatakek, “Kachawharr Song,” in Constance Goddard Du Bois, “Ceremonies and Traditions of the Diegueño Indians,” *Journal of American Folklore* 21 (1908), 229. Southern California Nations, including the Kumeyaay, had strict exogamous marriage laws, based upon incest taboos, which forbade people from marrying those to whom they were too closely related. Among the Cahuilla for example, spouses had to be at least five generations removed from each other in order to wed. See George Harwood Phillips, *Chiefs and Challengers: Indian Resistance and Cooperation in Southern California*, 2nd ed. (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2014), 9; and Bean, *Mukat's People*, 83.

[53] Ibid., 339-40.

many beings, mainly their dearly departed, reside.[54] As their Creator, *Wiyot*, began to die, the people took him to the hot springs at the neighboring Cahuilla village of Pauī, high in what people today know as the Anza Valley. As his condition worsened, they took him east to the Cupeño village of Kūpa, in the chaparral-coated highlands, following the Puchorivo (San Luis Rey Canyon) down to the hot springs in village of Pauma and later to those at Malama Ekapa further west down the canyon.[55] None of these worked, nor did those at Cherukanukna Jaquiwuna near Temeeku (Temecula) or Etengvo Wumoma by the largest natural freshwater lake in the otherwise dry region, Paiakheche (Lake Elsinore). There, at the foot of Kalawpa (Saddleback Mountain) on the shores of this terminal rift lake, Wiyot died.[56]

Rising out of the rift to the east and up into the arid Temescal Mountains, the huge mass of Qáwwic Yúykawet (Mount San Jacinto, Ayakaich in Serrano) appears on the horizon. It faces-off with its equally massive partner, Qáwwic Yúyka (Mount San Gorgonio, Qwirriqaich in Serrano), the tallest peak in Southern California.[57] The San Gorgonio Pass, ripped open by the San Andreas Fault, provides a natural causeway between these two massifs where sand piles into dunes, blown about by the strong winds that race through the divide. The Kauisik Cahuilla migration story tells of four brothers who lived at the village of Soboba at the western foot of the mountain. Led by four

[54] Constance Goddard Du Bois, "The Religion of the Luiseño Indians of Southern California," University of California Publications in Archaeology and Ethnography, vol. 8, no. 3, 108, n. 80; Villiana Calac Hyde and Eric Elliott, *Yumáyk Yumáyk: Long Ago* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994), 193.

[55] Salvador Cuevas in Du Bois, "The Religion of the Luiseño Indians," 133.

[56] Ibid., 134; Luiseño/Juaneño, Accession #1976-95 [NMNH-Harrington_mf3_r121_0357-000001], JPHP.

[57] Ernest Siva, email message to author, 15 September 2014; Serrano, Accession #1976-95 [NMNH-Harrington_ mf3_r114_0428], JPHP.

brothers, these people spoke the Cupeño, Serrano, and Luiseño languages.[58] One of these brothers, Kawishcionca, travelled all around the mountain naming locations for his people.

Looking down from a vernal pool, he named Pow ool, the headman spied, at the northeastern foot of the mountain, verdant, palm-shaded springs surrounded by mesquite trees, the main food source of the desert. Since they were included in the territories delineated by his predecessor, he soon led his people down to these springs. There they found another people, the Munalem (first people, probably Serranos), living there. Refusing to leave the rightful territory of this Cahuilla band, the Munalem fought a war with Kawishcionca who forced them to leave. The victors named the spot Sexi (the sound of boiling water) after its hot springs. Today, the world knows this place as Palm Springs.[59]

Ayakaich, known today as Mount San Jacinto, soars nearly above twelve-thousand feet above Sexi, and the sand dunes and creosote scrublands of the Colorado Desert. One of the most geographically prominent mountains in the United States, the peak served as the center point of the Cahuilla world. Known as ‘Asá Kwapáy, the fog bearer, to the Quechan, the mountain is home to a massive granite monolith that looms above the present town of Idyllwild, California. This sentinel, Takwish Heki’, houses the demon Takwish, whom all the nations of the region have feared since time immemorial.[60] Cahuillas maintain that his stirrings cause earthquakes throughout the region to this day.

---

[58] Francisco Patencio and Margaret Boynton, *Stories and Legends of the Palm Springs Indians* (Palm Springs, CA: Palm Springs Desert Museum, 1943), 86.

[59] Patencio and Boynton, *Stories and Legends*, 85-7.

[60] Bryant and Miller, *Xiipúktan*, 175.

Still more *nukatem* (beings from the first creation) reside on Ayakaich, influencing the world and marking the mountain as a significant place of power.[61] Here, Menil[y] (the moon maiden) established the moiety and clan system when she told jaguar, mountain lion, fox, and crow they were not to marry each other, but rather coyote, wolf, bear, and wild turkey.[62] These animals continue to make their homes among the Cahuilla today, and are emblematic of the familial system they largely share with the neighboring nations.[63]

The Cupeños tell how the first people made fun of and dancing upon rattlesnake. Rattlesnake was the Creator Mukat's favorite creation and so, in retaliation, Mukat taught rattlesnake to bite. Rattlesnake quickly killed willow, palm, and fir. He then created prickly pear cactus to kill people, and although it did not work, the plant remains a thorn in the side of the people of Southern California.[64] Such plants and trees still cover the hills and mountains of Cupeño territory as well as that of their neighbors, but none was as important as *wi'at* (the oak). In the winter, the Cupeños would gather at Kut'ava Ali'ma (Rabbit's House), and the women harvested and processed acorns while the men hunted rabbits. Later, they feasted on their harvest, pouring *wiwish* (acorn mush) out of large *ollas* (clay pots).[65]

---

[61] Bean, *Mukat's People*, 166-8.

[62] Patencio and Boynton, *Stories and Legends*, 8.

[63] An Indian hunter, probably Cahuillas from Agua Caliente, killed the last jaguar of Southern California in the mountains around Palm Springs in 1860. The animal reportedly attacked the man as he stalked deer. William Duncan Strong, *Aboriginal Society in Southern California* (Morongo Indian Reservation, Banning, California: Malki Museum Press, 1987), 72 n. 154.

[64] Unknown, "Story of the Creation," in *Mulu'wetam: The First People*, Jane H. Hill and Rosalinda Nolasquez, eds. (Morongo Indian Reservation, Banning, California: Malki Museum Press, 1973), 1-2; Rosalinda Nolasquez, "Story of the Creation," in ibid., 4.

[65] Rosalinda Nolasquez, "Acorn Time at Cupa," in ibid., 29-30.

Thus, the people still say, the Creator placed them in their homelands, establishing an intimate bond between the land, plants, animals, and people. Each nation of the region looked and continues to look to the Creator as the source of their sovereignty.[66] This creation established vital links between the land and the people. While these relationships can encompass the entire world, the stories of each tribe show the extreme religious and cultural importance of specific locations within their traditional territories. Chemehuevi elder Larry Eddy remarked, "When I go up to Mt. Charleston, I have to say my prayer. I can't just go walking up there. He'll punish me. I have to pray to him and ask his forgiveness that I'm coming up into his sacred land."[67]

The numerous hot springs of the seismically active region feature in many of the stories and the people revere their power as well to this day. Since the introduction of the Spanish language to the region, Indian peoples knew their territories as "'nuestro pais'—our country. And God gave it to them—that is the one clear, unanswerable argument to which they always return[ed]," reported one American newspaper of the Kumeyaay village of San Felipe around the turn of the twentieth century.[68] Their captain, Anadot Chapuli, expressed their feelings plainly:

> We have lived here since ancient times. We are natives here; we are not wanderers who came from somewhere else; here out fathers died, here we were born. In the beginning God made this land and gave it directly to us to be our homes; we do not want any other land, even if it is the finest on earth. We are poor, but we can get along if you leave us alone. This is our Country and in it we wish to stay until we die.[69]

---

[66] Anthony Madrigal, *Sovereignty Land and Water: Building Tribal Environmental and Cultural Programs on the Cahuilla and Twenty-Nine Palms Reservations* (Riverside: California Center for Native Nations, 2008), 26.

[67] Larry Eddy in Trafzer, *A Chemehuevi Song*, 25.

[68] "Stage Rolls Down Bank," *Los Angeles Times*, 13 June 1902, A1.

[69] Captain Anadot Chapulli, "Stage Rolls Down Bank," *Los Angeles Times*, 13 June 1902, A1.

Speaking before their eviction of the Cupeño people from their village of Kūpa and its hot springs, traditional *nuut* (leader) Cecilio Blacktooth remarked:

> There is no other place for us. We do not want you to buy any other place. If you will not buy this place, we will go into the mountains like quail, and die there, the old people, and the women and children. Let the Government be glad and proud. It can kill us. We do not fight. We do what it says. If we cannot live here, we want to go into the mountains and die. We do not want any other home.[70]

The words of Blacktooth evince the deeply spiritual relationship California Indians maintained with their homelands, one common among all Native Americans. This connection made it especially difficult for them when Spanish missionaries coaxed them to relocate to the missions and restricted movement beyond their gaze.[71] Fr. Fermín Lasuén added that it no doubt increased the grief of those trapped at the missions to see "their pagan relative in the forest, fat and robust and enjoying complete liberty."[72] Their continued loss of and separation from their homelands during the Mexican and American periods continued to deepen the spiritual and temporal wound. The onslaught forced their societies to adapt to the great change, as well.

---

[70] Cecilio Blacktooth and Celsa Apapas in Engelhardt, *San Luis Rey Mission*, 191-2.

[71] George Harwood Phillips, "Indians and the Breakdown of the Spanish Mission System in California," *Ethnohistory*, vol. 21, no. 4 (autumn 1974), 296. Although missionaries occasionally allowed neophytes to return to their villages on *paseos* (passes) for various purposes reasons as well as venturing out for work or obtaining materials, the missionaries expected them to return promptly. When they did not or if thy left without a *paseo* the military and other neophytes scoured the countryside to return the runaway. If they were unfortunate enough to be captured, they were corporally punished. One must also remember that situations at different missions differed greatly across their lifespans based on a number of factors, including personal characteristics of the missionaries, soldiers, and neophyte officers in charge, the nations being missionized, the climate, the food supply, the gentiles nearby, etc. The neophytes of Mission San Diego repeatedly demanded to choose their own alcaldes while one former alcalde, Cucunuchi (Estanislao) led a revolt at Mission San José. See Tanis Thorne, *El Capitan: Adaptation and Agency on a Southern California Indian Reservation, 1850-1937* (Morongo Indian Reservation, Banning, CA: Malki-Ballena Press, 2012), 12-3.

[72] Fermín Lasuén, cited in Florian F. Guest, "The Indian Policy under Fermin Francisco de Lasuen, California's Second Father President," *California Historical Society Quarterly*, vol. 45, no. 3 (1966), 209.

Contrary the rosy picture Lasuén drew and to some historic and present scholarly understandings, Native societies were not pure democracies or egalitarian utopias.[73] The immense diversity of the societies throughout the Americas alone should give pause to such statements. Although political consensus and redistributive economics was a general norm throughout the region, there were always haves and have-nots among the nations of Southern California.[74] The center of political life in the region was the same as for the spiritual and ceremonial, the Big House, which the lineage or village leader generally occupied by.[75] Ethnographic information shows that among the Cahuilla, for example, the *net* (captain or headman) guided nearly every aspect of his people's lives from spirituality and kinship to resource distribution and individual ownership rights.[76] This was generally a hereditary position, although the people would have skipped over an unsuitable heir. The *paxaa* (assistant), together with a *puvalam* association (a group of spiritually powerful men) assisted him in governing a village centered on his patrilineal lineage. The Luiseño and Cupeño, who spoke Takic languages related to Cahuilla, had similar

[73] The famed Santee Dakota physician Ohíye S'a (Charles Eastman) once poetically claimed: "Once we had departed from the broad democracy and pure idealism of our prime, and had undertaken to enter upon the world's game of competition, our rudder was unshipped, our compass lost, and the whirlwind and tempest of materialism and love of conquest tossed us to and fro like leaves in a wind." *Ohíye S'a in The Soul of an Indian: And Other Writings from Ohiyesa (Charles Alexander Eastman)* (San Rafael, CA: New World Library, 1993), 55. Noted author Tony Hillerman recently claimed of Indians "Unlike Europeans, their societies were (with *rare* exceptions) almost pure democracies, without repression, without a class system, and without hereditary rulers." Tony Hillerman, *The Best of the West: An Anthology of Classic Writing from the American West* (New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 1991), 35. Emphasis mine. His is a classic view that one finds from sources as varied as the historic explorer and politician William Clark and the contemporary Seneca legal scholar Robert Odawi Porter. Lewis Cass and William Clark, cited in Francis Paul Prucha, *American Indian Treaties: The History of a Political Anomaly* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994), 211; Robert Odawi Porter, "The Decolonization of Indigenous Government," *For Indigenous Eyes Only: A Decolonization Handbook*, Angela Cavender Wilson, Michael Yellow Bird eds. (Santa Fe, New Mexico: School of American Research, 2005), 95.

[74] Anthony Madrigal, Sr., personal conversation with the author, 18 November 2013.

[75] Trafzer, *The People of the Pines*, 31.

[76] Bean, *Mukat's People*, 104-5.

governing structures that functioned in much the same way with a *noot* and *pumelum* association and *nuut* and *pulum* association, respectively.[77] The noot had great power within Luiseño society, which was more socially stratified and had more clearly defined leadership families than their neighbors.[78] Such leaders had great religious importance as well, and presided over essential ceremonies and rites throughout the year. People followed these leaders because of their greater knowledge and access to information.[79]

Southern California societies were inherently conservative in nature and tradition ruled.[80] Negative Kumeyaay attitudes towards comets, things that changed and disrupted the balance of their astronomical world, evince an integral view of order and tradition.[81] As non-literate societies, California Indians passed down their traditions, philosophies, laws, deeds, and many other intellectual constructs through songs.[82] "[P]restige, political power and access to economic resources [awaited] those who obeyed the 'songs.'"[83] Anthropologists have posited that this deference to tradition not only tempered dangerous or innovative decision-making, but also maintained the hold on power of those in control.[84] For the Luiseño, possession of *ayelkwi* (powerful knowledge that secured rank

[77] Phillips, *Chiefs and Challengers*, 20 & 23.

[78] Lowell John Bean and Florence Connoly Shipek, "Luiseño," in Phillip M. White and Stephen D. Fitt, Bibliography of the Indians of San Diego County: The Kumeyaay, Diegueño, Luiseño, and Cupeño. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 1998. 226.

[79] Florence Connoly Shipek, *Pushed into the Rocks: Southern California Indian Land Tenure, 1769-1986* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1987), 7.

[80] Bean, *Mukat's People*, 170-1.

[81] Michael Connolly Miskwish, "Kumeyaay Astronomy," presentation, California Indian Conference, 11 October 2014, California State University, San Bernardino.

[82] Trafzer, *A Chemehuevi Song*, 30.

[83] Bean, *Mukat's People*, 121.

[84] Ibid.

and position) created a stratified class system with many specialized officials who could yield the ayelkwi safely as opposed to the commoners who could not.[85]

Records from Spanish missionaries offer interesting insights into Native life at contact, although scholars must remember the perspectives from which they come. Fr. Gerónimo Boscana, a missionary among the Acjachemen (Juaneño) Nation at San Juan Capistrano, observed that, although the captain (whom he characterized as a monarch) was highly respected and exercised important decision-making powers, individuals were generally free to act as they pleased within social constructs. However, when at war, the captain ruled absolutely and, although paying tribute to him with a share of one's hunt was voluntary, it was social practice. Captains often had more than one wife to secure plenty of plant foods for his family who all lived in the political center of the village, the Big House, as it is known in English today.[86] Among the Yuman speaking Kumeyaay peoples, the political leaders, *kwaaypaay*, came from a select few families and governed their own and other lineages that might not have anyone in such positions. Modern anthropologists at times have even characterized reservation captains in class terms, as one described Cinon Duro, captain and kwaaypaay of the Mesa Grande Kumeyaay, as "the aristocrat of his tribe, last of the chiefs."[87] Kwaaypaay often extensively intermarried among the surrounding nations and, in the interest of non-partiality, never governed a

[85] Raymond C. White, "Religion and its Role among the Luiseño," in *Native Californians: A Theoretical Retrospective*, Lowell J. Bean and Thomas C. Blackburn, eds. (Ramona, California, Ballena Press, 1976), 361.

[86] Gerónimo Boscana, *Chinigchinich: A Historical Account of the Origin, Customs, and Traditions of the Indians at the Missionary Establishment of St. Juan Capistrano, Alta-California*, Alfred Robinson, trans. (New York: Wiley and Putnam, 1846), 19-22; Trafzer, *The People of the Pines*, 130.

[87] Constance Goddard DuBois, "Indian Summer in Southern California," in Don Laylander, "Early Ethnographic Notes from Constance Goddard DuBois on the Indians of San Diego County," *Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology*, vol. 26, no. 2, 205.

village from which they came. These leaders exercised a greater role in decision-making and controlled a greater portion of land and resources than other band members did, creating what one missionary likened to a class of poor individuals.[88] Their relatives to the east, however, differed.

Civil leaders among the Quechan, *kwoxot*, were not hereditary, led by persuasion for consensus, and remained in power as long as they maintained the trust of the people. Dreams were very important, and if the people approved of the dreams of one man, they followed him.[89] While anyone could be a leader, some families had more power and produced more leaders than others. Relating the settlement of his people in their present homeland at the confluence of the Gila and Colorado Rivers, Quechan scholar Patrick Miguel noted a "ruling class of the tribe, composed of philosophers, war chiefs, ecclesiastics, teachers and shaman [sic]" as well as a "farming element."[90] Thus, some social stratification with a very limited and fluid leadership class existed along the lower Colorado, as well.

Pre-contact intertribal enmities in the area surrounding the Colorado River led to the formation of two "federations of mutually hostile tribes."[91] However, these "federations," are better termed alliances, as they were strictly military institutions without everyday governing authority. Moreover, while the leadership class often

[88] Florence Shipek, "Kumeyaay Socio-Political Structure," *Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology* vol. 4, no. 2 (1982), 297-300.

[89] Patrick Miguel in C. Daryll Forde, "Ethnography of the Yuma Indians," *University of California Publications in Archaeology and Ethnography*, vol. 28, no. 4, (1931), 134-5.

[90] Patrick Miguel, "The Quechan Tribe," in *Quechan Voices: Lee Emerson and Patrick Miguel*, Clifford Trafzer, ed. (Riverside: California Center for Native Nations, 2012), 63.

[91] Mark Santiago, *Massacre at the Yuma Crossing: Spanish Relations with the Quechans, 1779-1782* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2010), 13-4.

intermarried between clans and even nations, no large, governmental confederations, such as that of the Iroquois, existed in Southern California in the pre-contact period. Governance was, by-and-large, local and the people exercised a great deal of personal freedom.[92] An early Spanish colonizer described the Kumeyaay people as "absolutely opposed to all rational subjection and full of the spirit of independence."[93] Individuals generally had a choice in whether or not to follow the direction of a leader, although most usually did, paying tribute in produce and other goods, given social mores and recognition of the great knowledge leaders possessed. As is evident, however, the degree of political centralization and authoritarianism varied from nation-to-nation and by village-to-village.[94]

However, spiritual relations between the nations of western Southern California were close to such an extent that they formed "practically one ceremonial unit."[95] Among the Serrano and Cahuilla clans of the San Gorgonio Pass, the ritual exchange of *muketem* (shell money) between various clans and across linguistic lines at the death of a leader and during the *nukil* ceremony, which remembered the dead about one year after their passing, helped to build intra- and transnational ties.[96] The same process occurred among clans of the four nations further south, the Cahuilla, Cupeño, Kumeyaay, and Luiseño. Called, *sulakil* by the Cupeño, the "*nuut's* road" served to regulate relations between

[92] Clifford Trafzer, personal interview with the author, Yucaipa, California, 2 November 2013.
[93] Pedro Fages in Dan McGovern, *The Campo Indian Landfill War: The Fight for Gold in California's Garbage* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1995), 71.
[94] Shipek, *Pushed into the Rocks*, 7-9.
[95] Strong, *Aboriginal Society*, 263.
[96] Ibid., 94-6.

autonomous clans both within and across linguistic lines.[97] The money itself came from the Channel Islands, which coastal tribes then traded eastward. These trade routes continued further east, and linked Southern California to the Pueblos of the Southwest.[98]

Perpetuated by individuals like President Theodore Roosevelt, the myth that Indians did not have concepts of ownership and thus did not own their lands helped to legitimize non-Indian conquest.[99] However, Southern California Indians indeed owned their lands prior to European contact. Luiseño elder Francisco Ardea related, "in the old days each family (clan) had a territory marked by rocks and they killed all trespassers."[100] An officer of the United States Army reported, only a few years after the conquest, described "an international law, that [sic] rigidly enforces the rights of all." The "division of territory is well known to, and recognized by, all the Indians. No violation of a neighbor's empire is ever passed over."[101] Concepts of land ownership among the Native peoples of Southern California were therefore obvious to Americans at early contact; settlers and government agents simply ignored them later out of expedience and greed. Scholars have also pointed to linguistic evidence such as the words "*nemehana* (it is mine), *če'mexan'a* (it is ours), and *nexanat* (it belongs to somebody—implying you cannot take it, it is owned)" in the Cahuilla language as evidence of indigenous property

[97] Ibid., 262-3. Strong translated *sulakil* as the "*nuut's* road."

[98] Edward S. Curtis, *The North American Indian: Being a Series of Volumes Picturing and Describing the Indians of the United States and Alaska*, vol. 15 (1926), 27; Matthew Sakiestewa Gilbert, "The Mother of All Rain: Hopis and the Pacific Ocean," presentation, University of California, Riverside, 13 November 2014.

[99] Theodore Roosevelt, *The Winning of the West*, The Presidential Edition, vol. 1, (New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons: 1910), Appendix A to Chapter 4.

[100] Francisco Ardea in Strong, *Aboriginal Society*, 285.

[101] Bvt. Major Justus McKinstry, 28 June 1852 in United States Senate, *Senate Documents, Otherwise Published as Public Documents and Executive Documents: 14th Congress, 1st Session-48th Congress, 2nd Session and Special Session*, (Washington, D.C.: U.S. G.P.O., 1853), 96.

ownership.[102] Indeed, individuals wove detailed descriptions of landscapes into special songs that they owned.[103] These served as land titles or deeds that the owner could transfer to progeny or anyone the owner chose by giving them the song.[104] As many Native people asked later, in the twentieth century "if the Indians didn't own the land, why did they make the treaties…?"[105]

Francisco Patencio, net of the Kauisik clan of Cahuilla, recalled the story of two brothers who lived in the Coachella Valley who quarreled over the ownership of an eagle that had nested near them. The brothers each claimed that they owned the eagle since it nested upon their respective properties. Eventually the younger brother took their mother and moved further down the valley, no doubt having lost the property dispute.[106] Native societies had methods such as this for solving disputes, and they worked so long as the people were free to move about their own lands. There also existed "sociological and ritual modifiers," such as special redistribution ceremonies, taboos against hunters eating their kills, and elaborate gifting cultures at ceremonies that also helped to ameliorate quarrels and disputes that came with competition among individuals.[107]

---

[102] Bean, *Mukat's People*, 125. Many tribes, such as the Cahuilla, had intellectual property rights as well. Bean notes that women often owned exclusive use of abstract basketry designs while men held rights to songs and stories. Ibid., 127.

[103] Harrington noted that the Luiseño also owned songs. Luiseño, Accession #1976-95 [NMNH-Harrington_mf3_r120_0045], JPHP.

[104] Trafzer, *A Chemehuevi Song*, 30.

[105] Domingo Haquioc in "Report of Meeting Held at Soboba Indian Reservation, 3:30 p.m. Wednesday, April 23, 1924," 82891-1921, box 12, CCF 1907-39 – M.

[106] Patencio and Boynton, *Stories and Legends*, 43.

[107] Scholars have noted the uniqueness of Native societies in Northwestern California, which lacked such measures. Lowell Bean, "Social Organization in Native California," in *Native Californians: A Theoretical Retrospective*, Lowell J. Bean and Thomas C. Blackburn, eds. (Ramona, California, Ballena Press, 1976), 102. Bean, *Mukat's* People, 124-5, 135-8, 144-7.

Such cultural mechanisms declined as contact between Southern California Indians and the non-Indians increased after the sixteenth century. Although some might question the importance of indigenous cultural history before the Mission Indian Federation, they would ignore Native American perspectives of the past and the influence of ancient ways on modern people. The president of the M.I.F. Adam Castillo explained it in this way: "The Indian race have no written language like the white man; but the stories of those early days have come down to the present generation from parents and the older members to the children in clear detail."[108] The oral tradition was alive and well among members of the Mission Indian Federation, a tradition that taught them about their creation and place in the world, which was the foundation of their tribal sovereignty and identity as a unique indigenous people. Generations of Southern California Indians fought to maintain their traditional place on the land. In the face of the invasion by the federal government and its Office of Indian Affairs, which dictated policies for and to American Indians, they formed an intertribal organization to promote their own agenda of freedom from foreign interference in tribal affairs. Traditional leaders in Southern California promoted a return to self-rule and full determination of their own destinies, rights they held sacred forces that guided their cultures and lives gave them at the time of creation.

[108] Adam Castillo, "An Indian Appeals to the American Public," 28 March 1950, Coded Records, box 27, folder MIF, R.G. 75, SAO, NARA SB.

CHAPTER TWO
BEGGARS IN THE HILLS: COLONIZING SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA INDIAN COUNTRY

If the treaties had been carried out, the Indians would have been educated as the white children were, and many of them would now be educated doctors, lawyers, and professional men instead of poor beggars in the hills.

-ADAM CASTILLO, 1932

Native Californians endured betrayal, abuse, and domination by three different colonial powers. From Spanish contact and the mission period, through the decades of Mexican Ranchos, to centuries of colonization by the United States, they saw their populations plummet and newcomers take over large swaths of their lands and attempt to control them politically. Although California Indians found themselves pushed to the farthest margins of their territories by the turn of the twentieth century, they adapted in remarkable ways and clung to their homelands and cultures as best they could, and remained forces to be reckoned with in the region.[109] Interaction with Spanish missionaries and Mexican *rancheros* altered the political landscape through population decline and the use and support of Native leaders. The broken treaties signed with the United States followed by decades of political indifference relative to the protection of Native rights and property in the legal complexities that followed the conquest of California created a strong antipathy toward the federal government in Southern California Indian Country. At the same time, however, it ensured the continuance of traditional tribal governments. Subsequent federal intervention in the region during the

---

Title and epigraph: Title and epigraph from a speech given by Mission Indian Federation President Adam Castillo on the La Jolla Indian Reservation, San Diego County, California, 7 February 1932.

[109] The Kashaya Pomo of the Northern California Coast signed a treaty with the Russian American Company, as well. Diane Spencer-Hancock, William E. Pritchard and Ina Kaliakin, "Notes to the 1817 Treaty between the Russian American Company and Kashaya Pomo Indians," *California History*, vol. 59, no. 4 (Winter, 1980/1981), pp. 306-313.

Progressive Era, ostensibly to protect and uplift Native peoples met with a sharp resistance as the Office of Indian Affairs threatened the control of traditional leaders and tribal sovereignty. This unique history shaped Southern California Indian Country and produced the conditions that led to the creation of the Mission Indian Federation and its struggle to maintain the traditional governance of the region.

The Spanish only intermittently visited what is today Southern California for more than two hundred years beginning with the landing of Hernando de Alarcón in1540 near present-day Yuma, Arizona. It was not until 1769 when Father Junípero Serra established their first permanent settlement, Mission San Diego de Alcalá. Although often described as a pliant, subordinate people, California Natives rebelled against colonial domination many times in Southern California.[110] The Kumeyaay leveled Mission San Diego in 1775 and Quechans destroyed Missions San Pedro y San Pablo de Bicuñer and Puerto de Purísima Concepción in 1781.[111] Resistance continued with the famed rebellions led by Toypurina at San Gabriel in 1785 and Estanislao at Mission San José in 1821.[112] After they had sufficiently established themselves along the coast, the Spanish government and the Franciscan fathers who ran the missions began to push inland in search of new converts to the Faith and increased dominions. They moved eastward "until their grain waved in many a valley" of Southern California.[113]

---

[110] Phillips, "Indians and the Breakdown," 291-2.

[111] Robert Howard Jackson and Edward D. Castillo, *Indians, Franciscans, and Spanish Colonization: The Impact of the Mission System on California Indians* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1997), 75-6.

[112] Antonia I. Castañeda, "Engendering the History of Alta California, 1769-1848," in *The Gendered West: The American West*, ed. Gordon Morris Bakken and Brenda Farrington (New York: Routledge, 2013), 281-2.; ibid.

[113] Curtis, *The North American Indian*, 40.

Three inland settlements of the four southernmost missions reached into the Mission Indian Country of today. The missionaries established *asistencias* (assistant or sub-missions) at San Bernardino, Pala, and Santa Ysabel. Tribal histories of the construction of the Santa Ysabel Asistencia and work in its fields tell of groups of six men carrying a single timber from twenty-five to thirty miles. Women and even children joined these groups and collected bundles of firewood from the trees. Upon completion, men worked ox plows followed by women tossing seed from burden baskets. Those who resisted were "trussed up, rolled over on the side, and whipped with a bundle of oak brush heated in the fire to toughen it."[114] It is little wonder that many often tried to flee such places.

Non-missionized "gentile" Indians often raided these settlements for a variety of reasons. A *neophyte* (Native convert to Catholicism) at Santa Ysabel ran-away following a brutal punishment and convinced a group of Cahuillas to raid the cattle and women at the asistencia. The missionaries discovered the plot, however, and Kumeyaays from Mesa Grande killed the Cahuilla raiders, including their leader.[115] That the missions introduced new intertribal rivalries and politics is evident in that Mesa Grandes and Santa Ysabels had reportedly never fought with the Cahuilla before. Cahuilla history recollected a group of Serranos from Morongo soliciting the help of Sísu, a powerful Cahuilla warrior from Palm Canyon. They claimed a group of Kisiánu (Christian Indians) from the asistencia at

[114] Curtis, *The North American Indian*, 41.
[115] Ibid., 41.

San Bernardino had poisoned their chiefs and were out for revenge. Sísu obliged and led a joint attack, although the results are lost to time.[116]

The friars first coopted traditional Native leaders to control the new mission population. Luiseño scholar Pablo Tac, himself born at Mission San Luis Rey in 1820, related that the Franciscan missionaries established the mission at the village of Quechla largely due to the friendship of the local noot who spoke favorably of them.[117] It is possible that the Luiseño leadership class saw the missionaries as powerful purveyors of *ayelkwi* (powerful knowledge that secured rank and position) that they endeavored to secure for themselves.[118] That the various Luiseño villages were in a state of near constant war ("Life was hell in those days," related Rejinaldo Pachito, of Pauma), was likely the cause of the *noot's* friendliness.[119] A similar scenario unfolded among the Quechan when Olleyquotequiebe (One Who Wheezes, Salvador Palma to the Spanish) successfully argued down resistance to the Spanish at first contact.[120] Among the Quechan, however, leadership was more fluid than the Spanish believed it was, and the people eventually over-rode Olleyquotequiebe, and expelled the invaders some seven years and two missions after their first meeting.[121]

After a longer period of occupancy on the coast, however, the Spaniards presaged the American pattern of domination, and selected the most cooperative and acculturated

---

[116] Curtis, *The North American Indian*, 31.

[117] Pablo Tac in Lisbeth Haas, *Pablo Tac, Indigenous Scholar: Writing on Luiseño Language and Colonial History, c. 1840* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2011), 145-7.

[118] White, "Religion and its Role among the Luiseño," 361.

[119] Raymond C. White, "The Luiseño Theory of Knowledge," *American Anthropologist*, vol. 51, no. 1, 13 & 18 n. 11.

[120] Santiago, *Massacre at the Yuma Crossing*, 24-6. Quechan scholar Patrick Miguel claimed that Palma was not the first to meet the Spanish, rather a "one-eyed man whose name was Sarhenti." Patrick Miguel, "The Quechan Tribe," 68.

[121] Ibid., 125-6; Jackson and Castillo, *Indians, Franciscans, and Spanish Colonization*, 37.

neophytes to control the population on their behalf, issuing ceremonial canes so show their authority.[122] Cahuilla historian Edward Castillo related that, eventually, "an atmosphere of fear was maintained through an elaborate system of native informants and Indian bullies, who meted out beatings to those who might oppose this brand of salvation."[123] In the interior, however, where they had yet to establish firm control, the Spanish worked with traditional leaders in order to protect the more-vulnerable frontier mission property.

Owing to the difficulties presented by its location, Mission San Luis Rey operated very differently than others and generally allowed most converts to return to their villages, requiring them only return regularly for Mass, celebrations, and work.[124] "During the rule of the padres the Indians lived in their own villages, elected their own headmen or chiefs, their captains, their judges," recalled Adam Castillo of the interior village of Soboba.[125] The Spanish not only propped up, but also expanded the power of this traditional leadership class. Such leaders retained power and vigorously opposed foreign interventions into their political affairs well beyond the Spanish period and into the twentieth century.[126]

Along the coast, after a longer period of colonization, the Spanish introduced a highly stratified social order to a society that already included at least one higher

---

[122] Pablo Tac in Haas, *Pablo Tac*, 183.

[123] Edward Castillo, "An Indian Account of the Decline and Collapse of Mexico's Hegemony over the Missionized Indians of California," *American Indian Quarterly*, vol. 13, no. 4 (Autumn, 1989), 392.

[124] Shipek, *Pushed into the Rocks*, 23; Phillips, *Chiefs and Challengers*, 28-9.

[125] Adam Castillo, "The Story of the Indian Federation," in United States Senate, Survey of Conditions of the Indians in the United States, Part 29: California (Washington, D.C.: United States G.P.O., 1932), 15775.

[126] Shipek, "Kumeyaay Socio-Political Structure," 296-7.

leadership class.[127] At San Luis Rey, Pablo Tac reported that the missionary himself was "like a king; he has servants, *alcaldes*, *mayordomos*, musicians, soldiers…."[128] Desiring a single individual to represent and be responsible for a whole nation in the hinterlands, missionaries appointed individual captains as their go-betweens among the many clans, the traditional political entities in the region, of a language group or nation.

The Spanish also unknowingly introduced unseen forces among the people of the region that certainly did not go unfelt. Outbreaks of disease, especially syphilis and other viruses and bacteria, swept the missions and extended beyond, into the interior, devastating the Native population.[129] An epidemic in the year 1814 was so severe that one missionary warned that, without help, "Upper California will be without Indians at all."[130] Even overt introductions such as cattle, inflicted damage and transformed the Native foodscape into inedible grasslands.[131] While disease and introduced animals and plants wreaked havoc around the missions, they did not kill everyone, nor did they necessarily destroy Native economies and lifeways.[132]

Population decline had significant social and political impacts for the region. Lineage collapse led to the consolidation of those without a political/ceremonial unit with those that remained.[133] According to Maria Augustine of the Sewakil clan of Cahuilla, the *nets* (political and ceremonial leaders) of these enlarged groups took on greater authority

[127] Phillips, *Chiefs and Challengers*, 46.
[128] Pablo Tac in Haas, *Pablo Tac*, 149.
[129] Shipek, *Pushed into the Rocks*, 23.
[130] Phillips, *Chiefs and Challengers*, 50.
[131] Peter Nabakov, *Where Lightning Strikes: The Lives of American Indian Sacred Places* (New York: Viking, 2006), 247.
[132] Shipek, *Pushed into the Rocks*, 23.
[133] Strong, *Aboriginal Society*, 152-3.

than they traditionally held.[134] This combined with the Spanish practice of appointing one man as the leader of a nation and led to the creation of a new level of leadership. Among the Kumeyaay, the position of *Kuuchult Kwataay* (general) arose due to the threat the Spanish posed to interior groups.[135] The soldiers of the presidios called such persons Capitan Grande (big captain), a name that eventually lent itself to a Kumeyaay reservation.[136] The missionaries, who first appointed these new leaders, set in motion a movement towards political, social, and religious centralization in the region that continued well into the twentieth century.[137]

A Cahuilla of the Ṣewyáykikem or Costakiktum clan, Juan Antonio, became the *chem'yuluka* or *xanirál* of a large group of Cahuillas from numerous clans as well as Serranos and former mission neophytes at the village of Sáxaatpa in Santa Mateo Canyon.[138] Xanirál is the "Cahuillacized" form of the Spanish "general," a rank above captain. Chem'yuluka literally means "our head," and refers to the headman of a large group of people, which some scholars have dubbed federations.[139] Táxxalat, better known as Cabezón (literally "big head"), lived in the Coachella Valley near contemporary Mecca, California, and was chem'yuluka of the Cahuillas and Serranos from present-day

[134] Gifford, "Clans and Moieties in Southern California," 187.
[135] Shipek, "Kumeyaay Socio-Political Structure," 301.
[136] Thorne, *El Capitan*, 18-23.
[137] Edward W. Gifford, "Clans and Moieties in Southern California," *University of California Publications in Archaeology and Ethnography*, vol. 14, no. 2, (1918), 187.
[138] Juan Antonio was reportedly not a hereditary leader. *Los Angeles Star*, 24 January 1852. Cahuilla elder Lee Arenas told anthropologist J.P. Harrington that he was of the Ṣewyáykikem clan, whereas most other sources refer to him as a Costakik. Cahuilla, Accession #1976-95 [NMNH-Harrington_mf3_r114_0420-1], JPHP.
[139] Raymond Huaute, personal interview with the author, Riverside, California, 25 November 2014; Lowell John Bean and Sylvia Brakke Vane, *Tahquitz Report*, electronic copy in the author's possession courtesy Agua Caliente Cultural Museum, 32.

San Bernardino to Yuma.[140] These two men joined forces to prevent the spread of the missions from San Bernardino and San Luis Rey. Although the resultant Cahuilla War saved Juan Antonio and Cabezón's people from Spanish domination, it created a long-standing enmity between the Cahuilla and the Luiseños.[141]

Population collapse also affected land tenure. Historically, the Uto-Aztecan groups of the region generally maintained relatively isolated clans that lived in the territories they claimed.[142] As people consolidated clans, they moved to live with them, as well. The Cahuilla village of Pauī and the demonymic Cupeño village of Kūpa are two examples of groupings of people from several clans living at a common location (around hot sulfur springs) while maintaining clan territories in the surrounding countryside.[143] Thus, peoples from previously autonomous, separate clans began to concentrate themselves on a national basis. In some places, villages became multinational, such as at Wilakal, (San Ygnacio) which straddles the territorial limits of the Cahuilla, Cupeño, and Kumeyaay, all of whom populated it in equal measure with the addition of former neophytes.[144]

Mexican independence from Spain in 1821 marked the beginning of the end of the mission period. Spain designed the mission system to Hispanicize Native populations and create loyal, productive subjects of the king. The missions taught Native peoples European style agriculture and animal husbandry combined with Spanish language,

---

[140] Ibid.
[141] Cahuilla, Accession #1976-95 [NMNH-Harrington_mf3_r114_0421], JPHP.
[142] Gifford, "Clans and Moieties," 186-7.
[143] Strong, *Aboriginal Society*, 146-7 & 249.
[144] Ibid., 85; For a thorough and extensively researched account of nineteenth-century Southern California Indian Country, see Phillips, *Chiefs and Challengers*.

culture, and Catholic Christianity. In the plan, once sufficiently Hispanicized, Native peoples received title to allotments of the lands of the mission while the mission complex itself became the center of a pueblo. In spite of some sixty years of work, the mission system failed to generate a significant Hispanicized Native population.[145]

Liberal reformers and land hungry speculators had long called for the secularization of the missions throughout the Spanish colonies, and they pushed the newly independent Mexican government to seek to end the Church's control over California. Mexico City, however, never exercised much control over the far-flung territory of *Alta California*, and, due to a short-lived revolt for independence by the Spanish-speaking Californio elite, the federal government elevated California to a department that enjoyed great autonomy.[146] The Californios, the nationalistic Hispanic population of the province, greedily desired the vast tracts of land then held by the missions and pushed to remove the Franciscans and open their territories for land grants. The first Mexican governor of the Department of California, José Figueroa had attempted to secularize the missions a number of times before he even received orders from the Republic.[147] His first attempt was in 1826 with an Emancipation Proclamation that freed the neophytes of San Diego, Santa Barbara, and Monterey military districts from *neofia* –

[145] Virginia Marie Bouvier, *Women and the Conquest of California, 1542-1840: Codes of Silence* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2004), 34-5.

[146] Rosaura Sánchez, *Telling Identities: The Californio Testimonios* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1995), 239.

[147] Federico A. Sánchez, "Rancho Life in Alta California," in *En Aquel Entonces: Readings in Mexican-American History*, Cynthia M. Gonzales & Manuel G. Gonzales, eds. (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2000), 33.

their legal ties to the missions.[148] In contrast to many in the department and capital, however, the governor of California, José Figueroa, favored a gradual secularization process in order to avoid chaos and loss of Indian lands.[149] Opposition from missionaries, however, stalled such plans.

In the wake of the revolution, two wealthy Mexican entrepreneurs, José María Híjar and José María Padrés, devised a colonization scheme to enrich themselves by wresting lands held in trust for California Indians by the missions. In 1833, Híjar secured a proclamation from Mexico City naming him governor of California, and set out for the frontier with some two hundred thirty-nine colonists the following year. This greatly alarmed the provincial administration. In an effort to head-off the pair and prevent the theft of the missions, Figueroa issued his own secularization plan, one that protected Native allotments of the missions as well as the interests of the Californio elite.[150]

The secularization process bore striking resemblances to that of allotment, the policy followed by the government of the United States beginning at the end of the nineteenth century. One might think of the missions as an early reservation system, confining tribes to a set area (even naming tribal groups after particular reservations as the Spanish had done with missions), although protecting that land from theft by private settlers. Both policies sought to deed sections of the lands reserved for them under the mission or reservation systems to individual Indians. Both policies also had limits based

[148] Phillips, "Indians and the Breakdown," 298; Hubert Howe Bancroft, "Glossary" in *The Works of Hubert Howe Bancroft: California Pastoral, 1769-1848*, vol. 34 (San Francisco: The History Company, 1888), 797.

[149] David J. Weber, *The Mexican Frontier, 1821 – 1846: The American Southwest under Mexico* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1997), 64-6.

[150] Ibid., 66.

upon the degree to which each government saw the individuals as capable. During secularization, the missionaries were to decide who was fit to manage their own affairs.[151] The Burke Act amended the allotment policy of the United States and allowed local agents of the federal Indian Bureau, an agency within the Department of the Interior officially known as the Office and later Bureau of Indian Affairs, to judge whether or not a Native person "competent" to receive their lands.[152] On the face of it, the governments wanted Indian peoples to become acculturated, private landowners and citizens. In reality though, many unscrupulous non-Natives saw and used these policies to divest them of their lands.

The Indian response to the secularization decree, while surprising to the colonial officials, is unsurprising here and typical of the neophytes. In 1834, Luiseños declared themselves "a free nation (*nación libre*)" and shouted, "'We are free! We do not want to obey!'"[153] As soon as the government removed the element of force (the *mestizo* Figueroa had outlawed capital punishment early in 1833), many fled the missions, heading to towns, working on *ranchos*, or finding relatives living in freedom in the interior.[154] Showing their distaste of the mission system and evincing the animosities it had created among Indian peoples, Buenaventura, a Luiseño former neophyte, reportedly accosted the alcalde, or Native overseer of a mission. "'You alcalde are a son of a

[151] Phillips, "Indians and the Breakdown," 298.
[152] Donald L. Fixico, *Bureau of Indian Affairs* (Santa Barbara, CA: Greenwood, 2012), 98.
[153] Pedro de la Portilla in Engelhardt, *San Luis Rey*, 96.
[154] Phillips, "Indians and the Breakdown," 299-300; Fr. Naciso Durán, cited in Engelhardt, *San Luis Rey Mission*, 89.

prostitute… There is no nation, nor anything. In the coming year you all will be killed,'" he warned.[155]

The reactions of Native Californians to secularization, as with the missions and later the Americans, varied geographically, temporally, and individually. Some sought out and acquired their allotment of mission lands and continued to live a heavily Hispanicized life. Most, however, willingly left. Only now, there was no one to return them forcibly.[156] Some moved to the villages of relatives in the interior, bringing useful aspects of Hispanic life with them. Many, however, ventured into towns such as Los Angeles, finding themselves lost in a "psychological disorientation that often accompanies decolonization." Lives were short and cheap, gambling, fighting, and alcohol all too prevalent.[157]

To its credit, the Mexican government supported Native occupation of established villages over some petitions for ranchos. It also divided some mission lands, such as those of San Juan Capistrano, and even made several land grants to California Indians.[158] However, in nearly all of these cases, they lacked clear legal title to the lands, which seriously hampered Indian resistance and proved disastrous in the decades to come.[159] Following the expulsion of the Franciscan missionaries by decree from Mexico City, mission neophytes and other Indians fell under the mercy of local civil authorities. Eager

---

[155] Buenaventura, cited in Engelhardt, *San Luis Rey Mission*, 74.
[156] Phillips, "Indians and the Breakdown," 300-1.
[157] Ibid., 298-9.
[158] "Report of the Surveyor-General of California," in United States. General Land Office, Department of the Interior, *Annual Report of the Commissioner of the General Land Office to the Secretary of the Interior* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. G.P.O., 1886), 491.
[159] Ibid.; Arthur Woodward, "Lances at San Pasqual (Concluded)" *California Historical Society Quarterly*, vol. 26, no. 1 (March 1947), 30-1.

to expand their land holdings and prevent its expropriation by incoming immigrants from southern Mexico, Californios placed heavy pressure on Native holdings.[160] As their land base shrank, many neophytes adopted Spanish ways and worked the local ranchos in place of the missions. Others joined up with relatives among the inland bands and raided the Californio invaders' ranchos.[161] Under Mexican law, everyone, regardless of race, became citizens of the Republic. Thus, as members of Mexican society, California Indians held Mexican citizenship, a status many held onto in vain in the decades that followed.[162]

Indeed, many Southern California Indians pragmatically incorporated useful aspects of Spanish culture into their lives. Father Vicente Pascual Olivas described the settlement of 580 Kumeyaay at the "civilized pueblo" of Santa Ysabel as having "plantings of wheat, barley, corn, beans, peas and other plants for their sustenance, and two vineyards, with their gardens, their horse stock; and in summer their lands occupied with sheep."[163] However not all groups fared so well. Upon secularization of Mission San Diego, the Mexican government established three pueblos for the skilled Indians of the mission at Las Flores, San Dieguito, and San Pasqual. Although San Pasqual thrived during the Mexican period, the two other settlements failed.[164]

---

[160] Stephen W Silliman, *Lost Laborers in Colonial California: Native Americans and the Archaeology of Rancho Petaluma* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2008), 20.

[161] Phillips, *Chiefs and Challengers*, 67.

[162] José Antonio de la Guerra y Noriega in J. Ross Browne, *Report of the Debates in the Convention of California on the Formation of the State Constitution, in September and October, 1849* (Washington, D.C.: J. T. Towers, 1850), 63.

[163] Padre Vicente Pascual Olivas in ibid., 26.

[164] Glenn J. Farris, "José Panto, 'Capitan' of the Indian Pueblo of San Pascual, San Diego County," *Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology*, vol.16, no. 2 (1994), 149.

Neither was everything peaceful between Native groups. Tribal histories and ethnographic records shed light on intertribal wars in Southern California, usually spurned by times of hardship, such as food shortages. The Luiseños from Temeeku killed all of the fighting men of the Cahuilla village of Īvah in Massacre Canyon over the gathering rights to a chia field and a food shortage at Pechanga led to an eighteenth century war with its fellow Luiseño village of Pauma.[165] However, drastic changes brought about by Spain, Mexico, and the United States brought about even more intertribal violence, including the expulsion of many Chemehuevis from the Colorado River by the Mohaves, and several massacres during the Mexican-American War.[166]

In 1846, settlers from the United States revolted against Mexican authorities in Northern California and declared the California Republic in the tradition of Texas. Unbeknownst to them, the United States had already declared war on the Mexican Republic, and the invasion began in early July.[167] The numerous Native nations of California took a variety of positions during the Mexican-American War. Within Southern California alone, some, such as the Kumeyaay of San Felipe and San Pasqual, Cupeño of Kūpa, and most Luiseños aided the invading American forces.[168] It is possible that, as suggested by some scholars, these groups saw the invasion as a time to seek

---

[165] James F. Scheer, *The Magic of Chia: Revival of an Ancient Wonder Food* (Berkeley, CA: Frog, Ltd., 2001), 11-2; Raymond C. White, "The Luiseño Theory of Knowledge," *American Anthropologist*, vol. 51, no. 1, 13-4.

[166] Trafzer, *A Chemehuevi Song*, 115.

[167] Hubert Howe Bancroft, *The Works of Humber Howe Bancroft, Volume XXIL, History of California, Volume V. 1846-1848* (San Francisco, California: The History Company, Publishers, 1886), 145; Robert Glass Cleland, *A History of California: The American Period* (New York, Macmillan Company, 1922), 206.

[168] Daniel Tyler, *A Concise History of the Mormon Battalion in the Mexican War, 1846-1847* (1881), 250 & 269; Farris, "José Panto," 154-5.

revenge on their oppressors.[169] However, practical interests often played a part, as when, after having helped rout the United States Marines at the Battle of San Pasqual, eleven Californios stole horses from the local Luiseño village of Pauma. The Luiseño people of Pauma took revenge upon the thieves and killed them in an event now known as the Pauma Massacre.[170]

When *ranchero* José del Carmen Lugo headed south from his Rancho San Bernardino to avenge the dead Californios, he joined up with the Cahuilla chem'yuluka (headman) Juan Antonio, with whom he maintained a working alliance. The Cahuillas and Californios took their revenge near Awáanga (Aguanga) east of Temecula and killed some thirty-eight Luiseños. The traditional animosity between the Cahuillas and Luiseños was, no doubt, at the front of Juan Antonio's mind as he spared none and took no prisoners.[171]

Native California emerged into the American period greatly reduced in both population and land base. Francisco Patencio, head of the Kauisiktum Cahuilla, recalled, "the missions took whole valleys, and the Ranchos reached from the mountains to the sea."[172] Many Southern California Indians greatly resented the invaders of their lands, Spanish, Mexican, or American. To those non-Indians who held their confidence, they

[169] Strong, *Aboriginal Society*, 149.

[170] Leland E. Bibb, "William Marshall 'The Wickedest Man in California:' A Reappraisal," *The Journal of San Diego History, San Diego Historical Society Quarterly*, vol. 22, no. 1 (Winter 1976), http://www.sandiegohistory.org/journal/76winter/index.htm.

[171] Phillips, *Chiefs and Challengers*, 84; Millard F. Hudson, "The Pauma Massacre," *Annual Publication of the Historical Society of Southern California*, vol. 7, no. 1 (1906), 20.

[172] Francisco Patencio in "Progress Report: California Saga" (Tribal Council and Publishing Committee of The Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians, Palm Springs, California, 1990), 7-1.

expressed deep feelings of betrayal and knew they had lost what was rightly theirs to thieves.[173]

The 1848 Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo that ended the Mexican-American War and gave possession of California to the United States of America stated that Mexican citizens could either cross the new frontier into what remained of Mexico, or exchange their Mexican Citizenship for that of the United States. In practice, these new American citizens, regardless of their indigeneity, did not receive the full benefits of American citizenship. Worse yet, the new government ignored even the citizenship claims of Native Californians and treated them in the same manner as most other Indian nations it dealt with elsewhere within its borders. [174]

California presented the Americans unique circumstances that challenged the normal policy of driving Native nations westward. At the beginning of the American period, Indian labor remained essential to the economy. As such, simply removing Native populations was not an option. In addition, because of their colonial history and prior incorporation into the economy, a large number of California Indians possessed *razón* and claimed full citizenship.[175] Combined with the chaos of the Gold Rush that followed the 1848 discovery by an Indian worker at Sutter's Mill, and the distance from Washington, D.C., California Indian policy presented the federal government with a nearly insurmountable task protecting Indian rights and lives.[176]

---

[173] McKinstry, *Senate Documents*, 99.

[174] Martha Menchaca, "Chicano Indianism: A Historical Account of Racial Repression in the United States," in *Mixed Race America and the Law: A Reader*, Kevin Johnson, ed. (New York: New York University Press, 2003), 449-450.

[175] Hurtado, *Indian Survival*, 126.

[176] Ibid., 97.

Many Southern California Indians had partially integrated themselves into the newly secularized world of Mexican California. The vast ranchos claimed by the Californios required a workforce. Given their standing position as the laborers for mission industries and that they greatly outnumbered non-Indians during the Mexican period, California Indians remained essential to the economy of the region.[177] Although modern conveniences and technology lured many, starvation and force drove no small number of Native people to work for non-Native settlers. Whether coerced or not, Indian labor in California remained an economic necessity.

In the years immediately following the invasion by the United States, a U.S. Army officer proffered a very astute observation on the state of Indian labor in the newly conquered territory. His is a surprisingly sympathetic and highly accurate account of the power of the relationship between Southern California Indians and their lands:

> Few ranchos have not their indigenous inhabitants, who have become, as it were, serfs of the soil – not by coercion of the law, but who have thus remained on account of the strong attachment of the Indian to the land of his fathers. This has given the rancheros, holding, as it were, a second and more powerful claim over the soil, the opportunity of forcing the Indian's services – not that he owned the Indian, but that he owned the soil, and the soil owned the Indian. How strong must have been this love of birth-place in the Indian, to have held him in serfdom for a century![178]

The non-Native newcomers to Southern California, whether from Spain, Mexico, the United States, or elsewhere, benefited immensely from this condition. "These Indians have built all the houses in the country, planted all of the fields and vineyards… in a

[177] Albert Hurtado, *Indian Survival on the California Frontier* (New Haven, CN: Yale University Press, 1988), 55-7 & 73.

[178] McKinstry, *Senate Documents*, 99.

word, they filled all of the laborious occupations of civilization,"[179] remarked a prominent judge during the early American period. Southern California Indians did not passively accept abuse, however. Indeed, they were very astute with their labor. In August of 1867, a Cahuilla laborers in and about the city of San Bernardino organized at a convention and launched a successful strike for higher wages. The local paper reported on their plans to work with their fellow non-Indian workers and advocates for eight-hour workdays.[180]

The new generals of the region often filled important economic roles. Ranch owners paid the Cahuilla chem'yuluka Juan Antonio for all of the work of his people and he handled the distribution of that wealth. From his village of Sáxaatpa in Santa Mateo Canyon, he similarly branded all of the cattle, horses, sheep, and goats of his group with his personal "JA" brand.[181] Only the daring Ute raider, Walkara, from whom Lugo had hired the Cahuilla to protect his herds, ever tested the control and sovereignty of Juan Antonio and his people. To the south, however, the Cupeño, Luiseño, and Kumeyaay found theirs challenged by a more enduring threat, one that would cause massive upheaval and remain at the heart of Southern California Indian politics for decades to come: taxes.

---

[179] Benjamin D. Wilson in *History of San Bernardino and Riverside Counties: With Selected Biography of Actors and Witnesses of the Period of Growth and Achievement*, John Brown and James Boyd, eds. (Madison, Wisconsin: Western Historical Association, 1922), 16.

[180] "A Strike," *San Bernardino Guardian*, 10 August 1867, 3.

[181] Scholars often corrupt Sáxaatpa, literally "willow place," as Sahatapa. Similarly, the name of Santa Mateo Canyon, itself a corruption, mixing genders in Spanish, was either corrected or corrupted to its present name of San Timoteo Canyon. Cahuilla, Accession #1976-95 [NMNH-Harrington_mf3_r114_0421], JPHP; Phillips, *Chiefs and Challengers*, 175; Cattle/Horse Branding Iron Used by Juan Antonio, Cahuilla Leader, Circa 1850, A248-1 and Goat/Sheep Branding Iron Used by Juan Antonio, Cahuilla Leader, Circa 1850, A221-79, Riverside Metropolitan Museum.

Already smarting under severe losses to the Spanish, Mexicans, and now, increasingly, the Americans, not to mention disease, the newly classified "Mission Indians" reached a breaking point when the sheriff of San Diego County demanded they pay taxes. Although the militia commander for the south, General Joshua Bean, rightly insisted that the United States would not tax Indian peoples, Sheriff Ágoston Haraszthy persisted in his efforts to force payment.[182] Indian people were incensed at such an affront; this was not their government demanding taxes, but a new invader. Antonio Garra, the general of the Cupeños at Kūpa, paid some taxes to county authorities, although not all non-Indian officials assessed him, in 1851.[183] Quechan by birth and highly educated at Mission San Luis Rey, a large, international community had aligned themselves under Garra's leadership by the 1850s. Incensed at the taxation and probably pushed further by skirmishes fought between his Quechan relatives and the increased number of Gold Rush migrants through their territory, Garra spent several months towards the end of 1851 planning a massive war.[184]

What is now known as the Garra Revolt was to be a large, multinational effort aimed at ridding their lands of the invaders from the United States. The plan initially envisioned fighting men from the Tejón Pass through Southern California down into Baja California and east to the Colorado attacking Santa Barbara, Los Angeles, San Diego, and Yuma and driving out the Americans. Such a large, international effort quickly proved impossible as the Quechans soon broke with Garra, the Juan Antonio's Cahuillas were

[182] Phillips, *Chiefs and Challengers*, 92.
[183] Phillips, *Chiefs and Challengers*, 57-8.
[184] Ibid., 101; The term international is used giving more credence to the term "nation" than "tribe."

unable to get the Indians from Tejón to lend their support, and the Luiseño refused to join.[185] As the days drew closer to the planned attack, events spiraled out of Garra's control.

A judge in Los Angeles warned Juan Antonio against siding with Garra, however, and the chem'yuluka declared his loyalty to the non-Indian population as demonstrated by his years of service to the Lugos.[186] Antonio sent word to Garra to meet him at a village in the desert. Garra arrived first, and when Juan Antonio arrived, he seized Garra and his men and carried them back to Sáxaatpa as his prisoners. The Cahuilla leaders turned over the leader of the failed attack to the United States Army after the general and his people received a number of gifts, and the two nations signed a treaty of friendship.[187] Garra was tried by a state militia tribunal in San Diego, found guilty, made to kneel, blindfolded at the head of his grave, and executed by firing squad.[188]

The issue of taxation was certainly central to the affair, with newspapers arguing, "the law should be changed, for certainly the Indians receive no protection from the government and there can be no good reasons why they should be compelled to bear its burdens."[189] Some placed the failure of the uprising squarely at the feet of Juan Antonio, arguing that he turned coat for jealous, political, and economic reasons.[190] One newspaper offered perhaps a more thorough reflection from a wider lens that touches

[185] Ibid., 102 & 105.
[186] Ibid., 106.
[187] Ibid., 106-7 & 113-4. Unbeknownst to the Cahuilla, this treaty was technically without force, since the government did not commission Army to make treaties, nor did the United States Senate ratify it; details no one cared to share with the Indian people.
[188] Ibid., 129-30.
[189] *Los Angeles Star*, 20 December 1851.
[190] Phillips, *Chiefs and Challengers*, 137.

closer to the whole truth of the matter: "Their endeavors to combine the tribes… failed… principally owing to the difficulties of subduing the hatred between different tribes; to the jealousy of the principle chiefs; [and] to the difficulty of effecting a simultaneous rising over so large an extent of country."[191] The problem of taxation, as well as the various causes listed for the rising's failure, continued to plague Southern California Indians Country well into the coming century.

Alarmed by these events, a special commissioner sent to negotiate treaties with the nations of the newly conquered territory of California, part of a group that had ignored Southern California while they focused on their work in the north, hurried south.[192] On January 5, 1852, Commissioner Oliver Wozencraft negotiated the Treaty of Temecula with leaders of the Cahuilla, Cupeño, Luiseño, and Serrano Nations. The following day, he travelled inland to Santa Ysabel where he concluded a treaty with the Kumeyaay on the seventh.[193] Wozencraft secured the signatures of fifty captains and generals and sent the people off with gifts of bacon, bullets, and rice.[194]

These treaties set aside two massive reservations that stretched from Temecula eastward to the Salton Sink and from the San Gorgonio Pass south to the Mexican line. Representatives from a large number of Indian villages in the north of the territory signed a series of sixteen additional treaties with the commissioners that, combined with the two southern treaties, set aside 8.5 million acres of reservation land, more than eight percent

---

[191] *San Diego Herald*, 3 February 1852.
[192] Phillips, *Chiefs and Challengers*, 136 & 140-1.
[193] Ibid., 140-1.
[194] Cahuilla elder Lee Arenas related to J.P. Harrington that upon receiving the bacon, they burned it in their fires, and noticing how well it burned, attempted to plant the bacon as a crop. They tried the same with the bullets while the women ground the rice as they would wheat, acorns, or seeds to make *pinole*. Cahuilla, Accession #1976-95 [NMNH-Harrington_mf3_r114_0419], JPHP.

of the total territory of the state.[195] The United States also promised to deliver large quantities of livestock and farm goods, thousands of pounds of food, clothing, cloth, household and industrial goods, as well as a practical farmer and assistants to improve their agriculture, schoolteachers for the children, and buildings and supplies to maintain their functions.[196]

Not wanting to remove such large tracts of land from possible settlement by non-Indians, the new congressional delegation from California moved quickly to halt ratification of the treaties.[197] Advising the United States Senate on what was "necessary to control the Indians of South California," one notoriously unscrupulous Army officer warned that if they ratified the treaties, they would "concentrate and maintain at the expense of the government a people upon whom we are dependent for the necessary labor…."[198] Such arguments, combined with the concerted efforts of the California congressional delegation eventually won out, and the treaties were quietly shelved. Although unratified, the treaties marked the beginning of the reservation system within the empire of the United States.

---

[195] Roberta Ulrich, *American Indian Nations from Termination to Restoration, 1953-2006* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2010), 112.

[196] "Treaty with the San Louis (sic) Rey, Etc., 1852," January 5, 1952, *Indian Affairs: Laws and Treaties, Vol. IV, Laws*, Charles J. Kappler, ed. (Washington, D.C.: U.S. G.P.O., 1929), 1124-6; "Treaty with the Diegueno, 1852," January 7, 1852, in ibid., 1127-8.

[197] Vanessa Gunther, *Ambiguous Justice: Native Americans and the Law in Southern California, 1848-1890* (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 2006), 19.

[198] McKinstry, *Senate Documents*, 96. McKinstry holds the dubious distinction of being "the only general officer on either side in the American Civil War to be charged, convicted, and dismissed for fraud." John K Driscoll, Rogue: *A Biography of Civil War General Justus McKinstry* (Jefferson, N.C.: McFarland & Company, 2006), vii. The integral involvement of corrupt California merchants in his scheme to defraud the Union Army in Missouri speaks to the nature of some of the forces at play in Southern California Indian Country.

Without ratification from the United States Senate, the treaties were void. Instead of being the supreme law of the land, they meant nothing. Conveniently, no one informed the numerous nations on the other end of these agreements that the treaties were meaningless. As tribal historians reckoned it, "their treaties just vanished."[199] While government officials deviously worked against and hid the treaties in Washington, a good number of California Indians "surrendered their lands to their white brothers, and moved back into the wilderness and on the barren hillsides, on reservations set aside for their use," upholding their treaty obligations.[200] One cannot minimize this watershed moment in California Indian history. The Unratified Treaties, as they came to be known, played a central role in a great portion of California Indian politics for decades to come. The lack of protection from federal reservations led to immense loss of land. This prompted many Indian people throughout the state to enter into complex litigation through the Indian Claims Commission, lawsuits that dominated much of the politics of the first half of the twentieth century.

Many Southern California Indians were initially happy with the treaties, believing that the government was protecting them from the invaders, allowing them to "resume their previous free and mountain life, that possesses charms for them that far outweigh anything to be found in the simple life of a husbandman."[201] They mistakenly trusted the United States but soon they came to realize that it did not intend to keeps its side of the

---

[199] Katherine Siva Saubel and Eric Elliott, *'Isill Héqwas Wáxish: A Dried Coyote's Tail* (Malki Museum Press: Morongo Indian Reservation, Banning, California, 2004), 502.

[200] Ibid.; "Petition Authorized and Approved at the Indian Council Meeting at the La Jolla Reservation, Valley Center, San Diego County, California, July 6th, 1931," MIF folder, Federation packet, Clarence Lobo Collection, hereinafter referred to as CLC, courtesy of Lisa Woodward; Shipek, *Pushed into the Rocks*, 30-1.

[201] McKinstry, *Senate Documents*, 96.

agreements. Added to these difficulties, many Natives, particularly those along the coast at former mission sites such as the Acjachemen San Juan Capistrano were not party to the treaties and never received reservations.[202] Given the negative image and restrictions that came with being an Indian in California, many passed for Mexican in everyday life.[203] However, a great portion maintained ties with extended family members on reservations and continued to practice Native religion and culture in private.

In the eyes of the Indian peoples of Southern California, the Unratified Treaties began a history of broken promises, lies, and deceit by the United States federal government. The tribes "knew nothing of the technique of ratification … always assumed that the Treaties were binding… and surrendered their lands in full faith and confidence in the justice of their Government."[204] It took more than fifty years before clerks working in the secret files of the Senate found the treaties shoved in a drawer for the people to learn the details.[205] The fact that the government was not owning up to its promises was soon readily apparent, however, and many Southern California Indians, most notably prominent leaders like Juan Antonio, grew indignant and demanded what was promised in the treaties.[206]

Meanwhile, hostilities along the Colorado River had degenerated into a protracted war. Following their victory in what became known as the Yuma War, the United States Army made peace with the Quechan and organized a "Quechan Indian Government" with

[202] Phillips, *Chiefs and Challengers*, 140.
[203] Emanuel Olague, interview with the author, 29 November 2014, Chimney Rock, California.
[204] "Petition Authorized and Approved," CLC.
[205] National Park Service, "A History of American Indians in California: 1905-1933," http://www.cr.nps.gov/history/online_books/5views/5views1e.htm.
[206] Phillips, *Chiefs and Challengers*, 150-4.

Hum-sool-le-ya (Lizard Mouth) as headman, a stark departure from their traditional governance. In 1853, the army sent Hum-sool-le-ya to gather their Cocopah allies to join the peace. Wanting nothing to do with the Americans, however, the Cocopahs killed him upon arrival.[207] Following the war that ensued, the victorious Quechans, backed by the U.S. Army, appointed a new Cocopah leader from among their ranks with the understanding that he and his "government" was subordinate to that of the Quechan.[208] Thus, intertribal and external conflicts began the process of political centralization to the banks of the Colorado, as well.

Some officials in the federal government tried to ameliorate the tragedy, but federal involvement only made Indian people's lives worse. Quickly following the shelving of the Eighteen Treaties, in 1853, the U.S. Congress appropriated $350,000 to establish the first modern reservation system under the plan and supervision of Edward F. Beale. Beale, and many government officials in the state, saw the reservation system as picking up where the missions had left off.[209] He established the first reservation at the very northern edge of Southern California on the slopes of the San Joaquin Valley, the Tejón Indian Reservation, "where a very large amount of money was annually expended in feeding white men and starving Indians."[210] Owing to terrible execution and widespread discontent, by the end of the 1860s, the five original reservations had ceased

[207] Miguel, "The Quechan Tribe," 73-4.
[208] Ibid., 76.
[209] Gerald Thompson, *Edward F. Beale & the American West* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1983), 79; Charles Wetmore in William Vandever, *Mission Indians of California* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. G.P.O., 1876) 7.
[210] J. Ross Browne, "The Indian Reservations of California," *The Indian Miscellany: Containing Papers on the History, Antiquities, Arts, Languages, Religions, Traditions and Superstitions of the American Aborigines*, W.W. Beach, ed. (Albany, NY: J. Munsell, 1877), 316.

to exist, leaving only three in the state.[211] By 1867, the state's major newspapers concluded, "The Indian Department in California [had] been a disastrous failure from the first. Under no administration, in no part of the State, has it given satisfaction. The chief fault, no doubt, is in the system."[212]

Incoming settlers from the United States and elsewhere viewed Southern California with hungry eyes and often had little compunction about taking Indian land. "It is a place to be coveted, and that without a violation of the Decalogue," wrote traveler David L. Phillips.[213] With no reservations to hinder them, non-Indian settlers began to claim legal title to Indian lands. The pressures of the new waves of immigration wore heavily on California Indians who suffered epidemics, loss of land, and food and water resources. Months before formal admittance to the Union in late 1850, the California State Legislature passed "An Act for the Government and Protection of Indians," which, in practice, was anything but. The law allowed non-Indians to indenture Native children until the age of fifteen for girls and eighteen for boys.[214] Beyond this, it legislated that the courts could not prosecute whites on the testimony of an Indian and ruled many traditional practices such as fire swidden management of lands as illegal.[215]

Native populations plunged in the 1850s, mostly in the northern regions of the new state given the extraordinary pressures of the Gold Rush. The new state government

---

[211] *Exterminate Them: Written Accounts of the Murder, Rape, and Enslavement of Native Americans during the California Gold Rush, 1848-1868*, Clifford E. Trafzer, Joel R. Hyer, eds. (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1999), 26-8.

[212] "The Humboldt Indian War," *Daily Alta California*, 24 April 1867, p. 2.

[213] David L Phillips, "Letter No. XIII" in *Letters from California: Its Mountains, Valleys, Plains, Lakes, Rivers, Climate and Productions* (Springfield: Illinois State Journal Company, 1877), 114.

[214] Hurtado, *Indian Survival*, 130.

[215] Ibid.

sponsored genocide as it funded death squads that slaughtered entire villages. Some county and city governments even offered bounties on Indian scalps and heads.[216] Life in the south was no more pleasant as American ranching and viticulture interests grew and required plentiful, cheap labor. Although California entered the Union as a free state in 1850, Los Angeles came to possess its own unique slave market. On Sunday mornings, sheriff's posses rounded-up inebriated Indians like cattle into corals. The Sheriff auctioned-them-off the next morning to whoever would pay their bails, feed, and clothe them. In return, they worked as indentured servants for their bondsman for the week. Come Saturday evening, the ranchers and viticulturists paid them partially in alcohol in order to perpetuate the cycle.[217] One observer satirically noted that the city's residents were "a moral and intelligent people and many of them disapprove[d] of the custom on principle, and hope[d] it [would] be abolished as soon as the Indians [were] all killed off."[218] One Acjachemen history described such times as "*la ley del tigre*," the law of the tiger.[219]

In the countryside, squatters from the United States and Mexico, mainly Sonora, stole fields, homes, and lands that even the Mexican government recognized legally belonged to tribal villages such as San Pasqual.[220] Whenever land became desirable to the increasing tide of settlers, these would then work the political system through the federal

---

[216] Brendan C. Lindsay, *Murder State: California's Native American Genocide, 1846-1873* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2012), 208-12.

[217] Richard Steven Street, *Beasts of the Field: A Narrative History of California Farmworkers, 1769-1913* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2004), 123-4.

[218] J. Ross Browne, *Crusoe's Island: A Ramble in the Footsteps of Alexander Selkirk* (New York: Harper & Brothers Publishing, 1867), 284.

[219] Luiseño/Juaneño, Accession #1976-95 [NMNH-Harrington_mf3_r121_0583-000001], JPHP.

[220] Shipek, *Pushed into the Rocks*, 91.

land office and by petitioning officials at every level of government for title. Unfortunately, the government was often apt to side with such "importunate white applicant[s]."[221] In so doing, the General Land Office often ignored legal stipulations that secured Indian land rights or simply ignored their petitions.[222]

Out of sheer greed and racist disregard, incoming whites characterized the Indians of the region as treacherous vagabonds and thieves; loafers who did nothing to improve the land and instead lived off the produce of the whites.[223] Federal agents found no evidence to support such charges, and instead learned of the dispossession of Indian lands and livestock. The fact that any improvements to their fields, gardens, or vineyards would only benefit those who stole them removed any incentive to continue any work.[224] Pointedly, perhaps the most humane assessment of the situation by a white settler of the region suggested that there was "worthless land enough upon every ranch for Indians to live on" and work as peon laborers for the squatters who stole their lands.[225]

Indian citizens, unrecognized as they were, found little support or help from the local legal authorities. In 1856, a group of Juaneños sought redress against a group of squatters from the local district court judge, Benjamin Hayes.

> During the past year, some Sonorians have usurped the water, and even intruded upon the little lots of the Indians. Ignorant of our laws, without means to pay lawyers, they recently came twice to Los Angeles, to complain to me. What could I do for them? Nothing—effective. Nor have we an Indian agent to take their cause in hand. As they had irretrievably lost their crop for the present year, (which they themselves suggested, but wanted protection for the future), I told them, if

---

[221] Charles Wetmore in William Vandever, *Mission Indians of California* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. G.P.O., 1876) 7.
[222] Shipek, *Pushed into the Rocks*, 36 & 39-40.
[223] Farris, "José Panto," 158.
[224] Phillips, *Chiefs and Challengers*, 194.
[225] Farris, "José Panto," 158.

> they were intruded upon again this fall at planting and sowing time, to come to me and I would recommend them to a lawyer from whom they could get advice. What a prospect this, to an unsophisticated Indian! How will he ever comprehend why the *Juez de Distrito* cannot give him redress, with the simple waving of his cane![226]

Southern California Indians thus began to see the sheer indifference of American government, even when people broke its own laws, and took note. For many, they were now on their own against both squatters and the government. Leaders from tribes throughout the region soon utilized private legal counsel to varying degrees of success.

Many incoming people from the United States practiced a form of Manifest Destiny still darker, greedier, and more sinister than just squatting on Indians lands. "The American people know they are to occupy all the rich portions of this coast, and that the red men are to die out" claimed the *Daily Alta California*, "the sooner the savages are exterminated, the better for all parties."[227] Such attitudes prevailed, no doubt, when, in 1865, non-Indian settlers placed the heads of three Chemehuevi boys on pikes at the top of the Cajón Pass. Retaliatory raids and attacks by Southern Paiutes of the Mojave Desert touched off a series of militia campaigns that drove the Yuhaviatam clan Serrano, people uninvolved in the incidents yet possessing lands surrounding recent gold discoveries, out of the San Bernardino Mountains to the valley below.[228] The campaigns culminated in the thirty two day "battle" during which a militia force dubbed "Army of the Mojave" massacred hundreds of Payuche (Southern Paiute) people at Chimney Rock, just east of

[226] Benjamin Hayes and Marjorie Tisdale Wolcott, *Pioneer notes from the diaries of Judge Benjamin Hayes, 1849-1875* (Los Angeles: Private Printing, 1929), 115-6.

[227] "The Humboldt Indian War," *Daily Alta California*, 24 April 1867, p. 2.

[228] Clifford E. Trafzer, *The People of San Manuel* (Patton, CA: San Manuel Band of Mission Indians, 2002), 63-9.

present-day Victorville.[229] Fortunately for the Cahuilla of Agua Caliente, Pedro Chino, their leader and a very powerful *pavuul* (the highest order of shamans), and was able to draw and deflect the bullets of a party sent to massacre them in Chino Canyon.[230]

Beyond murder and squatting, political corruption and graft were rampant in the new state. One American visitor took pains to note that the state definitely had many incomers who hoped to "share in the spoils of official knavery and corrupt political life."[231] Indeed, this corruption was rampant and was at its worst in the realm of Indian affairs. A cabal of settlers got the sheriff to evict the Luiseños of Temeeku, arguing that their poverty, traditional houses, and migrant labor were all evidence of *their* squatter nature. After all, why would anyone "make such an outcry about ejecting a lot of worthless Indians from lands which they never owned and never intended to own?"[232] The group planned to not only clear the Temecula grant of its original inhabitants, but also to then sell their ranches in the surrounding area to the federal government as homes for the resulting refugees.[233]

There is an unsettling irony in such a scenario, the federal government buying land from its own citizens to give back to its rightful owners who had lived on it since before the government and the thieves even existed. The theft and graft followed by forced eviction from their homes by the government that gave-in to such swindles greatly

---

[229] Emanuel Olague, interview with the author, 29 November 2014, Chimney Rock, California.

[230] Ernest Siva, interview with the author, 27 November 2014, Banning, California. Mr. Siva believed Chino was using an ancient power to *we'ev*, or dodge, the projectiles.

[231] D.L. Phillips, *Letters from California: Its Mountains, Valleys, Plains, Lakes, Rivers, Climate and Productions. Also its Railroads, Cities, Towns and People, as Seen in 1876* (Springfield: Illinois State Journal Co., 1877), 97.

[232] Phillips, *Letters from California*, 97-8.

[233] Phillips, *Letters from California*, 98-9.

prejudiced Native Southern Californians against it. Occasionally, it appeared that the government had finally come around to take action to prevent the squatting, such as the establishment of the reservations of Pala and San Pasqual. The executive order reservations were fickle creations, however. They had stipulations that limited the trust period to twenty-five years and the president could revoke them at any time.[234] Many Southern California Indians refused to abandon the homes and fields they presently occupied and on which they paid taxes. Combined with local opposition to government protection of Indian people, President Ulysses S. Grant rescinded the executive orders that had established the reserves a little more than a year later.[235]

Southern California Indian agents and superintendents faced many obstacles. They oversaw a large geographic area with numerous small, isolated reservations populated by peoples who spoke varieties of five languages with many dialects from two different linguistic families. Additionally, due to traditional marriage laws, reservation populations were highly intermarried, sometimes across tribal and linguistic lines. The government relied on federally appointed reservation police officers for assistance in enforcing government policy across the poorly funded regional division, the Mission Indian Agency (MIA).[236] These officials often oversaw distribution of meager rations and materiel from the government.

Reservation captains and Indian leaders actively resisted meddling agents and officers. The people of the village of Pauī on the Cahuilla Reservation found "the

[234] Shipek, *Pushed into the Rocks*, 35-6; 91.
[235] Phillips, *Chiefs and Challengers, 185-94.*
[236] Tanis Thorne, "The Death of Superintendent Stanley and the Cahuilla Uprising of 1907-12," *Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology*, vol. 24, no. 2 (2004): 233-258.

restrictions and government of the reservations extremely irksome."[237] Irksome to say the least, in 1912, the arrogant Superintendent William Stanley told traditional Captain Leonicio Lugo "you are nothing," when confronted with an assertion of authority from Lugo. The situation quickly escalated into bloodshed as a subsequent melee left Stanley dead from a gunshot in the back.[238]

The agents also interfered with the self-governance of the Indian peoples of Southern California. In 1853, for example, Indian Agent Cave Couts appointed Maneulito Cota as the general of the Luiseño; a man he could manipulate to solidify his own control as agent. The Luiseño forcefully resisted the imposition of Cota and insisted upon the man whom they elected to leader them, Olegario Sali, a member of an important Calac clan.[239] The situation was bad enough by 1871 for traditional, long-standing animosities, particularly between the Luiseños and the Cahuillas, to give way to political cooperation between regional chiefs. That year, the Cahuillas under Manuel Largo at Pauī aligned themselves with the man they knew as Xanirál 'Aligáariyo.[240]

Sali fought for the independence of the traditional leadership as local agents propped up unpopular, cooperative leaders, and resisted government removal to small reservations already inhabited by different bands. Their demands were thus simple: let us

[237] Stella Atwood, "Southern California Indians," in *History of San Bernardino and Riverside Counties*, 318.

[238] Thorne, "The Death of Superintendent Stanley."

[239] Richard Hanks, *This War is for a Whole Life: The Culture of Resistance among Southern California Indians, 1850-1966* (Banning, California: Ushkana Press, 2012), 40; Phillips, *Chiefs and Challengers*, 189.

[240] Xanirál is the Cahuilla word for "general" taken from Spanish. Cahuilla, Accession #1976-95 [NMNH-Harrington_mf3_r114_0420], JPHP.

stay on our lands and govern ourselves.[241] He found a local political ally in the eccentric person of Sand Diego County Judge Thomas H. Bush, a man who certified his position as a general and advised them to take their concerns straight to "the great Father at Washington" on a nation-to-nation basis.[242] This advice set the stage for many a decade to come, as Southern California leaders, tired of dealing with the intermediaries of the Indian Bureau, demanded a voice with the president.

Sali was finally able to travel to Washington, D.C., and had a personal audience with President Grant in which he explained the plight of his people. Historians note Grant for appointing Ely Parker of the Seneca as the first Native American Indian Commissioner of Indian Affairs as well as for his Indian Peace Policy that aimed to change the federal footing toward Native people away from outright war to assimilation.[243] He began creating the many small executive order reservations that remain in Southern California today, in the 1870s, a process his successors continued. These are but slight shadows of the vast lands traditionally owned by the tribe, or even those set-aside in the Unratified Treaties.[244]

Olegario clearly illustrated that Southern California Indians had a solid understanding of the American political system by that time. When obtaining certification from Judge Bush, he underscored the fact that his people democratically elected him, just

[241] Phillips, *Chiefs and Challengers*, 191 & 198.
[242] Ibid., 188-9.
[243] Francis Paul Prucha, SJ, *The Great Father: The United States Government and the American Indians* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1995), 513.
[244] Gunther, *Ambiguous Justice*, 37-9.

as in the political system of their colonizer, the United States.[245] Native peoples elsewhere in the United States had utilized such strategies, as well, most notably the Cherokee Republic of Georgia and later Oklahoma.[246] It is also evident that a precedent was set for bypassing the local agents of the Indian Bureau and going straight to Washington. Only then were they able to get any results. Their local allies were important in getting them there, though, and the leadership's political skills continued to grow into the twentieth century.

With the reservations, however, came the Indian Bureau, and agents, superintendents, and bureaucrats of all sorts became increasingly central figures in the lives of Southern California Indians. In 1886, noted non-Indian reformer Charles C. Painter worried that "The undoubted good intentions" of the government would "be crippled, if not utterly wrecked, if the spoils system finds recognition in the displacement and appointment of agents."[247] Unfortunately, his worries had already materialized.

The notorious spoils system that developed at the advent of the Andrew Jackson Administration plagued the Office of Indian Affairs (OIA), or more popularly the Indian Bureau, since its inception.[248] Satirist John Ross Browne noted, "the Executive Department adopted the policy of selecting officers experienced in the art of public

[245] Richard L. Carrico, "The Struggle for Native American Self-Determination in San Diego County," Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology, vol. 2, no.2, 199-213. 204-6.

[246] Theda Perdue and Michael D. Green, *The Cherokee Removal: A Brief History with Documents*, 2nd ed. (New York: Bedford /St. Martin's, 2005), 14.

[247] Charles Cornelius Painter, *A Visit to the Mission Indians: Of Southern California, and Other Western Tribes* (Philadelphia: Indian Rights Association, 1886), 29.

[248] Robert Marshall Utley, *The Indian Frontier, 1846-1890*, revised edition (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2003), 37.

speaking, and thoroughly acquainted with the prevailing systems of primary elections."[249] Indian peoples quickly became victims of neglect, politics, and sheer ineptitude.

Conditions continued to worsen as increasing numbers of squatters stole more valuable farm and rangeland as well as water. By the 1880s, poverty and desperation brought on by territory and resource loss forced Táxxalat (Cabezón), general of the lowlands between Yuma and San Bernardino, to "undergo the humiliation of appealing to the county supervisors for aid, so poverty-stricken had his people become."[250] Táxxalat effectively governed a confederacy of the Cahuilla of the desert and San Gorgonio Pass.[251] His son, Gervasio Cabezón assumed the role of general upon his father's death, while Manuel Largo, powerful in a very traditional way, both politically and spiritually, replaced Juan Antonio upon his passing.[252] Although this adapted, yet Native system remained intact for decades after the American conquest, the Indian Bureau constantly undermined the authority of these leaders when officials appointed their own, pro-government captains.[253] Strong leaders of large, unified groups of people like Juan Antonio and Cabezón struck fear into the hearts of both the government and citizens of the United States and California.

---

[249] Browne, *Crusoe's Island*, 290.

[250] Cahuilla, Accession #1976-95 [NMNH-Harrington_mf3_r114_0420], JPHP; *History of San Bernardino and Riverside Counties: With Selected Biography of Actors and Witnesses of the Period of Growth and Achievement*, vol. I, John Brown and James Boyd, eds. (Madison, Wisconsin: Western Historical Association, 1922), 17.

[251] Lowell J. Bean and Sylvia Brakke Vain, "Kauisik History," unpublished manuscript in author's possession, 27.

[252] Phillips, *Chiefs and Challengers*, 235; Cahuilla, Accession #1976-95 [NMNH-Harrington_mf3_r114_0418], JPHP.

[253] Gunther, *Ambiguous Justice*, 62-8; Carole Goldberg, "Public Law 280 and the Problem of 'Lawlessness' in California Indian Country," *UCLA Law Review* vol. 44, no. 5, (1997): 1410.

A story in the *Los Angeles Herald* provided the view of sympathetic non-Indians had of Southern California Indians in the late nineteenth century:

> These aborigines, though *alive*, are good Indians. For the most part they are moral and religious, and have earned their own living by cultivating the soil on which they were born, and which was the exclusive property of their ancestors. Day by day they find themselves crowded to the wall. Their lands are jumped, their hunting grounds have been curtailed, and they find their means of making a livelihood restricted. Not being marauders and murderers the government of the United States will do nothing for them.[254]

However, it is important to note that Indian peoples did not sit idly by while non-Indians stole their lands and livelihoods from under them. Nor did they ask much from the government beyond simple protection of their property, a core principle of the United States.

In 1878, a group of Luiseño captains gathered at the Pala mission and petitioned the federal government to help stem the tide of squatters that ate away at their lands. Pointedly, they noted that they had never and were not then asking for any government assistance or intervention beyond securing their lands. They wrote, "To the present we have asked, nor received no assistance, moral, physical nor material no pay from government. Now we only ask for land and for protection on it, so we may support our families with our labor."[255] Later that year, an upstart writer in Massachusetts named Helen Hunt Jackson developed an interest in Indian rights and affairs.[256] She soon drew the gaze of the federal government and the world to Southern California Indian Country with effects that resounded far beyond her years.

---

[254] *Los Angeles Herald*, 9 June 1885, in Painter, *A Visit to the Mission Indians*, 12-3. Note the play on the popular phrase "The only good Indian is a dead Indian."

[255] "Petition to the Minister at Washington," in Painter, *A Visit to the Mission Indians*, 13.

[256] Helen Hunt Jackson & Valerie Sherer Mathes, *The Indian Reform Letters of Helen Hunt Jackson, 1879-1885* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1998), 9-10.

Jackson first expressed her interest in Indian advocacy with her seminal *A Century of Dishonor*, first published in 1881. The next year, she found herself among the Mission Indians, and soon began a period of advocacy on their behalf.[257] In June 1882, the Secretary of the Interior, Henry Teller, placed her on a special commission to investigate conditions among the various bands and she travelled the region extensively, working with Native peoples throughout the region.[258] When her official government report failed to garner much interest or action, she wrote perhaps the most famous literature centered in Southern California Indian Country: *Ramona*.[259] Her advocacy and the wild success of *Ramona* created a nation-wide concern for Indian peoples, particularly the Mission Indians.

A hotly contested case, *John Morongo et al. v. John G. North and Richard Gird*, pitted two men who claimed some 45,000 acres of what is today's Morongo Indian Reservation and its Cahuilla and Serrano inhabitants.[260] Yet another federal commission headed by a man named Albert Smiley eventually superseded any ruling in the case. The Mission Indian Commission, better known as the Smiley Commission, sought to secure reservation lands for bands not protected in their holdings. However, Smiley was careful not to protect too much land from non-Indian settlement. To that end, whenever he created a new reservation, he reduced the size of an existing one, acre for acre.[261]

---

[257] Ibid., 205-15.

[258] Phillips, *Chiefs and Challengers*, 237.

[259] Kate Phillips, *Helen Hunt Jackson: A Literary Life* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003), 27.

[260] "Several Centenarians," *Sacramento Daily Union*, vol. 61, no. 85, 1 June 1889, 8.

[261] Clifford Trafzer, personal interview with the author, 25 March 2014, Riverside, California; Clifford E. Trafzer, "Native Sovereignty: Then and Now in California and the Northwest," *"They Made Us*

More reservations and an increasing number of letters from non-Indian advocates demanding that the government ameliorate the condition of the Indian peoples of Southern California meant an increase in the staffing rolls of the local divisions of the Office of Indian Affairs. More bureaucracy, however, did not solve the problem as one critic noted:

> There is no dispute as to the fact that these Indians, Christian, civilized, self-supporting, have been crowded… from the lands on which they have always lived, and to which they have, in the estimation of good lawyers, a valid legal, as well as a just and equitable title; and yet, Congress, knowing the facts, has contented itself with expending money on special commissions and committees, and elaborate reports, giving comfortable jobs to white men, and then suffering the cry of these poor people to die out amid the din of white interests, and the reported facts to lie buried out of sight.[262]

A very real case of divide-and-conquer colonialism, this reservation imperialism was detrimental to Southern California Indians as it divided into small political entities nations that had heretofore been consolidating into larger political units that were more effective at combatting outside intrusion. Instead of helping, the agents and commissions also exacerbated the problems increasing federal intrusion into tribal affairs and confusing problems with Native lands. In 1878, Special Agent John G. Ames recommended the breakup of tribal lands into individual plots held in fee simple. "It is for many reasons very desirable to break up the *communistic* customs which have prevailed among them, and to cultivate, as far as possible, a sense of pride of ownership and an ambition of the accumulation of property."[263] Though often well intentioned, many

---

Many Promises:" The American Indian Experience 1524 to the Present, Philip Weeks, ed. (Hoboken, NY: Wiley, 2014), 260.

[262] Painter, *A Visit to the Mission Indians*, 14.

[263] John G. Ames in Phillips, *Chiefs and Challengers*, 227. Emphasis mine.

opposed such actions, including leaders who sought to keep their lands and people together.[264]

Along the Colorado, the towering, venerable leader of the Quechans, like so many other people throughout Southern California Indian Country throughout the years, succumbed to an epidemic in May 1887. "Up to the time of his death, Chief Pasqual never knew that the size of his home land [sic] had shrunken to twenty-seven square miles," noted Patrick Miguel.[265] That same year, the United States Congress passed the General Allotment Act, which proposed to divide tribal lands among reservation residents, much as Agent Ames had suggested. These individuals would own their share of the land in fee simple and were supposed to become yeoman farmers in the Jeffersonian tradition. Some tribal people in Southern California were already aware of the Indian Homestead Act of 1883 and had completed or were in the process of obtaining individual title to lands.[266]

Allotment presented a host of problems in Southern California. The main issue was that "though the reservations for Mission Indians comprise thousands of acres of land… there is not enough land reserved… to give each Indian the full quota of land to which he is entitled under the Act."[267] Even if there were, land tenure in the arid region was far different for government surveyors accustomed to laying down townships on the Plains. Lack of water and rugged terrain meant populations concentrated along streams in valleys. As the reservations often covered limited areas of familial homelands, traditional

[264] Phillips, *Chiefs and Challengers*, 300-1, 310-1, & 316-7.
[265] Miguel, "The Quechan Tribe," 81.
[266] Shipek, *Pushed into the Rocks*, 106-8.
[267] Frank D. Lewis to Horatio Nelson Rust, 26 August 1889, RU 443, Horatio Nelson Rust Papers, The Huntington Library, San Marino, California.

ownership of specific areas also continued, a fact that allotting agents and surveyors often overlooked or ignored.[268]

The refusal of the government to respect the property rights of tribal people who maintained traditional ownership and/or had made improvements on the reservations only made things worse. Arbitrary decisions by government officials and surveyors often assigned individuals allotments that did not contain the houses and other structures on the land. Equalization efforts amounted to the confiscation of "the private property of some Indian families and [the imposition of] 'communal' and 'equal' property rights to insufficient farmland… equal poverty."[269] Given that some people came to reservations as refugees whom residents allowed to live on some of the poorer lands, original band members resented government plans for the equitable distribution of lands among the population.[270] Neither did any of this sit well with the leadership class on the reservations, who usually controlled more land and resources than others did. Worse yet, federal courts up to the Supreme Court of the United States ignored provisions of Mexican law and the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo and, through legal loopholes and trickery, evicted nearly the entire Cupeño Nation from their homelands at Kūpa (Warner Springs) and relocated them to the Luiseño village of Pala.[271]

By the turn of the twentieth century, California Indians had known non-Indian colonization and violence for more than a century. Because of their contacts with non-

[268] Shipek, *Pushed into the Rocks*, 47.
[269] Shipek, *Pushed into the Rocks*, 49.
[270] Ibid.
[271] Phillips, *Chiefs and Challengers*, 272-87.

Indians, mainly in economic capacities, California Indians "knew their enemies well."[272] One federal Indian Inspector told his superiors, "No Indians anywhere have endured wrong and outrage with more patience than these Indians…."[273] Tribal histories tell of extreme violence with people fleeing from gunshots in the Cajón Pass as they moved about for migratory work or policemen shooting teenagers in the back after they were caught drinking in an alley way.[274] Even those non-Indians who genuinely tried to help them met with stiff resistance. Petty politics worked against earnest Bureau employees such as the Soboba Reservation's first schoolmistress, Mary Sheriff, who had her $700 salary cut down to $600 for working with reformers against government corruption.[275]

The OIA undermined the sovereignty and authority of traditional captains across the Mission Indian Agency as the U.S. had done since it annexed the state.[276] The peoples of Soboba, for example, chaffed under federal control and intervention into tribal affairs. "They had told me many times that they could manage their own affairs without the help of the Government or anyone else," reported inspector Charles Davis in 1908.[277] Local Superintendent Harwood Hall made a rare break with the government line when he argued that the Indians of Southern California need "more protection and less bossing."[278] Federal interference in trivial reservation matters and complete lack of

---

[272] Hurtado, *Indian Survival*, 7.

[273] William Vandever, *Mission Indians of California* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. G.P.O., 1876), 6.

[274] Emanuel Olague, personal interview with the author, 29 November 2014, Chimney Rock, California.

[275] Helen Hunt Jackson to Henry Teller, 5 August 1883 in Mathes, *The Indian Reform Letters*, 288; Helen Hunt Jackson to Hiram Price, 11 October 1883 in ibid., 291-2.

[276] Goldberg, "Public Law 280," 1410-12.

[277] "Report on Soboba and its superintendent Will Stanley," in Thorne, "The Death of Superintendent Stanley."

[278] "Harwood Wall to Commissioner of Indian Affairs, 29 September 1913," in Thorne, "The Death of Superintendent Stanley."

respect for tribally elected leaders by Indian agents created a tense situation in the early twentieth century. This abuse combined with a belief in tribal self-government and regional conservative, libertarian political leanings nurtured a strongly independent, self-governing attitude among the reservations.[279]

Writing shortly after the American takeover, Benjamin D. Wilson, Indian Agent and former mayor of Los Angeles, decried the enormous loss of land following mission secularization. "That so much property should have passed from the hands of the Mission Indians… without any known agency of theirs, is an event calculated to leave an impression upon the minds of reflecting men, long after the actors in such a wholesale confiscation shall be forgotten," he warned.[280] His statement held even more weight by the close of the century after the United States and its citizens had taken their share. Indeed, it left an impression not only on the minds of "reflecting men," but upon the hearts and souls of the Indian peoples who had their lands stolen. So great was their connection to their homelands that the impression at times morphed into violence and blood loss, but more significantly it led to a unique, if fleeting, period of political unification in the region.

As Quechan scholar Patrick Miguel put it, since the Spanish *entrada* into Southern California, the Indians of the region "have incessantly struggled to preserve a vast area of land which they absolutely believed to contain sacred places; the abode of disembodied, contact spirits through whom the Creator directs the activities of the human

[279] McGirr, *Suburban Warriors*, 34.

[280] Benjamin D. Wilson, *The Indians of Southern California in 1852: The B.D. Wilson Report and a Selection of Contemporary Comment*, John Walton Caughey, ed. (San Marino, California: Huntington Library, 1952), 41.

races."[281] The federal government did little to help them secure their sacred lands from the thieving masses of settlers. Instead, it added another negative element to their colonial experience: meddling, corrupt, and inefficient bureaucracy. Leaders like Miguel bravely and boldly continued the struggle against squatters and the Indian Bureau into the twentieth century. The *paxaa* of the village of Soboba, Adam Castillo, explained years later that, "The story of the manner in which the Indians' villages and settlements were overrun by the goldseekers [sic] and white pioneers of the dark days following the end of the war with Mexico, remains fresh in the minds of scores of the older Indians still living. We take no pleasure in now speaking of those days, but in the new challenges our race faces, it is well for Indians and our friends that the lessons learned across the years when our rights were so ruthlessly ignored be not lost! It is from those hardships that we have gained our greatest strength – a determination to seek justice in an orderly manner and not by violence."[282] Thus, the unique history of Southern California Indian Country remained with and shaped the ways in which the Mission Indian people resisted the ongoing theft of their lands, while their surroundings provided some unlikely allies in their fight against federal oppression.

[281] Miguel, "The Quechan Tribe," 83.

[282] Adam Castillo, "An Indian Appeals to the American Public," 28 March 1950, Coded Records, box 27, folder MIF, R.G. 75, SAO, NARA SB.

CHAPTER THREE
A NEW WARPATH FOR PATRIOTS:
THE POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY OF THE MISSION INDIAN FEDERATION

[T]hese orders were given by him under the theory that the Indians were a self governing [sic] body and that they had the authority of such officers to use force and arms if necessary to make their authority recognized.

THOMAS L. SLOAN, 1927

In the early morning hours of May 3, 1912, the superintendent of the Soboba Superintendency, William Stanley, succumbed to gunshot wounds he sustained on the steps of the Cahuilla Day School in a violent shootout. The superintendent had been at the center of a power struggle between government bureaucrats and the traditional government of the Cahuilla Reservation, one that reached the boiling point that second day of May. As many of his predecessors had done before him, Stanley had contrived to depose the traditional captain of the reservation, Leonicio Lugo.[283] In the aftermath, Lugo's young nephew, Lupy Lugo, who had an education from the local off-reservation boarding school, Sherman Institute, worked to unify the people of the surrounding reservations to resist government intrusion into their political affairs. "[I]t is better to get all the Captains of southern California to help altogether and fight it out," he wrote Juan Alimo, a traditional leader on the Torres Reservation.[284] The United States had reignited the drive for political consolidation to fight a common enemy that had begun decades before with the ascent of the generals.

Title: William Dudley Pelley, "A New Warpath for Patriots," *The Weekly Liberation*, 7 August 1939, folder Silvershirts of America, Office File of Commissioner John Collier, R.G. 75, National Archives and Records Administration, Washington, D.C., hereinafter referred to as OFJC.

Epigraph: Statement of Thomas L. Sloan, 25 October 1927 in Winstead, "Joint Report of Agents Findlay and Winstead," folder 35417, box 20, CCF 1907-39 – M.

[283] Thorne, "The Death of Superintendent Stanley," 245-6.

[284] Lupy Lugo in Thorne, "The Death of Superintendent Stanley," 247.

The local auspices of the Indian Bureau in the region spent the rest of the decade attempting to subjugate the Mission Indians and interfering with Lupy Lugo's campaign. On November 28, 1919 however, some sixty-five leaders from throughout Southern California Indian Country met at the home of Jonathan Tibbet in Riverside, California.[285] A romantic who hoped to create a museum where local Indians would live in pre-contact fashion, Tibbet had toured the various reservations in the weeks prior and was shocked at what he saw.[286] Tibbet was a man of action and declared that assistance for the Indian peoples of the region "should not be left to cranks, faddists, or pink tea parties held by people who never get nearer to the real Indians than their own attractive drawing rooms."[287] Documentation of the goings-on among those who opposed the Indian Bureau on the reservations is spotty to non-existent, but Tibbet reported that when he learned that of Lugo's movement to unify the various bands, he offered the use of his large Riverside home.[288]

The offer was particularly attractive given that it was a central, neutral place for Indian people to meet.[289] Similarly, most of the legal proceedings of the region took place at the courthouses located in Riverside, thus providing tribal people with easier access for land and water disputes.[290] The city was also home to Sherman Institute where many tribal families sent their children, no doubt providing a convenient time to visit while in

[285] "Indians of South Meeting in City," 30 November 1919, *Riverside Enterprise*.
[286] "Lost Indian Shrine Found," *Riverside Daily Press*, 30 October 1919; "Betterment for Indians Needed," *Riverside Enterprise*, 23 November 1919.
[287] "Betterment for Indians Needed," *Riverside Enterprise*, 23 November 1919.
[288] "Indians of South Meeting in City," *Riverside Enterprise*, 30 November 1919.
[289] "Has Coat Presented Him by Gen. Fremont," *Riverside Daily Press*, 20 December 1919.
[290] "'Fig Tree John' Visiting Here," *Riverside Enterprise*, 20 December 1919.

town for meetings.[291] Most importantly, however, that Riverside was off the reservations meant that it was away from the reach of the Indian Bureau. Bureau officials and police confounded prior efforts to unite by traditional leaders upon the reservations in Southern California and elsewhere as laws dating back to the Indian Wars made it effectively illegal for Indian peoples to organize.[292] Significantly, government agents sent the chiefs of Indian police of the three local agencies to gain admittance to the first meeting in Riverside to gather intelligence. However, without any authority off the reservations, Tibbet turned them away from his home.[293]

Finally able to meet without fear of Bureau interference, representatives from twenty-five reservations from throughout the region formed the Indian Branch of the Pioneer Museum Society.[294] The non-Indian press reported that the organization would be "carried out on regulation American lines with a president, vice president and other officers."[295] Lupy Lugo found himself a co-author of the Branch's constitution, together with Benito Amago, Julian Flores, Ignacio Costo, Julio Norte, and Juan C. Siva.[296]

---

[291] Many parents met their children secretly through the school's fence when they worked in the orange groves that surrounded the institute. Clifford Trafzer, personal interview with the author, 9 December 2014, Riverside, CA; Even older siblings paid formal visits to their brothers and sisters while in town for Federation meetings. "Sherman Institute," *Riverside Enterprise*, 1 November 1920, 8.

[292] Saubel and Elliott, *'Isill Héqwas Wáxish*, 545; Carlos Montezuma in Hertzberg, *The Search for an American Indian Identity*, 183; Walter Woehlke, 17 March 1934, in "Proceedings of Southern California Indian Congress Held at Riverside, California, March 17 and 18. 1934," in *The Indian Reorganization Act*, Vine Deloria, Jr., ed. (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2002), 232.

[293] "Indians of South Meeting in City," *Riverside Independent Enterprise*, 30 November 1919, 1; James W. Jenkins to Cato Sells, 20 December 1919, in Mr. and Mrs. Joseph DePorte, *A Report in Three Parts on A Gathering of over Two Hundred Mission Indians of Southern California From Twenty-Six Different Reservations at the Home of One, Jonathan Tibbet, A Resident of Riverside, California, upon His Personal Solicitation and Invitation*, February 1920, Archives I, R.G. 75, Bureau of Indian Affairs Received, personal copy provided to the author by Lisa Woodward, Pechanga Cultural Resources.

[294] "Indians Employ Council to Free Chief Joe Pete," *Riverside Enterprise*, 2 March 1920, 4.

[295] "Indians of South Meeting in City," *Riverside Enterprise*, 30 November 1919, 1.

[296] "Indian Conference Splits into Two Parts at End," *Riverside Daily Press*, 2 February 1920, 4; Saubel and Elliott, *'Isill Héqwas Wáxish*, 546.

The organization unmistakably bore the influence of the federalism of the United States, with multiple reservations with their own traditional captains at the head of their governments who were subject to the officers of the overall Federation government. The appropriation of such a system as well as the liberal application of patriotic symbols of the United States, such as the American flag, evince an effort to show the federal government and other non-Indians that Southern California Indian peoples were capable and sophisticated enough to govern themselves. Contemporary Lakotas used a similar form of cultural camouflage when they held traditional ceremonial dances on holidays such as the Fourth of July in order to dissuade Indian Bureau officials from banning or breaking them up.[297] More notably, the Cherokee Nation took a similar tact to the Federation in the early nineteenth century with the creation of the Cherokee Republic that featured a constitution, chief executive, legislature, and a judicial system.[298] Despite such innovations and cultural accommodations, systems such as those employed by the Cherokees and the Mission Indian Federation lack neither legitimacy nor authenticity as Native governments.[299]

The founding meeting heard many grievances from tribal people centering on issues of land, water, Bureau abuses, and the Unratified Treaties. One attendee laid out the essential plight of all gathered saying, "We were here before the white men knew our land existed. We had first our land, then our liberty taken away from us. Now an

[297] John Troutman, "The Citizenship of the Dance: Politics of Music among the Lakota, 1900-1924," *Beyond Red Power: American Indian Politics and Activism since 1900*, Daniel M. Cobb and Loretta Fowler, eds. (Santa Fe, NM: School for Advanced Research, 2007), 97-9.

[298] Theda Perdue and Michael D. Green, *The Cherokee Removal: A Brief History with Documents* (Boston, MA: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2005), 14

[299] Carole Goldberg-Ambrose, "Of Native Americans and Tribal Members: The Impact of Law on Indian Group Life," Law & Society Review, vol. 28, no. 5 (1994), 1130.

immigrant may come and in a few years be a citizen. We and our descendants may live here an epoch and still be crushed under and treated as dogs. I think that if the Americans knew this they would not stand for it."[300] Southern California Indians founded the Federation to make the people of the United States pay attention to their cause and to gain redress for their lost lands and liberties. The solutions put forth, however, quickly divided the meeting. The younger members, many of whom had received boarding school educations, pressed for a demand for citizenship while their elders saw little value in the prospect. Instead, the elders pushed a platform of protection of treaty rights, allowing tribal people to live securely on their lands in their own manners, and opposition to concentrating their populations.[301]

The second meeting of the Indian Branch held at Tibbet's at the end of January 1920 was an impressive sight with representatives gathered from hundreds of miles around. The linguistic diversity forced scribes took down five separate translations of speakers from more than twenty-five different localities leading some to compare the work of the delegates to the peacemakers of Versailles.[302] Unfortunately, it also saw the divide that materialized during the first meeting grow into a formal split with many of the younger members leaving to form a progressive organization that pledged cooperation with the Indian Bureau.[303] Although the issue of Tibbet's role in the organization played a part in the split, those who left cited their disagreement with the Indian Branch's

[300] Anonymous in "The Indian Council at Riverside," *The Golden West*, vol.1, no. 18 (15 February 1920), 11.

[301] "Young Indians Want to be Citizens," *Riverside Enterprise*, 2 December 1919, 5.

[302] "Indians Endorse Editorial Appearing in Daily Press," *Riverside Daily Press*, 31 January 1920, 8.

[303] "Indian Conference Splits into Two Parts at End," *Riverside Daily Press*, 2 February 1920, 4.

advocacy for the abolishment of the Bureau as their main point of contention. The new group, led by many of the leaders of the Indian Branch, including its president, Julio Norte, stated that they looked "forward to a spirit of co-operation and friendliness on the part of government officials," and expected they would get it.[304] Little did they know, they already had the support of the Bureau and its agents, including the Indian disciplinarian of Sherman Institute, Joseph DePorte, one of the few federal employees invited to the meeting. That DePorte's supervisor credited him with helping break the younger, progressive, boarding-school-educated people from the nascent group speaks to the concerted clandestine efforts the Bureau employed to keep the Mission Indians divided and easier to control.[305]

By March 1920, those who remained with the original group that met at Tibbet's place settled on a formal name for their organization, the Mission Indian Federation (MIF), with the motto "Human Rights and Home Rule."[306] With the withdrawal of the progressives and cleaving of the group into two factions, the Federation became a markedly conservative organization, dominated by traditional leaders who wanted nothing to do with the federal government. In an ominous portent of events soon to come, that month the Bureau ordered Police Officer William Pablo of the Morongo Reservation

[304] "Indians Endorse Editorial Appearing in Daily Press," *Riverside Daily Press*, 31 January 1920, 8.

[305] Frank Conser to Cato Sells 26 February 1920, in DePorte, *A Report in Three Parts*. Bureau officials in deed launched a program to mount an "insurrection of the younger element," to divide the early Federation. E.M. Sweet, Jr., "Indian Agitators, Tibbett Convention" 6 March 1920, folder 23567, box 2, CCF 1907-39 – Sherman Institute.

[306] "Indians Employ Council to Free Chief Joe Pete," *Riverside Enterprise*, 2 March 1920, 4.

to arrest Joe Pete, Federation and traditional captain of the Martinez Reservation.[307] The violent arrest that saw the captain badly beaten and nearly choked to death broke up an early Federation meeting on the reservation.[308] Will Pablo offers an interesting and unique look at the evolving political life of a Southern California Indian leader. A traditional captain of the Cahuilla village of Malki, now the Morongo Reservation, Pablo fought a difficult battle against meddling Indian agents who exploited tribal divisions and personal ambitions an appointed the progressive Serrano leader John Morongo as head of the reservation in the 1880s and '90s.[309] However, in a bid to retain his power in the following decade, Pablo allied himself with an exceptional Indian agent who actually cared about and helped the tribal communities she worked with, Clara True.[310] By the advent of the Federation, Pablo positioned himself among the progressives and arrested traditional leaders as a police officer for the Bureau.[311] Pablo's story reminds scholars that the shifting nature of political positions and allegiances among people everywhere was also at play in Southern California Indian Country.

The progressive or cooperative tribal members had a difficult time of organizing, however, and never formed an organization that came anywhere close to the cohesiveness

[307] The Indian Bureau later joined the Martinez Reservation together with the Alimo and Toro or Torres Reservations to form the present Torres-Martinez Reservation.

[308] "Indians Employ Council to Free Chief Joe Pete," *Riverside Enterprise*, 2 March 1920, 4; "Opposition to Agents is Strong," *Riverside Enterprise*, 5 March 1920, 3; "Chief Joe Pete is Reported Arrested," *Riverside Enterprise*, 28 February 1920, 4. Though William Pablo has held historians' attention very well, tribal history ascribes him to a lesser role behind more powerful figures such as the Serrano leader Jim Pine of the oasis of Twenty-nine Palms. Ernest Siva, personal interview with the author, 26 November 2014, Banning, California.

[309] Hanks, *This War is for a Whole Life*,68-70.

[310] Ibid., 100-2.

[311] Ibid., 135.

nor covered the geographic vastness of the Mission Indian Federation.[312] Although the cynical Superintendent Paul Hoffman told the Commissioner of Indian Affairs in April that "The returned students and other industrious and intelligent Indians were attracted to the first meeting, but bolted in disgust and refused to go to any others," the local press reported that many in fact returned to the Federation.[313] Nevertheless, attempting to minimize the number of people arrayed against the Bureau, Hoffman characterized "the Indians who are active in this association are the older Indians who are easily misled (usually those who cannot read to speak English) and the younger reactionaries and ne'er-do-wells."[314] Still other Bureau employees dubbed the Federationists and their allies agitators, who sowed "the seeds of disrespect of the Government [sic]," and argued that it was "just as important" to silence their message as it was "to suppress Bolshevism."[315] Federation members were not, in fact, dangerous revolutionary agitators; they were traditional conservatives who fought to maintain their sovereignty.

One of "the younger reactionaries and ne'er-do-wells," who remained with the Federation, Adam Castillo, assumed the presidency of the Federation by April 1921, a post he held for over three decades.[316] Castillo was from the Soboba Reservation and was the grandson of famed Victoriano, former alcalde of the neophytes at Mission San

[312] Anthony Mojado in "Report of Meeting Held at Soboba Indian Reservation, 3:30 p.m. Wednesday, April 23, 1924," 82891-1921, box 12, CCF 1907-39 – M.

[313] Paul Hoffman to Cato Sells, 16 April, 1920, box 136, folder "Superintendent Hoffman," RMIA Riverside; "Indians Employ Council to Free Chief Joe Pete," *Riverside Enterprise*, 2 March 1920, 4.

[314] Paul Hoffman to Cato Sells, 16 April, 1920, box 136, folder "Superintendent Hoffman," RMIA Riverside.

[315] E.M. Sweet, Jr., "Indian Agitators, Red Fox" 6 March 1920, folder 23567, box 2, CCF 1907-39 – Sherman Institute.

[316] *The Indian*, vol. 1, no, 1 (April 1921), 5.

Gabriel, captain of Soboba, and signer of the Treaty of Temecula.[317] He viewed the Federation presidency in a traditional manner and told reporters that Native leaders held office for life unless removed for misconduct, just as with traditional leaders of the region.[318] Adam carried on the traditional familial leadership roles as a *paxaa* or assistant to the captain, a position that also held great ceremonial importance.[319] One particularly descriptive newspaper account painted Castillo as "an ageless, mild-mannered Indian…. Adam wasn't ramrod straight and tall like the Red Man in the history books. He was short, a little guy, a little bald and a little fat."[320] His foes derisively described him as a "controlled, smooth, cunning convincing person."[321] Examination of the surviving photographs shows the origin of the rather unflattering words of physical description, although relatives viewed his character attributes in a more positive light. His grandnephew, Professor Edward Castillo, described Adam as an eloquent man whom the Bureau and its oppressive agents were unable to suppress.[322] This mirrored contemporary accounts of Federation officers who told Bureau officials that Castillo was a "noble man… he got a head. He don't get excited like we do. He will talk to you."[323] In later years, colleague and friend Purl Willis thought of Adam as "'the George Washington of the missions,'" and "the Gandhi of the Indian race," while anthropologist J.P. Harrington

[317] Ed Castillo, personal interview with the author, 29 April 2015, Riverside, California.
[318] "Indians Not for Allotment," *Riverside Press*, 2 May 1923, 2.
[319] Kim Marcus, personal interview with the author, 10 October 2014, California Indian Conference, California State University, San Bernardino.
[320] Harmon W. Nichols, "Indian Travels Across The Country To Plead With Congress," *Chronicle-Telegram*, Elyria, Ohio, 16 January 1946, pg. 13.
[321] John Dady to William Zimmerman, 14 September 1937, folder 33247 pt. 2 ½, box 16, CCF 1907-39 – M.
[322] Edward Castillo, personal interview with the author, 19 December 2014, Riverside, California.
[323] Joseph L. Weaver in *The Indian Reorganization Act*, 245.

fondly remembered him as his "old friend… 'the Cahuilla lawyer.'"[324] Castillo's work towards the maintenance of traditional governance through the Federation, his ethnographic work with Harrington to save Native culture and language, as well as his duties as paxaa, all speak to the traditional nature of the president and driving force of the MIF.

The Mission Indian Federation itself was, at heart, a profoundly conservative and traditionalist organization. Native thought and philosophy is evident in even the basic iconography of the Federation, such as its seal that featured three sacred constellations. The most famous iteration of the Federation shield bore the face of Juan Ortega, a Cahuilla leader from Pala.[325] Emblazoned on the field behind him are three constellations of stars that alone constituted the original logo. These are traditional constellations from the region: the one of three stars the Serrano know as *túkumʃi'va't* and the Kumeyaay as *amu*, the mountain sheep. The grouping of five stars is known as the cross star and the seven stars are the Pleiades or *Chehaiyam*, seven sisters, whom the Luiseño say Coyote chased into the heavens.[326] Such symbolism spoke to traditionalist peoples of the region who largely shared a similar cosmology, one even ordinary people shared.[327] These special numbers also represented the committees of the Federation that were comprised

[324] Purl Willis in "County Deputy Attacks Mission Indian 'Autocrat,'" 14 March 1934, *San Diego Union*, pg. 2; "'Indians' Friend' Calls on Board To Ask Removal of Agent, Aids," *Evening Tribune*, 22 August 1932, pg. 6; Cahuilla, Accession #1976-95 [NMNH-Harrington_mf3_r113_0060], JPHP.

[325] Juan Ortega was originally a Mountain Cahuilla whose family had moved to Kūpa, only to have the government forcibly remove them to Pala in 1903. Saubel and Elliott, *'Isill Héqwas Wáxish*, 546.

[326] J.P. Harrington, Serrano, #1976-95 [NMNH-Harrington_mf3_r101_0032], JPHP; Manuel Lachuso, "Ground Painting," in Thomas T. Waterman, "The Religious Practices of the Diegueño Indians," *University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnography*, vol. 8, no.6 (1910), pl. 24; Paul Macarro and Lisa Woodward, Pechanga Cultural Resources presentation, University of California, Riverside, 7 November 2013.

[327] Ray A. Williamson, Claire R. Farrer, *Earth and Sky: Visions of the Cosmos in Native American Folklore* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1992), 165.

of groupings of three, five, and seven individuals following tribal numerological customs.[328] Though they incorporated non-Indian elements such as a federated government, they merely buttressed the traditional leaders as the Federation kept the original governments and political philosophies of Southern California alive.

Owing no doubt to the coverage of the non-Indian press and the records left by the Indian Bureau, however, historians have focused a great deal of attention to the non-Indian advisor, Jonathan Tibbet. [329] To be fair, longtime Federation president Adam Castillo gave Tibbet a good deal of credit for the formation of the MIF. He noted that the government had ignored his people for decades and that the lights of Hollywood distracted congressional committees sent to hear their plight when they were in town too much for them to pay the Indian people much attention.[330] Prominent Indian rights activist Lewis Meriam attended a Federation meeting at Tibbet's place in Riverside. Although Meriam accepted the criticisms of the Indian agents and Federation opponents who hosted him, he also noted that Tibbet "understands the Indian psychology," and that the Federation "must appeal very strongly to them."[331] With his understanding, Tibbet proved to be a strong ally and champion of tribal independence and sovereignty.

Those in the Indian Bureau entirely lacked his intuition, however, and simply could not accept that their wards would be so upset with their mismanagement and

---

[328] "Indians Want Self-Government thru Own Elective Council and Granting of Full Civil Rights," *Denver Post*, 28 November 1920.

[329] For examples of such a tendency, see Joan H. Hall, Riverside's One & Only Buffalo Heart (Riverside, CA: Coyote Hills Press, 2014) and Walter Robert Baggs, "An Unfortunate Kind of Leadership: Jonathan Tibbet and the Mission Indian Federation," (M.A. thesis, University of California, Riverside, 1978).

[330] Adam Castillo in Senate Committee on Indian Affairs, *Survey of Conditions of Indian in the United States, Part 29* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. G.P.O., 1932), 15776.

[331] Donald L. Parman and Lewis Meriam, "Lewis Meriam's Letters during the Survey of Indian Affairs 1926-1927 (Part II)," *Arizona and the West*, vol. 24, no. 4 (winter, 1982), 349.

meddling to oppose them in such a manner. Nor could they believe that they were sophisticated enough to set up an organized government, replete with all of the American trappings of governance, on their own. For decades, this belief caused Bureau personnel to point at Jonathan Tibbet (and Purl Willis who later replaced him), arguing that it was he who was responsible for the entire Federation, going around and rousing trouble among the normally quiet and pliant people of the reservations.[332] However, that Tibbet found "such a movement was on foot," during his initial reservation tour begins to reveal the actual founders of the Mission Indian Federation. Juan Ortega, treasurer of the Federation since 1923, held that the Federation was, indeed, a Native organization and that Tibbet only served as an advisor.[333] Examining eyewitness reports of Federation meetings and machinations from unaffiliated, third-party Indian sources shows that Tibbet did not participate in the actual governance of the Federation and its citizens. In fact, MIF officers licked him and all other non-Indians and non-members out of the proceedings of the Federation's court.[334] At the initial meeting, founding President Julio Norte tried to calm Native leaders, as they grew restless amid the ever-expanding docket of outsiders who spoke, saying, "It is for the white people. We have our own meeting tomorrow, so talk what you want."[335] Government informants also noted entire afternoon sessions conducted in Native languages, not translated for outsiders, while journalists

[332] For one example of this Bureau line among many, see B.W Cohoon to Assistant Director of Investigation, 18 August 1933 in United States House Committee on Indian Affairs, *Palm Springs Band of Mission Indians: Hearings on H.R. 7450* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1938), 440.

[333] Winstead, "Joint Report," 14; "Indians Want Self-Government thru Own Elective Council and Granting of Full Civil Rights," *Denver Post*, 28 November 1920, pg. 4.

[334] Statement of Thomas L. Sloan, 25 October 1927 in Winstead, "Joint Report," 7-8.

[335] Julio Norte in DePorte, *A Report in Three Parts*, 30.

noted entire days blocked to outsiders who were only aloud in the evening to wittiness traditional ceremonial dances.[336]

Largely, the membership of the Mission Indian Federation fit into the traditionalist category. Although little evidence of the proceedings of their meetings is extant, that which is shows that Native people ran the meetings, not the non-Indians the Bureau continuously blamed for corrupting the Indians.[337] These meetings generally they took place in the Native language of the people, such as in 1937 when the only thing federal bureaucrats noted of the discussion among traditional leadership of the Agua Caliente Band, their Federation allies, and tribal members was that they conducted the meeting "in the Indian tongue."[338] Indeed, the sheer lack of information about the proceedings of the thousands of MIF meetings held throughout its existence suggests that Federationists conducted most of them in non-literate Native languages.

However, many Federationists spoke English and Spanish in addition to their Native tongues, and the Federation fought legal battles to ensure Indian children desks next to non-Indians in public schools off their reservations. A good many worked outside of their tribal communities and interacted with non-Indians on a daily basis. Previously, bureaucrats, scholars, and even the public at large would have dubbed such folk assimilated or at least progressive assimilationists, due to their extensive interaction with the non-Indian world. The blanket label of "assimilationist" is very troublesome, though. Southern California Indians had to interact with the non-Indian world around them in

[336] Ibid., 12; "The Indian Council at Riverside," *The Golden West*, vol.1, no. 18 (15 February 1920), 11.

[337] Statement of Thomas L. Sloan, 25 October 1927 in Winstead, "Joint Report," 7-8.

[338] H. H. Quackenbush in House, *Palm Springs Band of Mission Indians: Hearings on H.R. 7450*, 352. One might characterize such instances as

order for their families and culture to survive. Federation supporter Wa Wa Chaw Calac Nuñez, a Luiseño poet who had grown up in a non-Indian home in New York, wanted "every American Indian [to] make it clear: We are not interested in being made over as White Men or White Women. Nor of the White Race. We are what we are. Being Indians and members of the American Nations. And as Citizens we are seeking Justice within the law of our American Nation."[339] She was, as many Mission Indians were, very cognizant of her dual citizenship in both their own nations as well as the United States, living with each foot in a different world.

Early Federation member Thomas Lucas noted that in the early years, "the big land grabbers and all of that time didn't want the Indians educated. The say if you educate the Indians, that's a mighty weapon in their hands."[340] He, as many other Southern California Indians, knew that settlers encroaching upon their lands did "a lot of crooked work," and often kept local congressional representatives in their pockets in order to continue the flow of Indian lands into non-Indian hands. Lucas, a Kwaaymii of the Laguna Reservation, knew that education and citizenship went hand in hand, claiming, "The strongest weapon upon the Government is an educated Indian," and that, "As citizens, the senators, congressmen and the law could work for us."[341] For him, as for many other Federationists, citizenship, education, and outside political participation did not mean forsaking their

[339] Nuñez, *Spirit Woman*, 230. Nuñez's name is as interesting puzzle today as it seemingly was to her during her life. However, she learned that her birth mother was a Calac, a leadership family among the Luiseño Nation. See ibid., 110.

[340] Thomas Lucas in Lora L. Cline, *Just Before Sunset* (Jacumba, CA: J an L Enterprises, 1984), 126.

[341] Carmen Lucas, *Kwaaymii: The Laguna Band of Indians*, unpublished manuscript, excerpt given to the author by Carmen Lucas.

identities as Indian people, but rather created a bulwark against its loss and buttressed their independence.

Indeed, many Federationists recognized the value of citizenship as opposed to their pernicious status as wards. For most, wardship was belittling, meant they "were prisoners and besides, it was wrong."[342] Remijio Robles, spokesman of the Pala Reservation told a government commission: "We are not children the Government has to take care of. We are over 21 years – we want our rights! We do not want to be Government charges."[343] While opposition to wardship was nearly universal, the question of citizenship and the future legal status of tribal people and their lands were most certainly not. Throughout Southern California Indian Country, people held varying opinions as to whether or not they should press for citizenship, accept allotments, or even abolish the Indian Bureau. These political differences mirrored those of American Indians across the United States. The first attempt at a pan-Indian rights organization, the Society of American Indians (SAI), itself foundered on and eventually succumbed to the same political divides.[344] The SAI, or at least certain members, undoubtedly influenced the politics of Southern California and the formation of the Federation. In 1919, for example, a Cahuilla delegation consisting of Captains Julio Norte of Morongo, Francisco Patencio of Agua Caliente, and Joe Pete of Martinez attended the Society's annual conference in Minneapolis, Minnesota. Patencio recounted the political divides visible at the meeting

[342] Ibid.

[343] Remejio Robles in Proceedings of the Southern California Indian Congress, held at Riverside, California, March 17 and 18, 1934 (Washington D.C.: U.S. G.P.O., 1934), 57. I use the masculine term "spokesman" throughout as it was the normative term in Southern California Indian Country as evidenced by the Spokesman and Committee group.

[344] Hertzberg, *The Search for an American Indian Identity*, 197-8.

and support garnered from the Dakota activist Zitkala-Ša, or Gertrude Bonin, who noted the differences that set Southern California apart from the rest of Indian Country.[345]

Perhaps the most famous member of the SAI was the Yavapai physician and activist Wassaja or Carlos "Carl" Montezuma.[346] Montezuma was perhaps the first to call for the abolition of the Indian Bureau and achieved something akin to prophetic status among many tribal people.[347] Federationists, of course, revered him and printed his articles in their magazine, *The Indian*.[348] The Yavapai activist played a central role in the philosophy of the Federation and attended an early Federation meeting in October 1920.[349] Doubtless he played a role in Jonathan Tibbet's attendance at the annual SAI meeting in St. Louis, Missouri, the following month.[350] Tibbet had his expenses covered by Federation funds at various times when its officers deemed it necessary that he travel on their behalf, such as the St. Louis conference.[351] While at the meeting, which proved to be one of the Society's last, Tibbet gave a speech entitled "Human Rights and Home Rule," in which he joined Montezuma in the call to abolish the Indian Bureau entirely and allow Native nations to govern themselves upon their lands.

Bureau officials simply could not fathom a system in which American Indians governed themselves. Agents mocked those who resisted federal control in favor of traditional government and characterized them as "childish and too simple for the serious

---

[345] Patencio and Boynton, *Stories and Legends of the Palm Springs Indians*, 64-5.

[346] Montezuma's Yavapai compatriots knew him as Carl. Mike Harrison and John Williams, et al, *Oral History of the Yavapai* (Gilbert, AZ: Acacia Publishing, 2012), 106.

[347] Hertzberg, *The Search for an American Indian Identity*, 44.

[348] Carlos Montezuma, "The American Flag," *The Indian*, March 1922, 17; Carlos Montezuma, "Evils of Indian Bureau System," *The Indian*, September 1922, 14.

[349] "Ceremonial Dance Held by Indians," *Riverside Enterprise*, 27 October 1920.

[350] "Riversider at Convention in East," *Riverside Enterprise*, 18 November 1920, 5.

[351] Winstead, "Joint Report," 14; "Indians Want Self-Government thru Own Elective Council and Granting of Full Civil Rights," *Denver Post*, 28 November 1920, pg. 4.

consideration of intelligent adults…." While they explained the widespread appeal and acceptance of the Federation's home rule ethos throughout the Agency by speaking of Southern California Indians as people "whose mentality is very low, who are ignorant and vicious," it was they who could not see beyond their own noses to realize that other forms of governance existed in the region before the federal government and that there were, indeed, options beyond the United States. Agent Pal Hoffman reasoned of the home rule plan that "instead of a properly accredited Federal officer acting under proper laws and regulations administering Indian affairs, [the Federation] prefers that an Indian should govern each reservation, with no semblance of law, regulations or anything else to restrain him."[352] Tribal communities indeed had laws and regulations, and the conservative tribal people of the region wished to maintain them and the structures that had always governed the region; they simply did not want outside laws restraining them against their will, certainly not from a government that did little to help them.

By the time the leaders of the various communities created the Mission Indian Federation, Southern California Indian Country consisted of some thirty reservations between one-hundred and twenty-seven-hundred acres in size, many of them troublingly checker-boarded because of federal grants to railroads.[353] Access was often very, and at times extremely, difficult with many miles of rough dirt roads, often wiped out by seasonal flooding, linking the communities up rugged mountains and across the

[352] "The Present Autocracy," DePorte, *A Report in Three Parts*.

[353] Report of Mr. Cohoon in House, *Palm Springs Band of Mission Indians: Hearings on H.R. 7450*, 436; Adam Castillo in United States House of Representatives, *Emancipation of Indians: Hearings on H.R. 2958, H.R. 2165, and H.R. 1113* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. G.P.O., 1947), 99.

windswept sands of the desert.[354] The economic climate throughout the region was gloomy as young men, including many Mission Indians, returned home following the First World War to a recession fueled by government spending cuts.[355] In 1920, the Mission Indians received the least attention from Indian agents and the smallest per capita federal aid of any group of recognized Native nations in the United States.[356] Indeed, the preceding year, most of the Mission Indian children attended local public schools on the same basis as non-Indians, with the federal government providing minor remuneration to local school districts for only a small percentage of tribal children.[357] Unable to make the poor lands of their reservations productive with meager government resources, a good many able-bodied individuals, male and female, were absent from their homes for most of the year working as migratory agricultural laborers or in the growing cities of the region in order to feed their families.[358]

The decades of neglect by the federal government allowed squatters to gain title to lands surrounding and between villages, thus eliminating the possibility of a large reservation that joined multiple villages together. While probably not a master scheme by the government, the situation produced a favorable outcome for the Indian Bureau, as the lands finally set aside as reservations were scattered and divided. For decades, the Indian Bureau had actively worked to undermine traditional leaders, especially the generals who

[354] Donald L. Parman and Lewis Meriam, "Lewis Meriam's Letters during the Survey of Indian Affairs 1926-1927 (Part II)," *Arizona and the West*, vol. 24, no. 4 (winter, 1982), 347-8.

[355] Gerald Nash, *The Federal Landscape: An Economic History of the Twentieth-Century West* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1999), 18-9.

[356] Philip T. Lonergan in House Committee on Indian Affairs, *Indians of the United States: Investigation of the Field Service, vol. 3* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. G.P.O., 1920), 640.

[357] Malcolm McDowell, "Report on California Nonreservation Indians," House Committee on Indian Affairs, *Indian Tribes of California* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. G.P.O., 1920), 102.

[358] Rep. William Kettner in House Committee on Indian Affairs, *Indians of the United States: Investigation of the Field Service, vol. 3*, 1089-91.

governed large numbers of people. The division of the nations of the region among several reservations stymied the political evolution and consolidation that had taken place since the arrival of the Spanish. Whether intentionally planned as a divide-and-conquer scheme or not, the division of the Cahuilla, Chemehuevi, Cupeño, Luiseño, Kumeyaay, and Serrano Nations onto multiple reservations amongst themselves alone weakened their political strengths.[359]

The founders of the Mission Indian Federation recognized the need for not only the nations themselves to unite, but for the various nations to unite into a stronger, singular political unit. The federal government, however, more-often-than-not refused to deal with the Federation as a unifying body. When congressional committees asked why they should listen to Adam Castillo regarding reservations upon which he was not enrolled, he boldly responded because, "I am their president. They belong to the federation. The 30 reservations are united."[360] Even at the local level, Bureau officials insisted that only the leaders they recognized were legitimate, to which the captains of the individual reservations defiantly responded: "We have our tribal rights on our Reservations [sic] therefore we have chosen our own captains and one chief who look [sic] after our own conditions on our reservations…. So, therefore we will not cooperate with the Agent's own elected spokesman and committee."[361] Similarly, when tribal members demanded that agents deal with their traditional leaders in the MIF, the

[359] Judy Stapp, director of cultural affairs, Cabazon Cultural Museum, personal interview with the author, 23 January 2015.

[360] Adam Castillo in House, *Palm Springs Band of Mission Indians: Hearings on H.R. 7450*, 148.

[361] Chief William Levy, Captain Pablo Kintano, Julian Augustine, and Billy Callaway to L.T. Eugene Ness, 16 March 1935, folder 1, L.T. Eugene Ness Collection, Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, Ohio, hereinafter referred to as ENC.

response invariably was that "it was the policy of the Government [sic] to deal individually with Indians," although they characterized such people as weak, brainwashed individuals.[362] Deference to the community leader for external matters was a traditional response throughout the region, and tellingly, when questioned by Bureau officials, Federation members looked not to Jonathan Tibbet, but to their reservation captains and to Federation officials.

These leaders were the descendants of the leaders who had governed the Southern California tribal groups since before the arrival of the United States, the successors to the signers of the Unratified Treaties and of Olegario Sali. Adam Castillo saw the Federation as "the union of those old tribal groups… the tribal voice of the Mission Indians."[363] The federal government designated the Indian peoples of Southern California simply as "Mission Indians" since at least 1865 as a matter of convenience.[364] The Mission Indian Federation saw strength in their blanket classification by the Indian Bureau, and sought to continue the political consolidation of the past century. In much the same way as individuals reappropriated racist slurs as their own cultural property in the later twentieth century, the Federation reappropriated the Mission Indian designation for political purposes. This reappropriation saw Federationists embark upon the very early stages of an intentional ethnogenesis. The MIF often rendered the tribal affiliations of its members as "Mission Indian of the ____ Reservation," in attorney contracts for the Claims Cases,

[362] Jenkins to Sells, DePorte, *A Report in Three Parts*; Inspector E.M. Sweet to Cato Sells, 19 January 1921, Inspection Reports, Inspection Division, folder 953, box 42, R.G. 75, Archives I.

[363] Adam Castillo to John R. Murdock, 17 April 1939 in House Committee on Indian Affairs, *California Indian Jurisdictional Act: Hearings on H.R. 3765* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. G.P.O., 1939), 472.

[364] W.E. Lovett to Austin Wiley, in United States Department of the Interior, Annual Report of the Department of the Interior (Washington, D.C.: U.S. G.P.O., 1865), 288-92.

petitions, and congressional testimony, while non-Indian newspapers referred to Castillo as the "president and secretary of the Mission Indians."[365] The effort never bore much fruit, as traditional national identities proved too difficult to ignore. Some, such as Jack Meyers, progressive spokesman of the Santa Rosa Reservation believed it "a rather large order to speak for all the Mission Indians—I prefer to speak for my own people. I cannot speak for the other tribes."[366] However, while the term is controversial today and some bands, such as the Cahuilla Band of Indians have dropped the moniker, many still identify with the term, including the Barona, Cabazon, Campo, Morongo, San Manuel, San Pasqual, Twenty-Nine Palms Bands of Mission Indians, just to name a few.

Though the Federation represented a large number of Mission Indian people, sometimes an estimated two-thirds of them, it never represented all, and always had a number of liberal or cooperative opponents. The Mission Indian Progressive Club, an association of returned boarding school students on the Soboba Reservation, was open only to English speakers and sought to promote "a spirit of progressiveness and *right living* among Indians."[367] In a mark of continuity, Tom Largo of Soboba, who served as the vice president of the Mission Indian Progressive Club in 1916, became the "sachem" of the California Indian Rights Association (CIRA), a group formed among urbanized Mission Indians in the 1930s that held more of a centrist position and fought primarily for

[365] Agua Caliente Tribal Members and Committee to Commissioner of Indian Affairs in Senate Committee on Indian Affairs, *Palm Springs Band of Mission Indians: Hearings on S. 1424 and S. 2589* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. G.P.O., 1937), 171; "Brand Outbreak Story Malicious," *San Diego Union*, 15 February 1924.

[366] Jack Meyers in Proceedings of the Southern California Indian Congress, held at Riverside, California, March 17 and 18, 1934 (Washington D.C.: U.S. G.P.O., 1934), 55.

[367] "Mission Indian Progressive Club," *The Indian's Friend*, vol. 28, no. 5 (May 1916), 4. Emphasis mine.; *The Mission Indian Booster*, vol. 1, no. 4 (July 1916), copy found in the personnel file of Harold E. Wadsworth, National Personnel Records Center, St. Louis, Missouri, hereinafter referred to an NPRC.

justice in the Claims Cases.[368] Back in Southern California Indian Country, the Mission Indian Cooperative Society represented the "progressives" of the La Jolla and Rincon Reservations in bitter opposition to the Federation.[369]

Many opponents of the Federation saw resistance to the Bureau as futile. Kumeyaay leader Ramón Ames of the Capitan Grande Reservation in San Diego County told a meeting of tribal people in Riverside, California, that his "father had 20 head of cattle. He sold them to fight the Government, give the money to the fighters. Brothers, we cannot fight the government."[370] Whether the "fighters" were the Federation or an earlier struggle against Bureau domination, Ames was a well-known anti-Federationist by the time of his statement. Importantly, he was also in the employ of the Indian Bureau as a police officer, a position that no doubt obligated him to be cooperative with the federal government.[371] His job was also a source of much-needed income and would have been a source of personal power and prestige, all of which he and those like him would lose in the face of Federation home rule.

Partisan lines so divided reservation communities that some even had Federation meeting houses, which were usually the traditional Big Houses, separate from the

---

[368] *The Mission Indian Booster*, vol. 1, no. 4 (July 1916), 2. In either 1919 or 1920, the Mission Indian Federation formed an auxiliary in Los Angeles that met in private homes, but it did not last long despite strong interest. Tom Largo, "Why We Organized," *California Indian News*, July 1936 in United States House of Representatives, *California Indians Jurisdictional Act: Hearings on H.R. 5243 and H.R. 1998* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. G.P.O., 1937), 11. Federation supporters at times accused CIRA of simply being a tool of the Bureau and money-seeking attorneys. J.P. Harrington for Glenn Marr to Representative Sam L. Collins, 3 June 1935, Letters sent, 1904-1960, Accession #1976-95 [NMNH-Harrington_mf9_r12_0505], JPHP.

[369] John Dady to William Zimmerman, 14 September 1937, folder 33247 pt. 2 ½, box 16, CCF 1907-39 – M; Donald L. Parman and Lewis Meriam, "Lewis Meriam's Letters during the Survey of Indian Affairs 1926-1927 (Part II)," *Arizona and the West*, vol. 24, no. 4 (winter, 1982), 347 n97.

[370] Mr. Ames in Proceedings of the Southern California Indian Congress, held at Riverside, California, March 17 and 18, 1934 (Washington D.C.: U.S. G.P.O., 1934), 58.

[371] Thorne, *El Capitan*, 109.

"official" tribal headquarters or meetinghouses.[372] The Bureau had attempted to impose a spokesman and business committee model on the Mission Indians wherein the government picked one progressive tribal member to serve on the tribal business committee with Superintendent and other Bureau personnel at various times since at least 1911.[373] These early attempts failed, however, and the rise of the Federation marked a continuance and solidification of traditional governance in the face of governmental interference.[374] The official magazine of the MIF, *The Indian*, described the "monthly councils which [were] held by members of the mission [sic] Indian Federation [as] similar to those which have been held among the countless tribes of American Indians for hundreds of years."[375] Given that the rule of the United States, no less the Indian Bureau was barely more than seventy years old in California at the time, maintaining the old ways of governance was, no doubt, conservative in and of itself. The style of the conferences described was very Native in nature, and sought consensus as "plans [were] suggested and confidence and loyalty increased."[376] The Native political tradition of consensus was evident in many of the petitions sent to federal officials, which Bureau personnel discredited for containing the signatures and marks of children and the elderly.

Indeed, J.H. Rainwater, San Diego County Director of Public Welfare, provided the best contemporary analysis of the philosophy of the MIF: "The Federation sees the

[372] J. Allison Moore to John Collier, 15 August 1933, folder 33247 pt. 2 ½, box 16, CCF 1907-39 – M; Thomas L. Sloan to John Collier, 20 January 1938, folder 33247 pt. 3, box 17, CCF 1907-39 – M.

[373] C. T. Hauke to Charles T. Coggeshall, 2 March 1912, folder 1 Tribal Relations, Business Committee, box 15, Mission Indian Agency, Central Classified Files 1920-1953, R.G. 75, Bureau of Indian Affairs, National Archives and Records Administration, Riverside, California, hereinafter referred to as MIA CCF 1920-1953, Riverside.

[374] Superintendent to Commissioner of Indian Affairs, 30 January 1921, folder 1 Tribal Relations, Business Committee, box 15, MIA CCF 1920-1953, Riverside.

[375] "Council an Old Custom," *The Indian*, October 1921.

[376] Ibid.

Indians as an independent nation and stands for a revival of the ancient tribal form of government with the Indians in complete control of each reservation. To these ends, on each reservation there is chosen a captain, a judge and policeman whose authority the Federation members consider absolute."[377] At the Federation level, a court met during the conferences and adjudicated inter-reservation matters, an executive council drafted policy and laws, and the president oversaw everything and was a unifying figure.[378] Like many non-Indians and even some Indians, however, Rainwater did not believe that tribal people had any right to do such a thing, at least not without the federal government creating the offices and running the elections. Others did not recognize what the Federation was. Anthropologist William Duncan Strong postulated in his seminal 1929 *Aboriginal Society in Southern California* that "had not disease, sterility, and changed conditions almost wiped out the native population, there would probably have existed a unified tribal organization with appointed leaders, entirely resulting from alien pressure on once isolated groups."[379] His statement is perplexing since Strong conducted extensive fieldwork among the Serranos, Cahuillas, Cupeños, and Luisenos during the winter of 1924-5.[380] Perhaps the anthropologist was so engrossed in the ethnography that he failed to look up and see what he was predicting unfolding right before his eyes. Much of the "alien pressure" that led to the formation of the Federation came from the disruptive and divisive practices of the Indian Bureau that continued to gain power over tribal

[377] San Diego County Board of Supervisors Report on the Conditions of Indian Reservations in San Diego County, 1932, quoted in B. W. Cohoon, "Supplementary Report," 18 August 1933, 33247-1933, 155 1/3, box 16, CCF 1907-39 – M.
[378] Winstead, "Joint Report."
[379] Strong, *Aboriginal Society*, 333-4.
[380] Ibid., 2.

communities and from the controversial federal Indian policies it pushed such as allotment.

In reaction to the political consolidation of the Indian peoples of Southern California, throughout 1920, the Indian Bureau moved to centralize its own operations. On November 15, 1920, it formally consolidated the Campo, Pala, and Soboba superintendencies into the new Mission Indian Agency, which encompassed all of the reservations from Santa Barbara to Mexico, with the exception of the tribes of the Colorado River.[381] The new superintendent, Charles Ellis, advocated a return to the prior attempts at installing progressive business committee governments as a way to combat the rising power of the Federation and to control reservation politics.[382] However, as the Federation moved to bolster the traditional captains of the region during the 1920s and early '30s, Bureau policy was more interested in allotting reservations than in tribal governance.

The special allotting agent in Southern California, Henry Wadsworth, knew that allotting reservations usually took care of traditional governance and leadership to the liking of the Bureau. He held that the traditional leadership was an "aggressive" minority group that controlled a disproportionate share of tribal resources and objected to allotment out of selfish reasons since it would ostensibly divide tribal resources equally among all tribal members. It was the government's duty, Wadsworth said, to "protect the

[381] Larry S. Watson, *A Guide to the Records at the National Archives Los Angeles Branch Relating to American Indians of California* (Yuma, AZ: HISTREE, 1988), 9.

[382] Superintendent to Commissioner of Indian Affairs, 30 January 1921, folder 1 Tribal Relations, Business Committee, box 15, MIA CCF 1920-1953, Riverside.

good, 'loyal' Indians – the 'quiet majority,' from these trouble-makers."[383] Non-Indian opponents wondered why then it was that opposition to the policy on many reservations was unanimous. Wadsworth was a mixed-blood Shoshone himself, which helps explain his zeal for allotment.[384] Throughout the United States, tribal members of mixed heritage tended to support land in severalty whereas those without non-Indian ancestry tended to oppose the process.[385] This was especially true among patrilineal groups since it was usually Native women who had children with non-Indians. Among a matrilineal people, such mixed-race children were automatically members of the tribe through their mothers. With patrilineal societies, however, these individuals were seen as members of their father's line and thus expected to go with that group upon adulthood. Such situations came to a head when tribal land bases shrank to reservations and even more so when the federal government moved to allot those reservations. Thus, the federal government created a number of "half-breed" tracts or reservations for mixed-race individuals primarily among the Plains peoples.[386]

The United State never created such land bases in Southern California, although the Federation took issue with outside men marrying women from a reservation and then

[383] Elizabeth Green, "The Indians of Southern California and Land Allotment," June 1923, 8-9, folder Palm Springs Indians, C. Hart Merriam Papers Relating to Work with California Indians, 1850-1974, Bancroft Library, Internet Archive, https://archive.org/details/bancroft_chartmerriam_1556_86, accessed 18 May 2015.

[384] J.P. Harrington, Cahuilla, Accession #1976-95 [NMNH-Harrington_mf3_r108_0057], JPHP. Adam Castillo likely informed Harrington of Wadsworth's heritage. Harrington noted he was one-fourth or one-eighth Shoshone.

[385] Alexandra Harmon, Rich Indians: Native People and the Problem of Wealth in American History (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2010), 189.

[386] Tanis Thorne, "Multiple Marriages, Many Relations: Fur Trade Families on the Missouri River," *Major Problems in American Indian History: Documents and Essays* (Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin, 2001), 224-5

un-rightfully claiming tribal land.[387] Allotment interfered with tribal customs as Castillo pointed out to the Superintendent: "You see the way our reservations have been handled, through our own tribal officers. So like you say, these parcels of land here are all allotted by the Indians many years back, before the agency was established here even, before the white man came here."[388] Bands had made land assignments on reservations among themselves in a traditional manner and members usually respected the assignments as formal divisions. When women inherited assignments and left the reservation to live with their husbands, they usually rented the land to outsiders. Owning to the shortness of land on the small reservations, however, many objected and demanded the use of the assignment.[389] Worse yet, Wadsworth introduced a scheme "of allotting the Mission Indians as one proposition, locating the allottees upon available lands on any of the various Mission Reservations regardless of the membership of the individual in any particular band."[390] Although the Bureau told him the plan was not legal, testimony from tribal members in the region shows that the special allotting agent did as he pleased.[391] His conniving attitude turned devious when the Federation got in his way.

Wadsworth took advantage of the absence of tribal leadership during Federation conferences, as in April of 1923 when surveyors appeared and plotted out allotments on the Agua Caliente Reservation while Captain Pedro Chino and his associates were in

[387] *The Indian*, April 1921, 5.

[388] Adam Castillo in "Report of Meeting Held at Soboba Indian Reservation, 3:30 p.m. Wednesday, April 23, 1924," 82891-1921, box 12, CCF 1907-39 – M.

[389] Alfred E. Whiteis to Commissioner of Indian Affairs, 19 September 1910, Senate, *Survey of Conditions of Indian in the United States, Part 29*, 15870.

[390] Charles Burke to Henry Wadsworth 18 September 1922, Senate, *Survey of Conditions of Indian in the United States, Part 29*, 15883-4.

[391] Lee Arenas to Elizabeth Green, 15 July 1923, folder Palm Springs Indians, C. Hart Merriam Papers Relating to Work with California Indians, 1850-1974, Bancroft Library, Internet Archive, https://archive.org/details/bancroft_chartmerriam_1556_86, accessed 18 May 2015.

Riverside.[392] The Southern California boosters of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce had worked for years to secure title to the bands scenic palm-studded canyons in order to create a national park and draw tourists to the region.[393] The plan would have benefitted greatly from allotment, which had provisions to sell "excess" tribal lands with the proceeds deposited in the United States Treasury on behalf of the tribe. Along the lower stretches of the Colorado River, the government allotted reservation of the Quechan people in 1912. Although the allotments were ostensibly private property, in many instances the local Indian agent leased the lands without the consent of the allottee, often at sub-prime rates, creating very little return for the owner.[394] For President Adam Castillo, the aims of allotment were all too clear. "[W]e know what the scheme is back of the allotments. We can see it plain. I think you would know, Mr. Ellis would know, every Government official knows, I think," he told the superintendent of the Mission Indian Agency.[395] Needless to say, the Federation did not allow the Bureau to allot Southern California Indian Country without a fight.

Tempers flared as large groups of Federationists tore down fences of mixed-blood progressives who scoffed at the traditional leadership and attempted to enclose tribal

---

[392] Elizabeth Green, "The Indians of Southern California and Land Allotment," folder Palm Springs Indians, C. Hart Merriam Papers Relating to Work with California Indians, 1850-1974, http://www.archive.org/details/bancroft_chartmerriam_1556_86, 9-10.

[393] "Doctor George P. Clements…," folder IDA of Southern California, Papers of the California League for American Indians, C-A 360, Carton 2, Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley, hereinafter referred to as PCLAI.

[394] Patrick Miguel to Hon. Charles H. Burke, 26 May 1927, folder Swing – Johnson Indian Bill 1932, carton 2, PCLAI; "Report on Cooperation between the Federal Government and the States, and Political Subdivisions in Welfare Work for Indians, folder Swing – Johnson Indian Bill 1932, carton 2, PCLAI.

[395] Adam Castillo in "Report of Meeting Held at Soboba Indian Reservation, 3:30 p.m. Wednesday, April 23, 1924," 82891-1921, box 12, CCF 1907-39 – M.11

common lands on reservations including La Jolla and Mesa Grande.[396] Opposition to allotment was so strong that Wadsworth, the target of much opposition and likely threats and intimidation from the Federation and others, dubbed Federationists "insurgents," and came to regard Southern California Indian Country as a "community of treacherous and murderous Indians…."[397] However, Adam Castillo and many other tribal members charged that, "The special allotting agent drops on the reservation and gets a few Indians who wants [sic] allotments. Then he does and allots each, gives them the chance to select somebody's land and allot it to that Indian."[398] They were not radicals. Rather, they resisted an outside force coming onto their lands and taking them from their members.

The politics of allotment worked again to divide the Mission Indians as agents like Wadsworth at times carelessly disregarded tribal reservation assignments made by the traditional leadership and effectively gave legal title to the lands that a tribal member lived on and often had built a house and other improvements upon to another. Matters often became even worse when allottees rented out such plots to non-Indians. Indeed, government investigators noted that allotment "had been a bone of contention for several years; the feeling growing more bitter as time went on. I found factions tensely lined up against each other, families divided against themselves."[399] The traditional leaders told non-Indian activists that they did "not want allotments, nor [did] they want Indian lands

[396] Charles Ellis to Commissioner of Indian Affairs, 21 November 1927, 32617, box 13, CCF 1907-39 – M; Charles Ellis to Commissioner of Indian Affairs, 22 August 1925, ibid.

[397] Harry Wadsworth to Commissioner of Indian Affairs, 21 April 1928, personnel file of Harry Wadsworth, NPRC; H.E. Wadsworth to Commissioner of Indian Affairs, 28 august 1922 in Senate Committee on Indian Affairs, *Survey of Conditions of the Indians in the United States: Part 29, California* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. G.P.O., 1934), 15883.

[398] Adam Castillo in "Report of Meeting Held at Soboba Indian Reservation, 3:30 p.m. Wednesday, April 23, 1924," 82891-1921, box 12, CCF 1907-39 – M.

[399] Jenkins to Sells, DePorte, *A Report in Three Parts*.

leased to white 'foreigners.' They want[ed] it to remain 'Indian.'"[400] Captains on some reservations such as La Jolla saw the Bureau make allotments in 1891, only to find after much work over many years that the government never approved nor issued title to them, a situation all too reminiscent of the 1852 treaties.[401] They demanded to know the true boundaries of their reservations since numerous surveys had robbed them of tillable lands and valuable sources of water and then that the government leave them to their own devices to continue their lives in a conservative manner as they had always done.[402]

Tribal funds and money were perhaps equally as contentious a topic as allotment. Traditionally, dealing with outsiders, especially in monetary affairs, was the job of the captain. In aboriginal and colonial times, the captains kept a portion of fines collected as fee for his services and distributed the remainder to the aggrieved.[403] In 1910, one agent complained that the fees collected by captain of the Cahuilla Reservation from the non-Indian trespassers as well as from his own people violated the Indian Bureau procedures. Instead, the Bureau demanded that the bands follow their own circuitous, bureaucratic procedures and leave financial matters to the federal government with monies deposited in the U.S. Treasury.[404] The Bureau often grossly neglected its trust responsibilities on behalf of the tribes and many instances existed of its employees defrauding both tribes

[400] "Indian Defense Association of Central and Northern California Field Trip Report, 18-22 December 1925," box 1, carton 7, PCLAI.

[401] "Petition Authorized and Approved at the Indian Council Meeting at the La Jolla Reservation, Valley Center, San Diego County, California, July 6th, 1931," MIF folder, Federation packet, CLC.

[402] Bernardo Resvoloso in "Report of Meeting Held at Soboba Indian Reservation, 3:30 p.m. Wednesday, April 23, 1924," 82891-1921, box 12, CCF 1907-39 – M.

[403] Thorne, "The Death of Superintendent Stanley," 238.

[404] Ibid., 241-2.

and the government. It was not uncommon to find resources sold from reservations at cut-rate prices in order to line the pockets of local Bureau employees.[405]

Not only was such an option entirely undesirable to people interested in what was best for their people, it was infantilizing and offensive and it infuriated traditional leaders. These same leaders presaged the actions of the Mission Indian Federation and continued the legacy of Olegario Sali when they took up a collection among the reservations of the area to help pay for legal fees of their attorney and travel to Washington, D.C., to bypass the meddling bureaucracy and deal with the federal government on a nation-to-nation basis.[406] Once again, the leaders of the Federation continued to operate in the same ways their forbearers had before them.

The Federation had formulated plans to go around local agents and work directly with the United States Federal Government in Washington, D.C., since the very days of its founding.[407] Longtime Federation president Adam Castillo travelled to the capital to lobby Congress together with a number of other traditional leaders from the region on reportedly over one hundred occasions.[408] Throughout its existence, the MIF charged membership dues and took up collections to fund such efforts. Pauline Murillo of the San Manuel Reservation remembered, Castillo, the man in "a brown suit and a little brown derby," visiting her family on the San Manuel Reservation. The people of the community saved money in a jar to donate to the Federation and always warned her, "'Don't touch

[405] William Gates to John Collier, 9 April 1935, folder Gates, Dr., OFJC.

[406] Thorne, "The Death of Superintendent Stanley," 243; Senate, *Survey of Conditions of Indian in the United States, Part 29*, 15784-5.

[407] "Indians Employ Council to Free Chief Joe Pete," *Riverside Enterprise*, 2 March 1920, 4.

[408] "Adam Castillo, Mission Indian Leader, Dies," *San Diego Union*, 26 December 1953, 13.

that money up there! That's for Adam.'"[409] Morongo elder Ernest Siva noted that Castillo "enjoyed a certain status," among the Indian peoples of Southern California.[410] Indeed, as president of the Mission Indian Federation, he had taken on the role of general of them all, and as such, expected that people would contribute to the causes he fought for on their behalf.

The Indian Bureau charged Federation leadership with corruption and laziness, citing the collection of such fees or dues, off which they claimed people like Castillo and Vice President Vicente Albanes of the La Jolla Reservation, skimmed a living.[411] Indeed, such allegations, whether true or not, tore the organization apart as government reports included information from Federation leaders wary of rolls of dollar bills "'big enough to choke an ox'" collected on the Campo Reservation handled in a suspicious manner by the treasurer.[412] Castillo reportedly claimed that the Federation raised some $16,000 a year while others put the number closer to $20,000, all kept in a bank in Riverside in his name.[413] Funds came primarily from collections taken on reservations but also from interactions with outsiders, as before, with Castillo accused to taking fees paid by a power company for a right-of-way across Soboba. A 1927 meeting on Soboba escalated when Juan Eleuterio, a long-time progressive, pressed his fellow tribesman for a detailed accounting of the group's funds. As others joined Eleuterio in his demands, Castillo reportedly threatened to arrest anyone who opposed him. By the end of the night,

[409] Pauline Murillo, "The Man with the Brown Derby," in Deborah Dozier, *Standing Firm: The Mission Indian Federation Fight for Basic Human Rights* (Banning, CA: Ushkana Press, 2005), 26.
[410] Richard A. Hanks, "Adam Castillo: A brief sketch (sic)," in ibid., 27.
[411] John Dady to John Collier, 7 February 1934, 33247 1/3, box 16, CCF 1907-39 – M.
[412] Ibid.
[413] Ibid.; Winstead, "Joint Report."

Federation police arrested Eleuterio and hauled him several miles away to the jail in nearby Hemet, California.[414]

The Federation's police force was the most violent point of contention on and among reservations as well as between the Federation and the Bureau. The Federation police was a formalization of the traditional police power of the tribes in a form they believed non-Indians would respect. As such, it ordered its police to uphold the peace, suppress liquor, and assist federal and civil officials.[415] At the time of the Federation's founding, non-Indian police power in Southern California Indian Country was both lacking and consistently accused of abuse. The traditionalists of the Federation smarted as the federal government increased its presence on reservations, changing the power dynamics of their communities. The Native people of Southern California had governed and policed themselves since time immemorial and did not take kindly to these new officers. While the government saw the growing bureaucracy as necessary to the maintenance of law and order as well as stifling the liquor trade, to the Federation and Jonathan Tibbet, Indian agents were just "men who ride up to your place with a bully policeman and tell you how to live and how to conduct your business."[416] The "bully policeman" Tibbet referred to was John Largo of the Cahuilla reservation, who received a

[414] *The Mission Indian Booster*, vol. 1, no. 4 (July 1916), 2; "Indian Sues Accusers," *Los Angeles Times*, 6 October 1927; Cohoon to Assistant Director of Investigation, Palm Springs Band of Mission Indians, H.R. 7450, 436.

[415] Adam Castillo and Ben Watta to All Captains, 30 October 1925, San Diego A-2-M Exhibits 46 - 72, Equity Case Files, Records of District Courts of the United States, R.G. 21, National Archives, Riverside.

[416] Paul Hoffman to Cato Sells, 13 April 1921, personal copy in the author's possession courtesy of Lisa Woodward, Pechanga Cultural Resources.

mortal wound in a gun battle with two Federationists after attempting to collect debts the government claimed one owed it.[417]

Viewing the death of a Bureau police officer as a result of the rise of the Federation, Indian agents issued a large number of indictments and arrested Jonathan Tibbet and fifty-five Mission Indian Federation leaders.[418] The government charged the Native leaders with inciting unrest among the Indians and Tibbet with seeking to alienate the Indians' confidence in the government. That the Bureau arrested powerful tribal spiritual leaders such as Pedro Chino and Salvador Lopez along with Manuel Tortes who claimed to be over 120 years old at the time made the Bureau's actions even more of an affront to the people of Southern California Indian Country.[419] While many local non-Indians rightly viewed the Bureau's charges as spurious, the charges hung in the air for months for most of those indicted and even longer for Tibbet and the top three Federation leaders.[420] The government dropped all charges against the Federation on May 1, 1923. The arrests were neither the first, nor the last time the Bureau arrested Federationists, both individually and in groups.

Federal agents refused to accept tribal police power and put for a large effort to suppress the Federation police, which led to incidents such as when Agent Paul Hoffman locked the Federation police officer of the Volcan (Santa Ysabel) Reservation in jail for

---

[417] *The Indian*, April 1921, 9.

[418] "Grand Jury Delves into Indian Row," *Riverside Press*, 8 April 1921, 3; "Two Indians are Taken at Temecula," 29 September 1921, Riverside Enterprise, 8.

[419] "Two Indians are Taken at Temecula," 29 September 1921, Riverside Enterprise, 8; "Data on Oldest of All Missions," *Riverside Press*, 8 March 1922, 11.

[420] "Tibbett (sic) Arrest Not Justified is Opinion," *Riverside Enterprise*, 28 October 1928, 6; "Mission Indian Ordered Released," *Riverside Press*, 1 August 1922, 2; "Indians Not for Allotment," *Riverside Press*, 2 May 1923, 2.

forty days.[421] Hoffman had a history of arresting reservations residents with whom he disagreed, and had not thought twice about arresting Federation police officers for "impersonating" officers of the law.[422] The agent insisted that only officers appointed by the Indian Bureau were legitimate, and his officers, including progressive Indian judges, fought the conservative traditionalists of the Federation for authority and control. In 1921, the judge appointed by the Pala Agency for the La Jolla Reservation, José Pedro Venado, fined Federation judge Reginaldo Pachito for "acting as a Judge among his people." Often the judgments of such officials became vindictive as when Judge Venado locked Manuel Topado in jail pending a $20 fine simply for not knowing Venado was a judge. No doubt Topado simply refused to recognize Venado's authority over the community.[423] Bureau sources later claimed that when the Federation police was armed during the 1920s, "they burned many houses, destroyed fences, stole stock, and carried on many other depredations."[424] The government thus used the same language employed by the United States in earlier decades against peoples who defended their homelands from settler colonialists. By tearing down allotment fences and refusing to allow others to usurp the rights and lands of its members, the Federation merely upheld traditional, conservative ways of life on tribal lands.

[421] Paul Hoffman to Mr. Le Crane, 3 December 1920, personal copy obtained from Lisa Woodward, Pechanga Cultural Resources.

[422] Paul Hoffman to Cato Sells, 13 April 1921, personal copy in the author's possession courtesy of Lisa Woodward, Pechanga Cultural Resources.

[423] Jose Pedro Venado to P.T. Hoffman, 18 June 1921, personal copy provided to the author by Lisa Woodward, Pechanga Cultural Resources.

[424] John Dady to William Zimmerman, 14 September 1937, folder 33247 pt. 2 ½, box 16, CCF 1907-39 – M.

The Federation police was involved in its fair share of violence, however. Intertribal politics and long-held animosities too found iteration within the Federation. Out on the Colorado River, violence flared when a Cocopah Federation police officer killed a Quechan man who was beating his Cocopah wife, a sister of the officer.[425] The Quechan, who at that point were mostly anti-Federationists, found their efforts at justice stymied by Bureau ineptitude. Quechan leaders pressed their superintendent for help, arguing, "if it were a white man killed you would prosecute," but to no avail.[426] The superintendent did not wish to bring the case to trial for fear of exposing misconduct on both his part and the part of the agency doctor for the way they handled the death.

The most violent affray of the Federation police, however, was on the night of July 16, 1927, when, close to the Mexican line, the Campo Reservation held its annual fiesta. Fiestas were a common cultural activity throughout Southern California Indian Country that evolved from traditional winter gatherings and facilitated marriages, merriment, and politics.[427] The Federation utilized these traditional inter-reservation fiestas to conduct business and spread news.[428] Many people celebrated and enjoyed these "big times" for days, although the Bureaus saw them as occasions of vice and drunkenness as well as opportunities to interfere with Federation activities. When a prohibition team attempted to seize a pair of men suspected of bootlegging at the fiesta, one of whom was the younger brother of the Federation captain of the reservation, the MIF police ordered their release on the grounds that only they had jurisdiction on tribal

[425] "Yuma Reservation – Meeting of Indians, June 16/34," folder Gates, Dr., OFJC.
[426] Ibid.
[427] Clifford Trafzer, "Children's Health, Assimilation, and Field Nurses among Southern California Indians, 1928-1948," *American Indian Culture and Research Journal*, vol. 33, no. 4 (2009), 113-137.
[428] Marjorie Roalfe to J.A. Moore, 21 March 1933, 28034-1932, box 14, CCF 1907-39 – M.

lands. In the ensuing scuffles, pistol butts and clubs flew followed by shots fired. When the smoke cleared, two traditional leaders lay dead with at least eight others wounded.[429] The federal government moved to prosecute those Federation police involved in the incident, a move Indian attorney Thomas L. Sloan hoped would proceed with all expedience.

In 1926, the president of the Federation told the prominent attorney Thomas L. Sloan of the Omaha Tribe that "they were exercising self government [sic]," and that Sloan "should be in favor of Indians having self government [sic]."[430] Sloan, however, had received training as a lawyer in the legal system of the United States, having passed the Nebraska and California State Bars and argued a case in front of the Supreme Court of the United States. This rigorous training in non-Native legal traditions led him to disagree with the Federation's stance, arguing "that self government [sic] had to be based on some law authorizing its organization and giving it powers; that without such laws, that the acts of all their so called [sic] officer were violations of the law and subjected them to prosecution, fine and imprisonment."[431] As a former president of the Society of American Indians, Sloan was no stranger to the debate on the future of tribal people and governance and held a cynical but pragmatic stance on tribal relations with the United States. Indeed, in a 1911 piece written for the SAI's *American Indian* magazine, Sloan wrote that, "While treaties were made with all the solemnity of international law, still the Indian tribes were within the power and jurisdiction of the dominant government," and

[429] Tanis Thorne, "On the Fault Line: Political Violence at Campo Fiesta and National Reform in Indian Policy," *Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology*, vol. 21, no. 2 (1999), 182-212.
[430] Statement of Thomas L. Sloan, in Winstead, "Joint Report," 8.
[431] Ibid.

the that the United States had "always exercised sovereignty over the territory lying within its borders," though at the same time, it "acknowledged from the beginning that the various Indian tribes owned the land."[432] This distinction laid the heart of Sloan's position and enabled him to fight for title to or compensation for the theft of the lands Indian peoples rightly owned, while arguing against tribal home rule or sovereignty at the same time.

Sloan's conviction that the Federation operated outside of the law instilled in him a desire to bring about its demise. The Omaha lawyer took on at least three federal court cases against the Mission Indian Federation and its individual members throughout the course of the 1920s, including for the arrest of Juan Eleuterio, for the destruction of allotment fencing on La Jolla, and for the eviction of an elderly woman from the Soboba Reservation.[433] Combined with the prosecution of the Campo Federation police officers, these cases meant little as they languished far-out on the docket of the federal court. Frustrated, Sloan lamented, "the delays seem unending with the criminal prosecutions here."[434] His lack of progress in his prosecution of the Federation in federal courts underscored the legal ambiguities within Indian Country at the time and prompted Sloan to write local Congressman Phil Swing and argued for the transfer of criminal jurisdiction over tribal people within California to the state in order to ensure more prompt action and

[432] Thomas L. Sloan, "The Reservation System," in Alvin M. Josephy, *Red Power: The American Indians' Fight for Freedom* (New York: American Heritage Press, 1971), 21.

[433] T. Robert Przeklasa, "Divided Opposition: Thomas Sloan and the Mission Indian Federation," unpublished manuscript, 25; C.L. Ellis to Commissioner of Indian Affairs, 28 February 1929, folder 82891-1921, box 13, CCF 1907-39 – M. .

[434] Thomas Sloan to Charles Ellis, 30 January 1928, Folder 2, Organizations Interested in Indians, Mission Indian Federation, ½, Box 16, MIA CCF 1920-1953, Riverside.

execution of justice.[435] Sloan thus represented the impetus of the future Swing-Johnson Bill that sought just such a transfer, and eventually resulted in the famous Public Law 280 in 1953, which transferred civil and criminal jurisdiction over certain sections of Indian Country to their respective states.[436]

Interestingly, Sloan first arrived in California on the heels of his legal partner, Herman Freese of Pender, Nebraska. Before Sloan's arrival, Freese worked with the Mission Indian Federation in their struggles against allotment.[437] As the Federation's legal counsel in 1924, Freese presented a powerful argument to the citizens of San Diego County in the local newspaper. He articulated the Federation's position in a petition to the federal government that stated that under allotment, "'families who have improved their tracts will be deprived of the fruits of their years of labor… thus leaving the industrious and frugal members of the tribe homeless and helpless…. By depriving them of their cultivated lands and allotting worthless hillsides to them, a large number may be made public charges as paupers and a burden on the taxpayer.'"[438] The argument of the Federation and their attorney was effective, as the paper's editor injected an editorial in bold print stating, "The prospect of the 1000-odd Indians affected becoming wards of the

[435] Thomas L. Sloan to Phil D. Swing, 6 January 1928, Folder 2, Organizations Interested in Indians, Mission Indian Federation, ½, Box 16, MIA CCF 1920-1953, Riverside.

[436] Ibid. The Swing-Johnson Bill referenced refers to that dealing with Indian Affairs, not the better-known bill that provided for the construction of the Hoover Dam. In an interesting twist, this origin means that a piece of legislation that the Federation later supported actually had its origins as a tool to use against "our Federation friends…" as Sloan termed them. Many Federationists also even took credit for the passage of P.L. 280. See Tanis Thorne, "*The Removal of the Indians* of *El Capitan* to Viejas; Confrontation and Change in San Diego *Indian* Affairs in the 1930s," Journal of San Diego History vol. 56, nos. 1 & 2, (Winter/Spring 2010), 43-66.

[437] "Old, Old Story Gets to Court," *Los Angeles Times*, 7 August 1924; "U.S. Act May Make Indians Wards of S.D.," *San Diego Sun,* 10 April 1924.

[438] Herman Freese in "U.S. Act May Make Indians Wards of S.D.," *San Diego Sun,* 10 April 1924.

county, also has focused the attention of county officialdom on the situation."[439] Indeed, the thought of the federal government relieving itself of its obligations to or burden of the Mission Indians leaving local officials to pick up the pieces was not appealing to county supervisors.

That same year, Republican President Calvin Coolidge signed the General Indian Enfranchisement Act and granted federal citizenship to all Indian peoples of the United States.[440] Four years later, the Republican Party included an Indian plank in its 1928 platform that called for "the repeal of any law and the termination of any administrative practice which may be inconsistent with Indian citizenship, to the end that the Federal guardianship existing over the persons and properties of Indian tribal communities may not work a prejudice to the personal and property rights of Indian citizens of the United States."[441] The plank was consistent with the national *policy* trend since the passage of the 1887 Dawes Allotment Act for the federal government to remove itself from Indian Country. However, the situation on the ground, particularly in California, never reflected the official federal policy that dictated a shrinking Indian Bureau, and Mission Indian peoples never forgot the ways the United States treated them and their forbearers.[442]

Native memory surveyed a larger arch of history than those of government bureaucrats in the Mission Indian Country. The 1903 forced evictions of Kupa and the

---

[439] Ibid.

[440] Helen Chalakee Burgess, "Citizenship and Enfranchisement," *Native America in the Twentieth Century: An Encyclopedia*, ed. Mary Davis (New York: Garland Publishing, 1994), 116-7.

[441] Jennings C. Wise to John Collier, 30 June 1928, folder T-Z Misc. Corresp., Carton 12, PCLAI. The Democratic National Committee did not have an Indian plank until 1940. John Collier to Jennings C. Wise, 11 September 1928, folder T-Z Misc. Corresp., Carton 12, PCLAI; Democratic Party Platform of 1940, The American Presidency Project, University of California, Santa Barbara, http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=29597, retrieved 25 May 2015.

[442] Thorne, "On the Fault Line," 185.

San Felipe Valley that saw most of the Cupeño moved to the Pala Reservation also forced people from other villages such as Puerta Noria from their homes. Their ejection left them not only without a home, but also often without any legal standing in the reservation communities that graciously took them in. Sebastiano Guassac, traditional captain of Puerta Noria found his way to the nearby Mesa Grande Reservation. In 1924, an agent told the people of Mesa Grande that they must do their part and help the government help them; Guassac responded, "The government isn't helping me. I want the Government to let me go free. I want the land I had years ago. The Indians owned all this land. We had a place to live by they have taken the lands away from us."[443] While the government refused to recognize village such as Guassac's, the Federation did from the very beginning, noting members from Mataguey, Santa Gertrudes, Halewah, San Felipe, Puerta Cruz, Puerta Noria, San Juan Capistrano, and San Luis Rey, all places the government never protected as reservations.[444] Federationists clung to their associations with such traditional villages for many decades after the removal and registered as members of them for the Claims Cases.[445] Except for those who worked in the Mission Indian Agency for years, Bureau officials were often ignorant of Southern California Indian history. Even when they were aware of immensely important events and issues such as the Unratified Treaties, federal employees did not ascribe the same importance to events seventy or more years in the past that Indian people did. For conservative

[443] Sebastiano Guassac in "Report of Meeting of the Mesa Grande Indians, held at Mesa Grande Reservation, April 25, 1924," 82891-1921, box 12, CCF 1907-39 – M.

[444] *The Indian*, vol.1, no. 4 (November 1921), 5.

[445] United States House of Representatives, *California Indians Judgment Fund, 1966: Hearings before the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs on H.R. 8021* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. G.P.O., 1966), 78.

Federationists as well as progressive cooperatives, the treaties arguably remained the central political issue for at least the first six decades of the twentieth century.[446]

As the 1920s came to a close, the Mission Indian Agency began to exert stronger, more conservative efforts to end the activities and self-government of the Federation. By 1929, Indian agents had begun to remove Federationists from agency ration rolls in an effort to starve them into submission.[447] Jonathan Tibbet passed away in 1930, and for a while the Federation continued to meet at his home with the welcome of his wife. In 1932, however, the County of San Diego commissioned a study of conditions on three of the numerous reservations within its boundaries, La Jolla, Los Coyotes, and Santa Ysabel, which combined had eighty Federation and seventeen non-Federation families.[448] The deputy treasurer of the county, Purl Willis, chaired the three-person commission. Appalled by the conditions he witnessed, Willis took it upon himself to champion the cause of the Southern California Indian people. Willis likely met Federation president Adam Castillo in September 1932, shortly after his initial tour of the San Diego reservations, as the pair led members of the United States Senate Committee on Indian Affairs around the region.[449] He soon assumed Tibbet's former role as non-Indian "counselor" to the Federation.

Thanks to a concerted effort to win her over on the part of the Mission Indian Agency, Mrs. Emma Tibbet had warmed to the Indian Bureau since the death of her

---

[446] "Report of Meeting Held at Soboba Indian Reservation, 3:30 p.m. Wednesday, April 23, 1924," 82891-1921, box 12, CCF 1907-39 – M.

[447] S.P. Crowley, "Joseph Albanes, et al," box 13, CCF 1907-39 – M.

[448] B. W. Cohoon, "Supplementary Report," 18 August 1933, 33247-1933, 155 1/3, box 16, CCF 1907-39 – M.

[449] "Visit Indian Reservations in Probe," *San Diego Evening Tribune*, 26 September 1932, pg. 1.

husband. So much so that by 1933, the agent in charge of the MIA claimed that she was "really working with us."[450] The bureaucrats of the Agency also strived to keep Willis out of the picture, fearing another oppositional figure in the spirit of the late Tibbet. Tensions immediately flared when Willis showed up at the October 1932 conference only to have Mrs. Tibbet eject him. From then on, the Federation met elsewhere, mostly in secret on the reservations. Described as a "convert to our administration," Mrs. Tibbet had worked successfully "to hold Adam in line" for a number of months following the passing of her husband on the Bureau's behalf. The Agency worked on Castillo, as well, attempting to do their part to keep him from fighting them with a federal job during the Great Depression.[451] By December, however, Castillo had had enough of trying to make nice with the government and sided with Willis instead of listening to the Bureau and their agents, official or otherwise.

Willis was a controversial man, one at times accused of carrying an onion in his pocket due to his tearful, passionate speeches.[452] To many Indians and non-Indians he was a crook who robbed Federation members of their cash dues and sought to profit from their lands and Claims Case settlement.[453] His harshest critic characterized him as a "psychopathic liar."[454] The Bureau accused him of profiteering from the sale of the Baron Long Ranch to the government in connection with the removal of the people of the El

[450] John Dady to John Collier, 10 October 1933, 33247-1933, 155 2/3, box 16, CCF 1907-39 – M.
[451] John Dady to William Zimmerman, 16 February 1934, folder 35249-1934 155, box 17, CCF 1907-39 – M.
[452] Carl Steiner to Mr. Murphy, 20 August 1940, personnel file of John Dady, folder 3, NPRC.
[453] Patty Dixon, personal interview with the author, 5 October 2012, California Indian Conference, San Marcos, California; George Marston to Major Ed Davis, 31 January 1933, folder 27844-1939, box 20, CCF 1907-39 – M.
[454] Dady to Zimmerman, 16 February 1934.

Capitan Reservation.[455] Tribal members on the La Jolla and Rincon Reservations in San Diego County who did not trust Willis joined the Mission Indian Cooperative Society (MICS). Most MICS members had already received title to their land as allotments and pledged cooperation with the Bureau. MICS claimed membership of some sixty percent of the populations of La Jolla and Rincon.[456] Using the opposition's numbers, the remaining forty percent, then were "not willing to cooperate with the Indian office and saw Willis as a great reformer who had "given unreservedly of [his] time and means in promoting the best interests of the Indians."[457] A lifelong Republican, Willis served on the California Republican Central Committee as a delegate from San Diego County, and brought his political ideals with him to the Federation. Although the Bureau considered him "a formidable figure in Indian affairs in southern California," the rise of Democratic power in Washington saw him enter the politics of Indian affairs on a national level.[458]

In 1934, Democratic President Franklin Roosevelt said that the "'continuance of autocratic rule by a Federal [sic] department over the lives of 200,000 citizens of this nation [was] incompatible with American ideals of liberty.'" For him, the Indian Bureau

[455] B.W Cohoon to Assistant Director of Investigation, 18 August 1933 in House, *Palm Springs Band of Mission Indians: Hearings on H.R. 7450*, 437. For an excellent, in-depth look at the El Capitan saga, see Tanis Thorne, *El Capitan: Adaptation and Agency on a Southern California Indian Reservation, 1850-1937* (Morongo Indian Reservation, Banning, CA: Malki-Ballena Press, 2012).

[456] Lois Calac, S. E. Calac, Tom Arviso, and Ben Amago to John Collier, 3 August 1933, personnel file of John W. Dady, NPRC; San Diego County Board of Supervisors Report on the Conditions of Indian Reservations in San Diego County, 1932, quoted in B. W. Cohoon, "Supplementary Report," 18 August 1933, 33247-1933, 155 1/3, box 16, CCF 1907-39 – M..

[457] Ibid.; Louis Thomas to John Collier, 26 August 1933, folder 33247-1933, 155 2/3, box 16, CCF 1907-39 – M.

[458] Tanis Thorne, *El Capitan*, 154-5. "San Diegans on Committees of State G.O.P.," *San Diego Union*, 30 September 1930, 8; Cohoon to Assistant Director of Investigation, *Palm Springs Band of Mission Indians, H.R. 7450*, 438.

had been "'destructive of the character and self-respect of a great race.'"[459] In an effort to bring the government in line with those ideals of liberty, Roosevelt appointed the progressive activist Harold Ickes secretary of the interior the year before. Early in his administration, Ickes told Federation President Adam Castillo that he knew the Mission Indians were scattered on thirty small, remote reservations "inadequate for… proper subsistence." From Ickes's perspective, however, these problems were all "the product of a remote past, and it [would] not be the immediate power of any new personnel to change them suddenly."[460] These words no doubt troubled the Federation President, although Ickes' appointment of John Collier, a passionate non-Indian activist, social worker, and above all, romantic, to the post of Commissioner of Indian Affairs, initially seemed a victory. After all, Collier had campaigned for the abolition of the Indian Bureau alongside the Federation for years.

As commissioner, however, Collier spear-headed a piece of legislation known initially as the Wheeler-Howard Bill and today as the Indian Reorganization Act (IRA) or the Indian New Deal. At the time, some supporters believed that the IRA would strip the Bureau of its power to abuse and exploit Indians and eventually lead to its final abolition.[461] However, as the Mission Indian Federation and many others in Southern California Indian Country quickly recognized, it would do no such thing. The same year as President Roosevelt's stirring words, Federation leaders traveled to Washington, D.C., in order to fight for their rights to private legal counsel and for a proper settlement of the

[459] Franklin D. Roosevelt in "The Indian Rights Bill," *Los Angeles Times*, 1 May 1934, A4.
[460] Harold Ickes to Adam Castillo, 5 July 1933, 28034-1932, box 14, CCF 1907-39 – M.
[461] Ibid.

debacle unfolding on the El Capitan Reservation, as well as to oppose Collier and the IRA. The Federation had become politically sophisticated and its leaders handed down orders that "Every Indian must register [to vote] now, if he has not already done so," and urged local leaders to "Check up on this."[462] After all, they knew that every congressional representative ran an election every two years, and they had made "a lot of powerful friends here in Washington."[463] The men also reported that they had been meeting with other Indian groups from around the United States throughout the early months of 1934. The others must have liked what they saw in the Mission Indian Federation for they planned to use it as the basis for a new, national organization to bring an end to Bureau domination of Indian lives.

[462] Adam Castillo to friends, 30 May 1934, 33247 1/3, box 16, CCF 1907-39 – M. Original emphasis in capitals, underline mine.

[463] Ibid.

CHAPTER FOUR
"INDIANS AREN'T RED!" THE MISSION INDIAN FEDERATION GOES NATIONAL

The American Indian Federation, therefore, consists of certain men who have a bona fide authorization from a majority of the members of certain of the Mission Indian bands of Southern California, and with these men are associated a few individual Indians in other parts of the country and certain white men.

-COMMISSIONER JOHN COLLIER, 1935

American Indian leaders from across the United States gathered at Gallup, New Mexico, on August 27, 1934. There, led by the Mission Indian Federation (MIF) of Southern California, politically conservative Indian opponents of the newly appointed Commissioner of Indian Affairs, John Collier, formed a national front: the American Indian Federation (AIF). On that day, the MIF gained "more friends than ever" in their struggle for freedom and justice.[464] In the end, however, the national effort proved too difficult to maintain, as it quickly succumbed to internal conflict and a determined campaign by the Indian Bureau to discredit the organization through its affiliation with the far right.[465] This collapse greatly hampered the struggle against federal control over American Indians during the New Deal Era of the 1930s and '40s, a period that fundamentally changed the Mission Indian Federation.

The AIF's membership rolls contained only Indian people. The Native organizations that filled the ranks hailed from across the country, ranging from the Black

---

Title: William Dudley Pelley, "'Indians Aren't Red!' The Inside Story of the Administration's Attempt to Make Communists of the North Carolina Cherokees," (Asheville, North Carolina: Pelley Publishers).

Epigraph: Department of the Interior Memorandum for the Press, 6 February 1935, folder 7 – Organizations Interested in Indians, AIF, MIA CCF 1920-1953, Riverside.

[464] Purl Willis to L.T. Eugene Ness, 6 August 1935, folder 1, ENC.

[465] Although the Office of Indian Affairs only became the Bureau of Indian Affairs in 1947, period sources refer to it as the Indian Bureau. This and the blanket designation of records under Bureau of Indian Affairs by the National Archives and Records Administration have compelled me to utilize Office and Bureau of Indian Affairs when appropriate as well as Indian Bureau and Bureau to variation.

Hills Treaty Council to the Eastern Band of Cherokees to the Mission Indian Federation, and had fought for their rights in the decades preceding the meeting. A number of non-Indian organizations continued to work on behalf of American Indians across the country alongside them as well. Among these was the American Indian Defense Association (AIDA), the organization that John Collier spearheaded prior to his appointment in the Interior Department. An idealistic social reformer based in Northern California, Collier spent much of his early career with AIDA working among the Pueblo peoples of New Mexico. There, he developed his theory of the "Red Atlantis" as an idealization of Native communalism. One Bureau employee remembered Collier as "a poet, and… a mystic… a person who was so unusual."[466] Because of this outlook, waves of criticism and allegations of communist ties beset Collier long before he became Commissioner of Indian Affairs and later greatly tinged his administration.[467]

Regardless of the initial accusations, Collier was an effective and respected reformer in Indian Country. Prior to his appointment, the Mission Indian Federation and the California Mission Indian Advisory Council, the MIF's affiliated body of non-Indian advisors, supported John Collier in his work on behalf of Indian rights.[468] For his part, Collier was conciliatory towards the MIF even in his early administration when he stated, "the Mission Indians as now organized in the federation must be a central, [sic]

[466] Rita Singer, "Oral History Interview with Rita Singer," OH 92–13, State Government Oral History Program, California State Archives, Sacramento, California, 32.

[467] Joel Pfister, *Individually Incorporated: Indians and the Multicultural Modern* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2004), 200.

[468] Adam Castillo in U.S. House of Representatives, *Readjustment of Indian Affairs, Part 7* (U.S. G.P.O.: Washington, D.C., 1934), 270.

component part of any local organization for Indian Service."[469] When confirmation hearings for his appointment to the Bureau stalled, Collier called upon a number of tribal groups, including the MIF, for endorsements. The MIF provided theirs and helped secure his appointment.[470] The Federation did so with the belief that Collier shared their goal of eliminating the Indian Bureau. Within months, however, he dashed such hopes and charged Mission Indian Reservations with rebellion.[471]

Collier lost support in Southern California due to several factors. The Mission Indians expected the new administration to replace local officials of the Mission Indian Agency (MIA), many of whom they had come to distrust and dislike. MIF members recommended their non-Indian advisor, Purl Willis, "without his previous knowledge," to replace the incumbent superintendent, Charles Ellis.[472] Instead, Collier appointed a "new agent of the 'old school,' a career Bureau man with a name that betrayed his paternalism, John Dady, to the position in July of 1933.[473] Furious, Federationists vociferously reasserted their demands and chanted, "We want Willis. We want Willis," during the new superintendent's introductory speech.[474]

The new commissioner further angered the Indians of California with his support of a compromise made by the California Attorney General, U.S. Webb, on the Claims Case, *Indians of California vs. United States*, filed on behalf of the descendants of the

---

[469] John Collier quoted by Adam Castillo in House, *Readjustment of Indian Affairs, Part 7*, 289.
[470] Adam Castillo in ibid., 290.
[471] Department of the Interior Press Release, 17 April 1934, 33247 1/3, box 16, CCF 1907-39 – M.
[472] Adam Castillo in U.S. House of Representatives, House, *Readjustment of Indian Affairs, Part 7*, 270.
[473] Louis Thomas to John Collier, 26 August 1933, 33247, box 16, CCF 1907-39 – M.
[474] Ibid., 268; Tanis Thorne, "The Removal of the Indians of El Capitan to Viejas," *The Journal of San Diego History* Vol. 56 Issue 1/2, 56-7; J.H. Batten to Sen. Lynn Frazier, 27 February 1934, 33247 1/3, box 16, CCF 1907-39 – M.

signers of the Unratified Treaties of the 1850s. The agreement accepted an offset for "services rendered" by the government to the Indians of California in return for the ability to bring additional litigation in the future. Thus, bureaucrats methodically figured out the costs incurred by the Indian Bureau, sometimes down to individual buttons, during its decades of work in the state. The federal government even deducted the cost of boarding schools like Sherman Institute from the Claims award. The offsets amounted to $12,500,000 that the court eventually deducted from the final judgment of $19,000,000. This massive deduction from the claim infuriated not only the Mission Indians, but those across the state as well.[475]

To fight the offsets, the MIF moved to allow Indians to hire their own attorneys to argue the Claims for them. Their inability to employ private council symbolized the second-class citizenship the Federation fought to rise above. Given that the Attorney General advocated that the federal government deduct the majority of the settlement, the MIF and many others naturally believed that private attorneys could do better. Collier and Webb opposed independent attorneys since they argued that the attorneys were merely sharks out for a ten percent cut of the judgment.[476] At worst, a $1,900,000, ten-percent attorney fee was much better than the $12,500,000, some seventy-percent, taken by the offsets in the deal obtained by Webb, free-of-charge.

Following the Claims Case debacle, their failure to gain control of the Mission Indian Agency with the appointment of Willis as superintendent, and Collier's plans to

[475] Susan Sanchez, "The Selling of California: The Indian Claims Commission and the Case of the *Indians of California v. the United States*," (PhD diss., University of California, Riverside, 2003), 44-6.
[476] John Collier to Robert Scripps, 21 June 1934, 27844, CCF 1907-39 – M.

grow the Indian Bureau rather than eliminate it, the Mission Indian Federation moved to oust the new commissioner with a national organization.[477] Collier's experience with the MIF earlier in his career enabled him to fight back very effectively. He knew that the group set itself up as a governing force in Southern California Indian Country with its own political leaders, judiciary, and police force. Collier initially tried to coopt the MIF and use them as a governing body on his behalf, but the Federation would never accept his control.[478] Therefore, he set out to undermine and eventually destroy the Federation.

Three days after Dady's appointment, on August 5, 1933, a large force of MIF police officers ordered Bureau police and prohibition officers to leave the annual fiesta on the Mesa Grande Reservation. In a move one officer characterized as "arrogant," the Federationists demanded warrants before they would allow searches of automobiles for liquor.[479] Although the officer backed down and averted bloodshed, or so he bragged, the incident had drastic consequences. Instead of following the customary path of filing charges against those involved, the new commissioner approached the situation with a more sweeping and dramatic response: "throwing self-government squarely at *each* of the bands."[480] The Bureau planned to have tribes set up governments as federal corporations with a spokesman and business committee elected yearly. The boilerplate constitutions and non-Native style of the governments appealed to very few in the region. The self-

[477] James H. Batten to John Collier, 30 April 1934, 32876, CCF 1907-39 – M.

[478] John Collier quoted by Adam Castillo in House, *Readjustment of Indian Affairs, Part 7*, 289.

[479] John Collier, "The Mission Reservation, the Mission Indian Federation, and the Allegations of Mr. Purl Willis and Mr. Adam Castillo," in U.S. House of Representatives, House, *Readjustment of Indian Affairs, Part 7*, 272-7. Although the repeal of national prohibition came in December of 1933, prohibition against American Indians continued for decades until the federal government left the matter to tribes in the 1950s.

[480] John Collier to John Dady, 8 August 1933, 33247 3/3, CCF 1907-39 – M, emphasis mine.

government plan was also a move designed to eat at the heart of the Federation's strength, to divide and conquer. The self-government program forced Federation captains to jockey to hold positions in the new Bureau-sanctioned governments. Collier's Bureau also worked quickly to dismantle the Federation police, who quickly disappeared from the record, effectively marking the end of the Mission Indian Federation's function as a governing body in the region.

A man noted to "be most interested in regulating the conduct of *his* Indians," and "rather dictatorial in manner," Dady, moved quickly to implement Collier's "scheme of self-government."[481] In the depths of the Great Depression, the superintendent used his most powerful weapon to starve out the Federation: employment. According to Felix Rice of the Santa Rosa Reservation, Dady reasoned that if members had enough money to pay dues, they must not need a job.[482] Under such conditions, reports began to reach Collier in April of 1934 that the MIF had begun to form a national organization to oppose him and his legislation.[483] Within months, the campaign to organize nationally bore fruit in the form of the American Indian Federation. The work began in California, driven by the Indian Claims Commission case.

Given that some pushed for the suit to represent Indians of the entire state, the Mission Indian Federation moved to unite with Indians in Northern California. The first step towards a national opposition towards Collier saw the union of the MIF of Southern

[481] A.C. Cooley, Memorandum on Superintendent John W. Dady, 22 January 1934, personnel file of John W. Dady, NPRC. Emphasis mine. John Dady to John Collier, 5 February 1934, 33247 1/3, ibid.
[482] Felix Rice to John Collier, 21 January 1934, ibid.
[483] James H. Batten to John Collier, 30 April 1934, 32876, ibid.

California with a Northern California group, Indians of California, Inc.[484] Run by the notorious Reverend Frederick Collette, a Methodist minister widely believed to be a confidence man among tribes in Northern California, Indians of California, Inc. worked for years to gain compensation for the Unratified Treaties through the Indian Claims Commission.[485] The Federation's non-Indian advisor, Purl Willis, recognized Collette's dubious reputation less than two years earlier and denied any connection between the MIF and Collette.[486] While Collette's organization remained largely removed from the MIF and the soon-to-be-formed AIF, he kept a foothold in the AIF through his controversial attorney Thomas L. Sloan and occasionally cooperated on Claims Cases.

The commissioner and Bureau officials chaffed at the mounting opposition, which they labeled the Collette-Willis gang, and enlisted J. Edgar Hoover's Bureau of Investigation to "stamp out this unhealthful situation."[487] Collier refused to believe that Indians themselves were capable of such opposition and blamed the resistance on the outside influence of white men.[488] Although the two organizations cooperated on Indian Claims, the traditional divide between them remained as Collette denied any union between the two even while working jointly on the cases.[489] The groups kept their

---

[484] Collier, "The Mission Reservation," 275.

[485] Terri Casteneda, "Making News: Marie Potts and *Smoke Signal* of the Federated Indians of California," in *Women in Print: Essays on the Print Culture of American Women from the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries*, James P. Danky& Wayne A. Wiegandeds, eds. (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2006), 81-2.

[486] Purl Willis in United States Senate, *Survey of Conditions of the Indians in the United States, Part 29: California* (Washington, D.C.: United States G.P.O., 1932), 15697.

[487] B.W. Cohoon to Assistant Director of Investigation, 18 August 1933, 33247 1/3, CCF 1907-39 – M.

[488] John Collier to Adam Castillo, 22 August 1933, ibid.

[489] Rev. Frederick G. Collette in United States House of Representatives, *Indian Conditions and Affairs: Hearings, etc., on H. R. 7781 and Other Matters* (Washington, D.C.: United States G.P.O., 1935), 941.

relationship very professional and matter-of-fact and rarely minced words.[490] The nature of this association was indicative of the ties between the various members of the American Indian Federation: fractured and divided, brought together only in their opposition to John Collier.

Connections to tribal nations and groups beyond state lines centered upon opposition to Collier's keystone piece of legislation, the Indian Reorganization Act (IRA) or the Indian New Deal. The IRA ended the federal policy of allotment wherein individual Indians received individual title to reservation lands.[491] It provided for the establishment of tribal governments to manage tribal affairs and communal land and resources through incorporation with the federal government. The act featured a number of other provisions such as a revolving credit fund available for these new governments to borrow from for tribal development. It also established a fund to consolidate scattered reservation parcels and purchase lands to compensate for the massive losses that resulted from allotment.[492]

The reasons many opposed the IRA, specifically in Southern California, varied greatly. A common refrain from members of the Mission Indian Federation was that Indians already possessed the right to organize amongst themselves and had already organized self-government with the Federation; therefore, the IRA was superfluous.[493]

---

[490] Adam Castillo to F.G. Collett, 12 February 1934, folder 3, ENC.

[491] Reformers and government officials implemented allotment as a way to assimilate Native people into the new Euro-American society and secure occupations and self-sufficiency. The policy proved disastrous across Indian Country as more than one-hundred million acres of land passed out of Indian possession as a result. See: Kirke Kickingbird & Karen Ducheneaux, *One Hundred Million Acres* (New York: Macmillan, 1972).

[492] Hertzberg, *The Search for an American Indian Identity*, 288.

[493] Adam Castillo in House, *Readjustment of Indian Affairs, Part 7*, 264-5, & 437.

Furthermore, the legislation left the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and his superior, the secretary of the interior, with a great deal of power over the IRA governments.[494]As such, it did not provide for actual self-government; it only perpetuated bureaucratic control over Indians. It also gave the federal government a key role in the distribution of the funds available to help with issues such as lack of good land, which caused many to believe that the money would be of no use to them at all. As Cahuilla leader Rupert Costo argued, it only created more bureaucracy for them as citizens to pay for.[495]

Other provisions of the bill, such as an increase in funding for on-reservation day schools and a shift in curriculum emphasis to include traditional culture and Native languages, met with strong resistance as well. For many years, the MIF fought to force integration of their children into local public schools.[496] The logic, according to Winslow Couro, traditional captain of the Santa Ysabel Reservation, was simple: "why not let the Indian children mix with the whites, then they will be able to compete with the white man like everyone else."[497] Costo could not understand the desire to educate Indian children in reservation schools: "Is that the way to make American citizens of us?"[498] Couro and Costo both recognized the need for their children to be able to operate in the world outside of the reservation as most Mission Indians had already done for decades. The

[494] Purl Willis in House, *Readjustment of Indian Affairs, Part 7*, 262.

[495] Rupert Costo, 17 March 1934, in "Proceedings of Southern California Indian Congress Held at Riverside," 244. Rupert Costo was a member of and worked with the Federation at various times. At still others, he opposed them as a member of other organizations such as the California Indian Rights Association. See *The Indian*, vol. 4, no. 2 (June 1934), 1.

[496] John W. Dady to Walter Woehlke, 9 June 1934, file 32247, CCF 1907-39 – M.; "Indian Children in Public Schools," *The Indian*, July/August 1934, pg., 9.

[497] Winslow Couro, 18 March 1934, in "Proceedings of Southern California," in *The Indian Reorganization Act*, 254. Couro was a "direct descendent of the General of the Diegueno…." "Before the Indian Claims Commission: Findings of Fact," 13 Ind. Cl. Comm. 369, 461.

[498] Rupert Costo in ibid., 245.

inability of the Santa Ysabel children to attend schools with the non-Indian children in the surrounding communities was Couro's chief grievance with the Bureau. The Bureau had employed him as a sub foreman for emergency conservation work in an attempt to sway the Santa Ysabel Federationists, but released from his post when his criticism and opposition to discriminatory policies became too much for the superintendent to bear.[499] They wanted quality education that would help them succeed in that world so that they could provide for themselves and their families outside of the grinding reservation poverty.

Historians Laurence Hauptman and Hazel Hertzberg noted that scholars have often written-off those who opposed the IRA as assimilationists and over-looked the intricate ways in which they blended Native and outside worlds.[500] A superficial reading of statements such as those from Couro and Costo no doubt lent themselves to such an impression. However, as attested to by his life's work and publications such as his Indian rights newspaper *Wassaja*, Rupert Costo was certainly not an assimilationist. For Costo, education was imperative for cultural and religious survival in the modern United States while citizenship provided necessary guarantees of liberty requisite for the task.[501] Even more complicated was Couro's position. Although he told the House Committee on Indian Affairs in 1934 that the people of his Santa Ysabel Reservation had "no tribal

[499] John Dady to Walter Woehlke, 9 June 1934, folder 33247 pt. 2 ½, box 16, CCF 1907-39 – M.
[500] Laurence Hauptman, "The American Indian Federation and the New Deal: A Reinterpretation," *Pacific Historical Review*, vol. 52, no. 4, (Nov. 1983), 378-402.
[501] Clifford E. Trafzer, e-mail message to the author, 3 June 2013.

customs," Couro remained dedicated to his people's cause and fought to return lands to tribal control under his organization, Kumeyaay, Inc., into the 1960s.[502]

Christianity played a large role in both the Mission and American Indian Federations, as well. Collier's administration made a concerted effort to stop government opposition to traditional religions. This, too, was controversial across Indian Country and elicited reactions similar to those on educational issues. Some Southern California Indians worried that openness to traditional ways would cause them "to revert to old conditions."[503] Others were more blunt, arguing "our nation was founded by its forefathers upon Christian principle, and I don't feel that there should be any opportunity given by which Indians may go back."[504] Similar feelings arose at many of the congresses that introduced the IRA across the rest of Indian Country, too.

Adam Castillo and Purl Willis actively coordinated opposition to the Indian Reorganization Act on the Navajo Reservation in New Mexico, in April of 1933.[505] In all likelihood, the pair met with a "stocky, bowlegged Navajo in [a] three-piece suit," Jacob C. Morgan.[506] A missionary who represented the northern Navajos at the time and later served in various positions on the tribal council including chairman, Morgan led Navajo opposition to the IRA and Collier's subsequent Navajo stock reduction program.[507] Morgan's strong belief in the value of boarding school education among the Navajo as

---

[502] Leonard M. Hill to John D. Crow, 5 April 1961, file 2912, Central Classified Files 1958-1975 – Mission, R.G. 75, NARA, Washington, D.C., hereinafter referred to as CCF 1958-75 – M.

[503] Anonymous question, *The Indian Reorganization Act*, 242.

[504] Ibid.

[505] Collier, "The Mission Reservation," House, *Readjustment of Indian Affairs, Part 7*, 272-7.

[506] Bruce Gjeltema, *Chavez, Senator Dennis and J.C. Morgan*, New Mexico Office of the State Historian, http://www.newmexicohistory.org/filedetails.php?fileID=24598.

[507] "Minutes of the Special Session of the Navajo Tribal Council Held at Fort Defiance, Arizona, March 12 and 13, 1934," in *The Indian Reorganization Act*, 147; Omer Call Stewart, *Peyote Religion: A History* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1987), 296.

well as his work on behalf of the Christian Reform Church facilitated his ties with the Mission Indian Federation.[508] Indeed, Morgan held that "education and Christianity… are the only two great factors for the future salvation of [the Navajos]."[509] Collier believed that Floyd Burnett had contacted missionaries on the Navajo Reservation to bring the Nation into the fold.[510]

The Reverend Floyd O. Burnett served as a Home Missions Council missionary at Sherman Institute, an off-reservation boarding school in Riverside, California (the birthplace of the Mission Indian Federation).[511] The Home Missions Council's field secretary, G.E.E. Lindquist, actively worked against the IRA, which he believed would relegate Indians to a permanent underclass.[512] In April 1934, Burnett instigated a controversy when he used the school's mimeograph machine to copy materials that spoke against the impending IRA. Rumor had it that he took students to various churches in the region to speak out against the new legislation. Once Collier heard of the incident, he promptly barred Burnett from working at Sherman. Collier's actions became vindictive

[508] Vine Deloria, Jr. and Clifford Lytle, *The Nations Within: The Past and Future of American Indian Sovereignty* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1998), 173-4; Parman, "J.C. Morgan," 89.

[509] J.C. Morgan to John Collier, 5 October 1934, American Indian Federation 1933-1937, folder 1, OFJC.

[510] John Collier to Ernest H. McCray, 34 September 1934, American Indian Federation 1933-1937, folder 1, OFJC.

[511] Leaders like J.C. Morgan strongly supported boarding schools such as the Sherman Institute, which historian Kevin Whalen explained had a significant Navajo population at the time. These students likely exposed to the local politics through people such as Rev. Floyd Burnett as well as their California Indian classmates. Kevin Whalen, e-mail message to the author, 8 October 2013.

[512] Lindquist played a large role in coordinating forces against the IRA and eventually established contacts with many members of the AIF, including J.C. Morgan. For information on Lindquist, see David W. Daily, *Battle for the B.I.A.: G.E.E. Lindquist and the Crusade against John Collier* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2004).

when he callously refused to reinstate the Reverend even after the school superintendent supported such a move.[513]

Missionary work spread the anti-IRA organization to others as well. Mark Vest brought the Maricopa and Pima peoples of the Salt River Reservation's Mormon community at Lehi, Arizona, into the fold. A Latter-day Saints missionary, Vest was a member of the Cocopah tribe. By the 1930s, the Bureau had allotted the tiny Cocopah Reservation, which left many tribal members with no land or resources.[514] Those without land flocked to the anti-allotment Mission Indian Federation. These ties, combined with the Bureau's new acceptance of traditional religion to the detriment of Mormonism, led Vest and his constituents to plead for Adam Castillo and Winslow Couro to assist them on Salt River.[515]

After months of groundwork lobbying his case out of "room 2, rebel headquarters" in Washington, D.C., MIF president Adam Castillo met with the president of the Society of Oklahoma Indians on June 8th, 1934, and preliminarily organized a national opposition organization.[516] In late August, joined by Winslow Couro and a delegation of some fifty Mission Indians, Castillo "traveled the pathway of duty" to

---

[513] Daily, *Battle for the BIA*, 96-8; Precedent for Native organizations using the boarding school to print materials for their organizations indeed existed as the Mission Indian Progressive Club had its publication, *Mission Indian Booster*, printed there. "Soboba Indian School Jurisdiction, San Jacinto, California," *The Indian Leader*, vol. 20, no. 34 (April 1917), 9. Collier's refusal was especially vindictive as Burnett pleaded desperately for his position to pay for a badly needed surgery for his wife.

[514] Mission Indian Federation, *The Indian*, April 1922, 7.

[515] Mark Vest to Joseph Bruner, 12 February 1935, in House, *Indian Conditions and Affairs, H.R. 7781*, 15.

[516] L.T. Eugene Ness to Purl Willis, 5 June 1934, box1, folder 1, ENC; American Indian Federation to Abe Murdock, 9 February 1935, in House, *Indian Conditions and Affairs, H.R. 7781*, 14; Marci Barnes Gracey, "Joseph Bruner and the American Indian Federation: An Alternative View of Indian Rights," in *Alternative Oklahoma: Contrarian Views of the Sooner State* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2007), 69.

Gallup, New Mexico.[517] There, gathered "under the protecting roof of a modern, wholesome, Christian church," they expanded the Mission Indian Federation into the national American Indian Federation.[518] Reporting on the event, Donald H. Biery, superintendent of the Sherman Institute, fingered a cast of Southern Californians as the architects of the AIF. After all, the new organization's chaplain, Floyd Burnett, treasurer Winslow Couro, first district president Adam Castillo, and their most powerful attorney, Thomas Sloan, were all residents of the region.[519]

The local newspaper reported that the MIF's non-Indian advisor had been "active in the formation" of the new federation. Collier claimed that the AIF formed "through the initiative of one Purl Willis" to discredit the national organization as illegitimate and under the control of non-Indians.[520] Navajo J.C. Morgan denied Willis's involvement, however, and stated that, though he was indeed present, the adviser remained on the sidelines as Indians themselves organized the AIF.[521] Since the MIF began to criticize Collier, the commissioner launched a Justice Department investigation of Willis that

[517] J.C. Morgan, "American Indian Federation Organized Tuesday at Gallup," *Farmington Times Hustler*, Court of Claims Suit… Bill Texts, OFJC.

[518] "The American Indian Federation," *The American Indian*, vol. IV, no. 4, November-December 1934, 5.

[519] Donald H. Biery to John Collier, 22 September 1934, American Indian Federation 1933-1937, folder 1, OFJC. Further evidence of the AIF's Southern California origins exists in documents originating from the Office of the District Attorney of San Diego County and the Office of Indian Affairs citing the Mission Indian Federation as the American Indian Federation multiple times in 1924, a decade prior to its inception. C.C. Kemply to Charles H. Burke, 13 September 1924, 69558, CCF 1907-39 – M; Charles H. Burke to F.M. Hewson, 27 September 1924, 69558, CCF 1907-39 – M.

[520] M.L. Woodward, "Indians Organize Welfare Society at Gallup August 27," *Southwest Tourist News* 12 Sept 1934, p 1, Court of Claims Suit… Bill Texts, OFJC; John Collier to Robert M. Codd, 20 September 1934, Alice Lee Jemison (Mrs.), OFJC.

[521] J.C. Morgan to John Collier, 5 October 1934, American Indian Federation 1933-1937, folder 1, OFJC.

revealed a forgery conviction in Ohio.[522] Collier used the bad press often to cast Willis as a pernicious criminal influence, but failed to curb him and the Federations completely.

Bureau officials had long claimed that non-Indians controlled the Mission Indian Federation, pointing to Jonathan Tibbet, upon whose property the Federation originally met, as an instigator who riled up Native passions. Adam Castillo took offense at the charge that Willis controlled the MIF and told a congressional committee, "this feeling of freedom and a right in our own business is not one of recent birth; no one has 'incited' us to ask for it now. It has always been in the breast of every Indian."[523] The allegation smacked of paternalism with its assumption that Indians could not have organized the Federations by themselves. Collier and the Indian Bureau applied the same logic to the American Indian Federation and charged Willis with its creation.

Castillo led the inaugural convention as *chairman tempore* prior to the election of a fiery, full-blooded Creek oilman, Joseph Bruner of Sapulpa, Oklahoma as the AIF's first president.[524] Morgan assumed the First Vice-Presidency, Choctaw W.W. LeFlore became secretary, Levi Walker represented the Klamaths of Oregon, and Seneca Alice Lee Jemison stood for the Six Nations of New York.[525] The conference chose the magazine of the Mission Indian Federation, "The Indian," as the official organ of the AIF and renamed it "The American Indian."[526] By December, the group sent a memorial to

---

[522] B.N. McLaughlin to John Collier, 1 October 1934, folder 27844, CCF 1907-39 – M.

[523] Adam Castillo in House, *Readjustment of Indian Affairs, Part 7*, 270.

[524] Resolution on the Formation of the American Indian Federation, 8 June 1934, in House, *Indian Conditions and Affairs, H.R. 7781*, 15.

[525] Joseph Bruner to John Collier, 21 December 1934, American Indian Federation, 1933-1937, folder 1, OFJC.

[526] M.L. Woodward, "Indians Organize Welfare Society at Gallup August 27," *Southwest Tourist News* 12 Sept 1934, p 1, Court of Claims Suit… Bill Texts, OFJC.

President Franklin Roosevelt that officially declared their opposition to the IRA, demanded Collier's resignation, the removal of Indians from ward status, and the institution of tribal trusts to manage their land holdings.[527] In short, abolish the Indian Bureau and treat Indians as equal citizens.

At its height, the AIF claimed membership from more than forty tribes including the Sioux, Crow, Creek, Chippewa, Ojibwe, Navajo, and the Blackfeet.[528] Hauptman characterized the AIF as a loose umbrella organization that brought together diverse groups who left the Federation as freely as they joined.[529] The Bureau continuously attacked the American Indian Federation and labeled it a fake organization with the charge that it did not represent any significant group of Indians.[530] Interior Secretary Harold Ickes, however, acknowledged that the AIF did represent a majority of the Mission Indians, whose organization under the Mission Indian Federation made them readily identifiable as AIF members.[531]

A favorite Collier response to Federation attacks was to argue that they simply did not represent *real* Indians, rather, a few lost souls, led astray by white swindlers and racketeers. Collier simply could not understand why any Indian would oppose him. In a letter to AIF President Joseph Bruner, Collier called him "an interesting human being. You are interesting because there are others like you. You have Indian blood. You call yourself an Indian, you identify yourself as an Indian, and yet, some inward compulsion

[527] Joseph Bruner to Franklin Roosevelt, 21 December 1934, American Indian Federation, 1933-1937, folder 1, OFJC.

[528] Cowger, *The National Congress of American Indians*, 22.

[529] Hauptman, "The American Indian Federation," 380.

[530] Ibid.

[531] John Collier statement to House Complaint Committee, 5 April 1935, American Indian Federation, 1933-1937, folder 1, OFJC.

makes you frenziedly active to prevent Indians from receiving the help and protection which they need and for which they are petitioning. Why?"[532] The answer to Collier's loaded question varied widely when applied to different groups. For Bruner and many others, the chief reason was that being Indian restricted him in the outside world. As a ward of the federal government, he was unable to own property, take out loans, or hire a lawyer, all of which hampered the successful oilman.[533] Successful indeed, Bruner was a wealthy allottee who had much to lose if the Indian Bureau tribalized individual Indians' assets, as he feared.[534]

The same held true, to some extent, in Southern California. Bureau farmer Harry Hess claimed that the MIF membership of the Cahuilla Reservation consisted of those tribal members who controlled large sections of land on the reservation and made their livings as absentee landlords.[535] However, on another level, many hated that as wards they could not even own their own home as wards, which according to Winslow Couro, was "not in accord with the communistic views of [John Collier]."[536] The membership of the Mission and American Indian Federations was diverse, however, and not all were of means or highly assimilated. The *Los Angeles Times* proffered a vivid picture of the Southern California Federation membership in 1934: "The delegates ranged from the

---

[532] John Collier to Joseph Bruner, 8 May 1934, American Indian Federation, 1933-1937, folder 1, OFJC.

[533] Bruner to Roosevelt, 21 December 1934, American Indian Federation, 1933-1937, folder 1, OFJC.

[534] Neil Brown, *American Indian Social Leaders and Activists* (New York: Facts on File, 2002), 70; Bradley G. Shreve, *Red Power Rising: The National Indian Youth Council and the Origins of Native Activism* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2011), 27.

[535] Harry Hess to John Collier, 14 February 1942, 21861, Central Classified Files, 1940-57 – Mission, R.G. 75, Records of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Central, National Archives and Records Administration, Washington, D.C., hereinafter referred as CCF 1940-57 – M.

[536] Winslow Couro to L.T. Eugene Ness, 17 February 1938, box1, folder 1, ENC.

nattily dressed Indians of education and comparative wealth, through the high-heel-booted, leather-cuffed, wide-sombreroed Los Coyotes, who are rangemen and stockmen; to the more primitive and poorer serape-wrapped Manzanitas."[537] While the Bureau attributed the poorer members to a diet of misinformation and intimidation by Federation leadership, traditional leadership patterns and Native politics as discussed in the second chapter of this work enable a different lens, that of consensus politics, through which to view their participation.[538]

At heart, the reason for their and all of the Federationists' membership was the indignity they suffered as wards of the federal government under the tutelage of the Indian Bureau. Ward status had a significant negative psychological impact upon many Native people.[539] Seneca Alice Lee Jemison, the eloquent spokesperson for the AIF, asked the House Committee on Indian Affairs if they could "even begin to imagine how much it hurts to see our people denied the rights of other citizens in this, their own country; to be continued as incompetent wards."[540] As she and her compatriots saw it, the government relegated Indians to a second-class citizenship. They fought so their children could be "brought up in the principles of Americanism, not the principles of bureaucracy."[541] The IRA, however, meant large-scale expansion for the Indian Bureau despite its promises of "self-government." Simply baffled by the legislation, which did not reflect their views, J.C. Morgan came to believe that the commissioner had "gone off

[537] "Indians Hit Land Action," *Los Angeles Times*, 5 February 1934, pg. 12.
[538] John Dady to John Collier, 2 April 1934, in House, *Indian Conditions and Affairs, H.R. 7781*, 430.
[539] Singer, "Oral History Interview with Rita Singer," 35.
[540] Alice Lee Jemison in House, *Indian Conditions and Affairs, H.R. 7781*, 519.
[541] Ibid.

his horse completely," that "someone" in Indian Country had fed him misinformation.[542] Collier saw himself as a missionary, and the members of the AIF did not want a missionary.[543] They simply desired less government intrusion and an equal footing with those who stole their lands.

Historian Marci Barnes Gracey highlighted modern scholars' habit of dismissing those who had adopted outside ways or learned to operate within the wider world around them, especially those of mixed heritage, as somehow less than Indian.[544] Gracey traced this tendency back to Collier himself. As a mixed-blood herself, Jemison responded to such dismissiveness and asserted, "We are what Mr. Collier refers to as breeds. We make no apologies; we owe no apologies… we are pardonably proud of our Indian heritage."[545] Jemison identified primarily as a Seneca and served the Nation for many decades. At home in New York, before, during, and after her work with the AIF, she served traditionalist leaders such as Ray Jimerson and the tribal council nominated her for positions within the Indian Bureau several times.[546]

As a loose federation, the national districts of the AIF, such as Jemison's, remained important centers of activism. Adam Castillo served as president of the First District, which covered Nevada and California, and continued to operate the Mission Indian Federation autonomously. Local leaders such as Juanita Ortega coordinated

[542] J.C. Morgan to L.T. Eugene Ness, 17 July 1935, folder 1, box 1, ENC.
[543] Singer, "Oral History Interview with Rita Singer," 37.
[544] Gracey, "Joseph Bruner and the American Indian Federation," 64.
[545] Jemison in House, *Indian Conditions and Affairs, H.R. 7781*, 519.
[546] Laurence Hauptman, "Alice Jemison: Seneca Political Activist," *The Indian Historian*, vol. 12, no. 1 (summer 1979), 15-6.

regional conferences of reservation captains for advisement on national affairs.[547] These local meetings courted not only Indian leaders, but business and government leaders from the local area as well. The MIF sought the backing of numerous San Diego officials including the mayor and the school board.[548] Such conferences supported the larger efforts in Washington, D.C., with letters and petitions to local congressmen, including to their greatest ally, Los Angeles Republican congressman John S. McGroarty. The Federations succeeded to the degree that they did through organization and active encouragement of voting with close attention to congressional representatives.[549]

Connections such as McGroarty greatly helped the Indian Federations. For his part, the Los Angeles representative believed in assimilating Indians into modern American culture. He claimed that California's colonial Spanish Missionaries "took an idle race and put it to work – a useless race that they made useful in the world."[550] McGroarty fully supported both the MIF and AIF in their fight to abolish the Indian Bureau. He believed he could shrink the federal government through the advanced assimilation of Indian people. He worked closely with the Federation's non-Indian advisor, Purl Willis.[551] Willis proved instrumental to the legislative success of the Mission Indian Federation. He claimed he was the brother of the former governor of and senator from Ohio, Frank B. Willis, who died before he could accept the Republican

[547] Adam Castillo to Mrs. John Ortega, 8 February 1935, box1, folder 3, ENC.
[548] Adam Castillo to The Members of the School Board of the City of San Diego, California, 27 January 1934, box1, folder 4, ENC.
[549] Adam Castillo to Mission Indian Federation, 30 May 1934, 33247 1/3, CCF 1907-39 – M.
[550] John McGroarty quoted in Kevin Starr, *Inventing the Dream: California through the Progressive Era* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985), 89.
[551] Purl Willis to L.T. Eugene Ness, 28 January 1935, box1, folder 1, ENC.

Party's nomination for the presidency in 1928.[552] This lie brought about friendships with powerful politicians such as Senator Lynn Frazier who chaired the Senate Indian Affairs Committee until 1933. Such connections opened many doors for the Federation and greatly helped to advance its politics.

Willis's political connections also marked the beginning of the American Indian Federation's link with the far right. Hamilton Fish III, a conservative, redbaiting congressman from New York, helped Willis scapegoat Eshref Shevky, a Turkish-American anthropologist and long-time Collier friend, as a foreign communist agent.[553] Supposedly sent by Moscow to build communist colonies to enslave Indians through the Bureau, the scapegoat served as a rallying point for House Republicans in the fight against the Indian Reorganization Act and the New Deal, broadly. The conservative politics of the day often sympathized with the far right in their dogmatic fight against communism. Fish proved no exception and viewed Nazism as the lesser of two evils. Images of him exiting the plane of Nazi Foreign Minister Joachim von Rippentrop for a 1939 meeting in Oslo, Norway, haunted him for the rest of his political career.[554]

Right-wing assemblyman John Phillips of Banning, California, and Riverside district attorney Earl Redwine gave a series of speeches on behalf of the Associated

---

[552] Genealogical work shows that Purl Willis did not come from the same family as Frank B. Willis, whom, upon his death, newspapers reported two brothers, Buell and Lloyd, survived. "Senator Willis Dies during Delaware Political Rally," *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, 31 March 1928, pg. 6. Purl Willis, had two brothers himself, Edward, and Frank. However, Purl's Frank was alive in 1951 and living in San Diego, California. "Edward C. Willis," *San Diego Union*, 6 February 1951, pg. 22. At least one United States senator, Lynn J. Frazier of North Dakota advanced Purl Willis's causes because he believed him to the brother of Frank. Lynn J. Frazier to Rev. J.H. Batten, 22 February 1934, 33247 1/3, CCF 1907-39 – M.; "Senator Willis of Ohio Dies at Political Rally," *Los Angeles Times*, 31 March 1928, pg. 1.

[553] Frazier to Batten, 22 February 1934, 33247 1/3, CCF 1907-39 – M.

[554] "Last Isolationist, 'Ham' Fish, Veteran of Politics, Still Fighting," *Los Angeles Times*, 21 February 1982, pg. 2.

Farmers of California, Inc., a group some deemed fascist, centered on the evils of communism throughout the region in early 1934.[555] The impact of their speaking tour on the local Indian Country became apparent during a congress by the Bureau to pitch the Indian Reorganization Act to tribal communities. "The other day Mr. Redwine had an article in the *Riverside Press* not favoring communism and socialism for us Indians. I am one hundred [sic] percent American. I tell you this preaches communism and socialism. We don't want none of it," argued Jeanette Henry Costo, an Eastern Cherokee married into an influential Cahuilla leadership family.[556] However, even moderate Republicans such as Earl Warren warned against "communist radicals" in his own campaign for governor in 1942.[557] Clearly regional conservative, anticommunist politics affected the political views of the Native peoples of the region. Since many conflated communism with totalitarianism and government control, those who feared big government feared communism.[558]

Indian people, as no other citizens of the United States, had experienced true control by a federal government bent on managing many aspects of their personal lives. Mrs. Costo's husband, Cahuilla intellectual Rupert Costo, told the Bureau congress that the IRA was "quite communistic," legislation that would take "away all rights belonging to everyone." Under it, he worried enrolled Indians "Can't own anything for

[555] "Communism, Subject of Legion Address," *Riverside Daily Press*, 13 March 1934.
[556] Jeanette Henry Costo in "Proceedings of Southern California Indian Congress," in *The Indian Reorganization Act*, 245.
[557] Schuparra, *Triumph of the Right*, 4.
[558] Richard Gid Powers, *Not Without Honor: The History of American Anticommunism* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1998), 144.

ourselves."[559] The talk of communism confused many other Indian people as evinced by questions such as "If the bill passes and an Indian community accepts the charter, will they automatically become communists, or socialists?"[560] Ignorance of what exactly was a communist or socialist is not indicative of uneducated people or unassimilated Native Americans. No, such questions mirrored the bulk of non-Indian Americans who also did not fully understand what communism and socialism meant.[561] However, anticommunism was rampant in Southern California as when police and growers broke a pair of communist-backed farm laborers strikes in the Imperial Valley, in the midst of Mission Indian Country, in the 1930s.[562]

Both Hauptman and Gracey maintained that the right-wing rhetoric of the AIF obscured more about the Federation than it ever explained.[563] However trumped up by the Indian Bureau, the connections existed and with reason. Many scholars agree that the conservative political views of their rural non-Indian neighbors greatly influence American Indians who often absorb or take on many such leanings.[564] During the economic upheaval of the Great Depression that brought Franklin Roosevelt to the Oval Office, fascism gained a new appeal in the United States, particularly in California. A

---

[559] Rupert Costo in ibid., 244.

[560] Anonymous question in ibid., 245.

[561] Larry Ceplair, *Anti-Communism in Twentieth-Century America: A Critical History* (Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger, 2011), 1-9.

[562] M. J. Heale, *American Anti-Communism: Combating the Enemy Within, 1830-1970* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1990), 102; Kate Bronfenbrenner, "Imperial Valley, California, Farmworkers' Strike of 1934," Cornell University, ILR School, http://digitalcommons.ilr.cornell.edu/articles/553/, accessed 3 March 2015.

[563] Laurence Hauptman, *The Iroquois and the New Deal* (Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Press, 1981), 46-7; Gracey, "Joseph Bruner and the American Indian Federation," 64.

[564] Laurence Hauptman, telephone interview with the author, 15 October 2013; Andrea Smith, *Native Americans and the Christian Right: The Gendered Politics of Unlikely Alliances* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 2008), 222.

number of fascist groups formed in the state, including the Associated Farmers of California, Inc., and William Pelley's Silver Shirts, while the German-American Bund kept its western headquarters at the *Deutsches Haus* in Los Angeles.[565] As Dust Bowl refugees flooded across the state line and an avowed socialist captured the democratic nomination for the governorship, the economic and political elite of the Golden State moved sharply to the right in response to the broader shift to the Left.[566]

The New Deal hit Indian Country between 1934 and 1936 when the referenda for approval of the Indian Reorganization Act by the individual tribes of the United States took place. Winslow Couro's Santa Ysabel Reservation voted on December 19, 1934. Although forty-three members voted against its adoption and only fourteen for, a disgusted Couro received notice that even though it was clear the band did not want to come under the act, the Bureau said they would. The reason was the slippery wording employed by Collier that held that a majority of those officially enrolled had to specifically vote against the act lest they automatically fall under its provisions. This roll then officially included tribal members who had been absent up to forty-three years.[567]

"[G]ood, old fashioned Democratic politics," replied McGroarty when Couro informed the House Committee on Indian Affairs that one of those the Bureau claimed as a tacit yes had been dead at the time of the election.[568] Couro related the story to Congress for the AIF in February 1935. Rupert Costo, MIF Vice President Vicente

---

[565] Arnie Bernstein, *Swastika Nation: Fritz Kuhn and the Rise and Fall of the German-American Bund* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2013), 104-6.

[566] Nelson A. Pichardo Almanzar & Brian W. Kulik, *American Fascism and the New Deal: The Associated Farmers of California and the Pro-Industrial Movement*, (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2013), 11-13.

[567] Winslow Couro in House, *Indian Conditions and Affairs, H.R. 7781*, 59-63.

[568] John McGroarty in ibid.

Albanes along with Adam Castillo, and Purl Willis joined him from Southern California. Other Federationists at the hearings included AIF President Joe Bruner, Alice Jemison, J.C. Morgan, Levi Walker, and Thomas L. Sloan. They exhibited the American Indian Federation's opposition to Collier and the Indian New Deal on grounds ranging from Sloan's support for property rights on allotted lands to Jemison's support of Seneca rights under the Treaty of Canandaigua.[569]

The Mission Indian Federation remained a central coordinating force for the AIF as the year progressed as representatives from other districts traveled to San Diego, California, to conference with Castillo and Willis.[570] The city played host to the national Federation's second annual conference that July. Although MIF attorney Eugene Ness urged tribal leaders to utilize the conference "to make the tie that binds the organization stronger," the event evidenced early fissures in the national organization's base.[571] Local tribal politics also hampered unity among the various reservations. Purl Willis blamed Jemison for instigating the division and a bloc of Morgan and Castillo prevented her from receiving money directly in Washington, D.C. They insisted that the local district treasurer, Marcus Forster, handle the funds.[572] Financial mistrust and disputes had long plagued the MIF and appeared early on in the history of the AIF.

Bruner assailed the Indian Bureau and Collier to the one-hundred-and-fifty Indians gathered from across the western United States.[573] However, the conference spent a great amount of time on local issues. Despite the prominence the Claims Case for the

[569] Ibid., 30-1 and 1026.
[570] J.C. Morgan to L.T. Eugene Ness, 17 July 1935, folder 1, box 1, ENC.
[571] L.T. Eugene Ness to Ventura Paipa, 21 July 1935, folder 2, box 1, ENC.
[572] Purl Willis to L.T. Eugene Ness, 6 August 1935, folder 1, box 1, ENC.
[573] "Indian Meeting Hears Radical Charge Hurled," *Los Angeles* Times, 26 July 1935, pg. 10.

MIF, neither Bruner nor any other national leader commented on it. Adam Castillo pointed out that the Claims were a regional matter with which the national should not interfere. Meanwhile, during the conference Bruner sent a telegram to the Capital to authorize Jemison to represent the AIF at a Senate hearing regarding old-age pensions for Indians where she again called to the abolition of the Indian Bureau.[574]

Jemison remained active in the District of Columbia as the American Indian Federation's spokesperson for the remainder of the 1930s.[575] Purl Willis distrusted Jemison while J.C. Morgan openly disapproved of her at the San Diego conference.[576] By the end of 1935, an unknown person had spread rumors amongst the leaders of the AIF in an attempt to undermine the group. Willis confronted Marion Butler, a former North Carolina senator who worked with the Federations as an attorney and lobbyist, with negative reports he received of a meeting with Jemison. Butler denied any meeting and urged him to seek unity against what he believed to be meddling from the Indian Bureau.[577]

Butler's suspicion that the Bureau intended to destroy the AIF was well grounded. Collier himself believed that as commissioner he had the means and authority to stamp out any opposition to his work.[578] Castillo and Willis accused him of spying on those

[574] Alice Jemison in United States Senate, *Old Age Pensions for Indians: Hearings on S.3293*, (U.S. G.P.O.: Washington, D.C., 1935), 38-9.

[575] Laurence Hauptman, "Alice Lee Jemison: A Modern "Mother of the Nation," in *Sifters: Native American Women's Lives: Native American Women's Lives*, Theda Perdue, ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), 179.

[576] Purl Willis to L.T. Eugene Ness, 6 August 1935, folder 1, box 1, ENC.

[577] Marion butler to Purl Willis, 23 November 1935, folder 1, box 1, ENC.

[578] John Collier quoted in House, *Indian Conditions and Affairs, H. R. 7781*, 975.

opposing him, a charge Collier expressly denied.[579] The commissioner lied. Collier went after the AIF with all of the resources at his disposal including Post Office inspectors, the Division of Investigation, and spies from throughout his numerous Indian Bureau staff.[580] The commissioner utilized every angle of surveillance. He spied on Jemison's automobile purchases and attempted to take down Willis on tax charges.[581] On occasion, the Bureau even successfully won Federationists to the pro-government camp with positions on the federal pay scale, a tempting offer during the Depression.[582]

One of the Federations' key allies in Washington was a senior clerk for the Senate Indian Affairs Committee, Albert Grorud. An opponent of the IRA, Grorud had access to the committee members and aided the Federations whenever possible. He warned the AIF leadership not to allow internal issues to pull them apart lest the Bureau use the divisions to destroy the organization.[583] The admonishments did little to bring the group together, however. Although the circumstances remain unclear, amidst bickering over workloads and factional support of MIF Vice President Vicente Albanes over Couro, Adam Castillo pulled the Mission Indian Federation from the national organization in late 1935.[584] Willis later claimed that the national organization failed to live up to its founding

[579] Collier, "The Mission Reservation," House, *Readjustment of Indian Affairs, Part 7*, 272-7.

[580] W.B. Buckley to John Collier, 3 July 1939, AIF S2206 & HR5921, OKLA RACKET & Sen. Thomas, OFJC; A.C. Monahan to John Collier, 21 June 1939, in ibid.

[581] "Jemison Auto Purchase," Alice Lee Jemison (Mrs.), OFJC; B.W. Cohoon to Assistant Director of Investigation, 18 August 1933, 33247 1/3, CCF 1907-39 – M.

[582] MIA Superintendent John Dady successfully turned Tom Lucas away from the MIF with a bureau construction job in the depths of the Great Depression. John Dady to John Collier, 9 January 1934, 33247 1/3, CCF 1907-39 – M.

[583] L.T. Eugene Ness to Purl Willis, 26 August 1935, folder 2, box 1, ENC.

[584] Willis to Ness, 6 August 1935, folder 1, box 1, ENC; Alice Lee Jemison, 6 July 1935, folder 12, box 1, ibid.

constitution that Castillo drafted a little over a year prior.[585] Only four Mission Indian leaders, including the national treasurer, Winslow Couro, remained with the AIF.[586] J.C. Morgan soon followed suit and took the AIF's Navajo contingent with him.[587]

Because the Bureau had already held the referenda on the IRA in Southern California where the majority of reservations rejected it, the MIF shifted its focus from outright antagonism of the Indian New Deal to Claims and legislation specific to the local Capitan Grande and Agua Caliente Reservations.[588] The AIF however continued to focus on the Reorganization Act in the hope of preventing its implementation elsewhere. In the process, the national organization ratcheted up its rhetoric against the commissioner and his legislation. Without the membership of the Mission Indian Federation in their ranks, however, the American Indian Federation began to hurt for two vital components of their lobbying campaign: money and legitimacy.

An organization with a suspect membership to begin with, the Indian Bureau only recognized the AIF as representative of the Mission Indians. Following their departure, congressional committees spent greater amounts of time forcing Jemison to justify her testimony as legitimate and representative. With a dwindling membership, the task often took up several pages of the congressional record and diminished the effectiveness of the

[585] Purl Willis to Senator Elmer Thomas. 9 July 1937 in Senate Committee on Indian Affairs, *Palm Springs Band of Mission Indians: Hearings on S. 1424 and S. 2589* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. G.P.O., 1937), 200.

[586] Rep. Harry Sheppard in United States House of Representatives, *Palm Springs Band of Mission Indians: Hearings on H.R. 7450* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. G.P.O., 1938), 173.

[587] Parman, "J.C. Morgan," 90.

[588] Adam Castillo, Winslow Couro, and Purl Willis to the Members of the Missions and other Tribes and Individual Indians of California and to All of Our Friends, 9 March 1935.

AIF's lobbying efforts.[589] Funding Jemison's lobbying work also proved difficult without a large base. Responding to later accusations by Collier, the Seneca activist revealed that out of desperation and hunger she had received financial assistance from fascist publisher James True.[590] Already plagued by links to the German American Bund and Pelley's Silver Shirts through rouge AIF member Elwood Towner, a mixed-blood Siletz Indian, Collier's attack on Jemison severely wounded his opposition.[591]

The AIF held its 1936 annual conference in Salt Lake City, Utah, with only thirty Indians in attendance. "We, the first Americans, the staunchest patriots, are the first to come under a communistic influence extending over the nation," boomed Cherokee O.K. Chandler.[592] A *Los Angeles Times* article noted the MIF's absence and pointed out that Juanita Ortega attended the Salt Lake conference as president of District One, Adam Castillo's old position.[593] Collier's spy at the convention noted an emphasis on anti-communism and a suspicious lack of any discussion of Indian issues. Describing Joseph Bruner as "good-natured and not too intelligent," the mole claimed that Chandler had seized control of the AIF and left Bruner a mere figurehead.[594] Grasping fascist literature in his hands, Chandler bemoaned the lack of non-Indians at whom he aimed his anti-communist and anti-Bureau message.

---

[589] House, *Palm Springs Band of Mission Indians*, 157-60.

[590] Alice Lee Jemison in United States Senate, *Wheeler-Howard Act – Exempt Certain Indians: Hearings on S.2103* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. G.P.O., 1940), 165.

[591] John Collier in ibid., 68-70.

[592] O.K. Chandler in "Indian Bureau Communistic, Says Cherokee," *Washington Post*, 24 July 1936, pg. x6.

[593] "Indians Go Modern at Convention," *Los Angeles Times*, 25 July 1936, pg. 12.

[594] Floyd LaRouche report to John Collier, American Indian Federation 1933-1937, folder 1, OFJC.

Lured by the AIF's strong anti-New Deal stance, associations with individuals on and ideas of the far right crept in not only on Chandler and Jemison, but on Southern California as well. In a letter to a Mission Indian, Omaha Indian Leta Meyers Smart reported that her cousin, AIF and Indians of California, Inc. attorney Thomas Sloan had taken Winslow Couro and another Mission Indian with him to meetings at the Bund's *Deutsches Haus* in Los Angeles. Earlier, in 1934, the United States Marine Intelligence Corps linked Sloan's longtime legal partner, German immigrant Herman Freese, to a deal in which the pro-Nazi Silver Shirts procured arms from the San Diego Naval Base for their own paramilitary maneuvers near Sloan's hometown of El Cajon.[595] Commissioner Collier argued that Couro had arranged for Jemison's funding at Bund meetings.[596] Smart bitterly accused her cousin of being behind the entire scheme. Sloan's "Nazi blood [came] to the fore," she said; "he is a German, except for that small drop of Indian blood (one eighth)…."[597] From Smart's letter, it is clear that the association with the far right and the greedy scheming of the Claims lawyers had been simply too much for Southern California Indian Country. In disgust, they did the unthinkable and cooperated with the Indian Bureau.

When the MIF discovered that one of its Claims attorneys, Marion Butler, had been in league with Collette and Sloan, the Mission group switched to the government's plan and authorized the state attorney general to handle the case.[598] When Collier

---

[595] "Silver Shirts Got Arms from Base," *Jewish Daily Bulletin*, 8 August 1934, 1; "Herman Freese," in Clarence Alan McGrew, *City of San Diego and San Diego County: The Birthplace of California, Volume 2* (Chicago and New York : American Historical Society, 1922), 73.

[596] Ibid., 104-5.

[597] Leta Myers Smart, *California Indian News*, August 1938, 16.

[598] Adam Castillo in ibid., 69.

reversed the actions of an overzealous MIA employee (influenced by Sloan) and released Castillo, Willis, and the traditional leadership of the Agua Caliente Band from jail, Winslow Couro suddenly believed himself surrounded by turncoats.[599] Vitriolic acrimony arose between the AIF and MIF at a personal level. Couro characterized Castillo and the Mission Indian Federation as frauds who used elders for political gain.[600] Referring to the Federation's opposition to the Bureau sponsored spokesmen and committees, its intertribal nature, and its use of traditional villages as the basis of their Claims Cases instead of only federally recognized reservations, Couro mocked them to liberal congressional representative Edouard Izac, saying, "These are the so-called captains of the Mission Indian Federation. All of them are captains of reservations that do not exist, never did exist, but anyway it is promised to them that they will get the reservation and be the rulers supreme, an empire of their own."[601] Of course, he knew exactly what the Federation believed and was about, but he was increasingly isolated at both the local and national levels, causing him to lash out at neighboring reservations that had accepted the IRA and damning them as "traiters [sic] to the Indian race."[602] The MIF, however, still claimed a large number of members in the area while the AIF's numbers plummeted.[603]

In 1937, in hopes of bringing lost sheep back to the national-federation fold, Joseph Bruner wrote the leaders of his former Navajo constituency and desperately

---

[599] Couro to Ness, 17 February 1938, box 1, folder 1, ENC.

[600] Winslow Couro to Rep. Edouard Izac, 6 February 1938, in United States House of Representatives, *California Indians Jurisdictional Act: Hearings on H.R. 3765* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. G.P.O., 1939), 373.

[601] Ibid.

[602] Couro to Ness, 17 February 1938, box 1, folder 1, ENC.

[603] Stella von Bulow, "A Little Heart to Heart Talk with Your Editor…" *California Indian News*, August 1938, 4-7.

warned that they "must stand together now, solidly."[604] The letter did little good. An article from the *Washington Post* proffered further insight into the unraveling. Though centered on Morgan's leadership of the anti-Collier wing of the Navajos, it also listed the complaints of the Federation's other current and former constituencies: The Klamath's struggle against a corrupt superintendent who "had 'sold out' to the lumber interests," a four-hundred foot right-of-way for the Blue Ridge Parkway through the Eastern Cherokee's Qualla Boundary, and Bureau opposition to peyotism. Listed as one of the "severest critics of Collier and [the] Indian Office," Bruner's own fight against wardship capped off the list.[605] The peyote issue particularly worked against AIF unity, as key figures such as Sloan and Bruner supported its religious use, which hardline Christians like Morgan detested.[606] The sheer variety of issues across Indian Country and the AIF's avowed refusal to focus on anything beyond the removal of Collier, hastened its own demise.[607]

The AIF held its fourth convention in Lewiston, Idaho, where it called upon the federal government to cease regulating Indians.[608] Later in the year, in a speech at Muscogee, Oklahoma, Bruner reiterated the importance of abolishing the Indian Bureau to save taxpayers like himself the "millions upon millions of dollars" the government wasted on the Bureau. Highlighting the deep divides that broke the AIF, Bruner pointed a

---

[604] Jos Bruner to J.C. Morgan, Cato Sells, Robert Martin, and Howard Gorman, 10 April 1937 in ibid.

[605] "Navajo Political Party Leaves Indian Bureau Chief Unworried," *Washington Post*, 27 July 1937, pg. 3.

[606] Thomas C. Maroukis, *The Peyote Road: Religious Freedom and the Native American Church* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2010), 55; Laurence Hauptman, telephone conversation with the author, 15 October 2013; Stewart, *Peyote Religion*, 295-6.

[607] LaRouche report to Collier, American Indian Federation 1933-1937, folder 1, OFJC.

[608] "Tribes Ask Congress to Let Tribes Alone," *New York Times*, 1 August 1937, pg. 22.

question at the MIF and asked, "What's the use of trying to sue the Government for claims?"[609] For Southern California, the answer was justice for the legally owned lands stolen from them and their ancestors through the Unratified Treaties. The settlement monies would then provide them with a chance to stand on their own, shoulder to shoulder with their non-Indian neighbors.[610]

Claims loomed large in California and Collier's opponents remained divided in 1938, as the MIF turned against Collette and Sloan in the struggle over attorneys for the cases. Jemison stood by Collett and Sloan through the controversy, which damaged the AIF in Southern California. Pechanga activist and editor of *California Indian News* Stella von Bulow (Luiseño) noted that "quite a number have withdrawn from the national on that account in the southern part of the State."[611] Von Bulow characterized Collett and Sloan as crooks who preyed upon the Indians of Southern California, particularly the Agua Caliente at Palm Springs. She noted that her organization, the California Indian Rights Association (CIRA), found unity with the MIF on Claims issues. Soon joined by the California Indian Brotherhood from the northern part of the state, the trio of groups worked to force the nefarious Collette out of state Indian politics for good.[612]

That November proved one of the most controversial months in the history of the American Indian Federation. On the twenty-third, Jemison carried her charges of Indian Bureau communism to the Dies Committee. Her deposition to the committee, forerunner to the infamous House Un-American Activities Committee, brought the AIF into the

---

[609] Joseph Bruner, 7 October 1937, American Indian Federation 1933-1937, folder 2, OFJC.
[610] Adam Castillo in House, *California Indians Jurisdictional Act*, 67.
[611] Von Bulow, "A Little Heart to Heart," 5.
[612] Ibid.

national spotlight. In a story that made the front page of major newspapers across the nation, Jemison accused Collier and his powerful superior, Interior Secretary Harold Ickes, of sewing communism among the Indians in conjunction with a "communist front organization," the American Civil Liberties Union.[613]

In response, Ickes lambasted the entire congressional committee as "zany," and charged that its attack on him and his Commissioner of Indian Affairs was "one of the most outrageous things ever pulled off."[614] Collier came to his own defense in front of the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs about eighteen months after Jemison's testimony. He had used the time to order investigations from the Federal Bureau of Investigation on the AIF and its individual members.[615] Collier charged that the AIF was part of a "fifth column," under foreign influence to weaken the United States for the over-throw of its government.[616] The charges did not persuade the senators, some of whom ridiculed the commissioner for suggesting, "a blitzkrieg [had] captured the Senate Indian Committee and the entire Senate."[617] However, the publicity distorted the views of many modern scholars, who for many years characterized the AIF and its members as crazed assimilationists with ties to the Nazis.[618]

Despite finally receiving national attention, Joseph Bruner turned the American Indian Federation toward a regional policy focused on Oklahoma, a path that brought

---

[613] Chelsy Manly, "Link 6 High New Dealers to Red Front," *Chicago Tribune*, 23 November 1938, pg. 1.
[614] Harold Ickes in "Ickes Leads Attack on Dies' Committee Investigations," *Washington Daily News*, 24 November 1938, pg. 3.
[615] Hauptman, "Alice Jemison," 15.
[616] John Collier in Senate, *Wheeler-Howard Act – Exempt Certain Indians*, 100.
[617] Senator John Schafer in ibid., 101
[618] Gracey, "Joseph Bruner and the American Indian Federation," 63.

about the AIF's demise. In a scheme that Collier dubbed the "Oklahoma Racket," Bruner proposed that the federal government pay each AIF member who paid annual dues of one dollar a settlement of three-thousand dollars for "full, final and complete settlement of all their rights equities, or interests in and to all past, present, or future claims."[619] Along with the settlement, Federation members surrendered tribal loyalties and ended their special relationship with the federal government. Bruner's plan was one of desperation, one that forewent with advocacy on behalf of all Indians and settled for individual buyouts. Indeed, Gracey noted that the plan was a selfish one that specifically served Bruner's personal interests in forcing the compensation promised by the federal government to his loyalist Creek family at the close of the U.S. Civil War.[620]

The dues collections triggered racketeering allegations from the commissioner. Combined with its counteroffensive in both the halls of Congress and the field, the Bureau now threatened the very existence of the American Indian Federation. Burner's one-dollar scheme itself, however, ultimately dealt the final blow to the AIF as a national organization. Angry over the shift away from the assault on Collier and the Bureau, Jemison resigned the national Federation in July 1939. The resignation left Bruner without his most prominent member and spokesperson in Washington, D.C.[621] The AIF continued its decline largely centered on its Creek president into the Second World War. At the war's end, the rise of a new national Indian organization, the National Congress of American Indians (NCAI) meant direct competition for Bruner. Because the NCAI

[619] "A Proposed Bill by the American Indian Federation," in A.I.F. S2206 & HR5921, OKLA RACKETS & Sen. Thomas, OFJC.

[620] Marci Jean Gracey, "Attacking the New Deal: The American Indian Federation and the Quest to Protect Assimilation," (M.A. thesis, Oklahoma State University, 2003), 71.

[621] Ibid., 72-3.

worked against the budding policy of tribal termination (which both the Mission Indian Federation and Bruner supported), the election of one of his own officers, Napoleon Johnson (Cherokee), as its first president only added to his frustration.[622] The AIF slowly disappeared from Indian Country.

Back in California, the Claims Cases continued to headline on reservations and the MIF dug in its heels against the Bureau and real estate interests on the Agua Caliente or Palm Springs Reservation. However, its experience with the American Indian Federation and John Collier permanently altered the political landscape of Southern California Indian Country. The MIF gained enemies where once they had friends, especially in Thomas Sloan and Winslow Couro, and the scandal of the far right connections left a bitter and embarrassing stain on the cause. The AIF had lasting effects on a personal level for many involved as well. Ever one to hold a grudge, Collier intervened to stop Couro's appointment as a Bureau police chief by John Dady years after he resigned the national organization.[623] Even Dady, a harsh and paternalistic man who wanted the 1934 Warner Bros picture *Massacre* censored for the negative light it shed on the Bureau, argued to no avail for Couro's placement.[624]

The commissionership of John Collier transformed the Mission Indian Federation. Prior to his appointment, it enjoyed a quasi-governmental status and exercised Native sovereignty through executive, judicial, and police power on many of the region's thirty

[622] Ibid., 81-3.
[623] Fred Daiker to John Collier, 24 July 1941, 28902, CCF 1940-57 – M.
[624] John Dady to William Zimmerman, 16 February 1934, folder 35249-1934 155, box 17, CCF 1907-39 – M.

reservations.[625] They expected a friend in Commissioner Collier, someone who would finally phase out the Indian Bureau and set them free. "But John Collier betrayed us," explained Rupert Costo; "[h]is autocratic… and repressive administration damned him before the Indians."[626] Once Collier had power, he refused to let it go. Instead, Collier introduced progressive reforms that, arguably, have had some positive benefits. After more than a decade of harsh criticism and political battles, Collier resigned the commissionership in January 1945.[627]

Collier put forth a large, concerted effort to break the MIF because of its continued resistance to federal domination through the Indian Bureau after he became commissioner. However, while the commissioner brought an end to the Federation's formal, out-right exercise of tribal sovereignty, he failed to destroy the Federation completely, and instead turned it into a political party; one that worked on increasingly close terms with the local Republican establishment of Southern California to finally fulfill their dream of liberation. As a result, the Mission Indian Federation became one of the few Indian organizations in the United States to support the federal policy of tribal termination. One must view the Mission Indian Federation in the historical context of the time in order to understand their support of termination. The position was game changing for the Federation, as the quest for termination widened political divides among tribal communities and caused many to move shift their allegiances away from the MIF. It

[625] Edward Castillo, "Mission Indian Federation," *Native America in the Twentieth Century*, 345-6.

[626] Rupert Costo quoted in James Wilson, *The Earth Shall Weep: A History of Native America* (New York: Grove Press, 1998), 346.

[627] James J. Rawls, Gerald D. Nash, and Richard W. Etulain, *Chief Red Fox is Dead: A History of Native Americans Since 1945* (Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace College Publishing, 1996), 35.

proved to be a very different issue than the others against which the Federation had fought and eventually even many traditionalists opposed the policy. As the opposition organized on an advanced inter-reservation level to rival termination proponents in the Federation, the MIF found itself out-manned, though certainly not out-gunned as its political advocacy in the post-World War II era left indelible marks on Indian Country throughout the United States.

CHAPTER FIVE
PRIVATIZING THE RESERVATION: THE FEDERATION AND TERMINATION

Nearly all in this room are citizens and taxpayers…. Does it look like they ought to have an Indian Bureau over them? They are capable of supporting themselves, they have supported themselves for a hundred years and the Bureau of Indian affairs [sic] has failed to put the Indian on his feet with all the millions of dollars that you people appropriate every year to California, or all over the United States.

-ADAM CASTILLO, 1950

In 1943, Assistant Attorney General Norman M. Littell presented United States Attorney General Francis Biddle with a plan in which the Justice Department would file a series of eighteen lawsuits against the Agua Caliente Band and the non-Indian business interests of Palm Springs in order to quiet title to the Band's reservation lands.[628] By August, Littell was on the ground in a raucous conference with tribal members. The attorney made ready to leave after many tribal members made loud denunciations of their treatment by the Department of the Interior, but official persuaded him to stay. The episode prejudiced him against the people of Agua Caliente, whom he felt, with the assurances of local Indian Bureau agents, were being misguided by Purl Willis, a huckster lawyer, and their captain, Lee Arenas. Disgusted, he planted seeds of discord by announcing "that some of their tribal members… were making as high as $30,000… per year from tribal lands to which they had no more right than anybody else."[629] As the Assistant Attorney General left the meeting Willis reportedly pined, "if only we could

---

Epigraph: Adam Castillo in House Committee on Public Lands, *Mission Indian Problems in San Diego County*, Hearing Held 13 October 1950 (unpublished hearings, HRG-1950-PLH-0021), 39.

[628] Norman M. Littell to Katherine Mather, 17 October 1943, folder "BK #4, Aug 2, '43 – July 17, '44," box 2, Norman M. Littell Papers, 4419-001, Special Collections, University of Washington, herein after referred to as NMLP.

[629] Ibid.

have a man like that represent us in Washington, D.C."[630] If the settlement of *United States v. Lee Arenas* in 1944 did not completely interrupt Littell's plan to settle the troubles at Agua Caliente, his forced resignation from his post that year most certainly did.[631]

At the end of that year, however, the United States Court of Claims awarded California Indians as a whole a settlement of more than $17 million.[632] It was a bitter-sweet settlement, however, as the state attorney general, against whom the Mission Indian Federation fought for the right to private legal counsel in the case, was unable to get the Office of Indian Affairs to relent on its punitive offsets for more than ninety years of its operations within the state. The offsets took the bulk of the settlement, some $12 million away from Indian peoples and left each individual with a paltry $150 per person.[633] A bit of hope came when Congress established a federal Indian Court of Claims only two years later, opening the door for yet another suit against the United States for lands taken. The new court, however, was able to adjudicate not just the lands lost under the Unratified Treaties, but rather the entirety of the state.[634] The offsets literally meant that the Indian people of California paid for the ineptitude and inefficiency of the Indian Bureau.[635] This made it all the more urgent for the Mission Indian

[630] Norman M. Littell to Katherine Mather, 3 June 1944, in ibid.

[631] Ibid; "Norman Littell (1939-1944)," Environmental and Natural resources Division, United States Department of Justice, http://www.justice.gov/enrd/4780.htm, accessed 2 April 2015.

[632] Purl Willis in House Committee on Public Lands, Mission Indian Problems in San Diego County, 26.

[633] Sanchez, "The Selling of California," 51.

[634] Ibid., 51-2.

[635] The Federation also worried when the state of California formed its own Interim Committee on Indian Affairs, that it too was interested in getting a share of the Claims settlement, thus shrinking the sum even further while perpetuating government interference in their lives. Adam Castillo in United State

Federation to rid themselves of federal wardship, lest the government offsets apply to the new judgment and further diminish their already shrunken settlement. This time, the Federation was determined not to lose either their rights as United States citizens or the bulk of their settlement. They needed a good attorney.

In March of 1947, Adam Castillo and Purl Willis were encouraged to meet Littell in Washington, D.C.[636] Littell later confessed to his daughter that it took some cajoling for him to agree to the meeting given the negative image of Willis as a "rabble-rouser" fed to him by the Bureau men. However, following their meeting, "the doors were opened on scenes of unwholesome Indian Bureau practices," for Littell.[637] The attorney now described the Federation's adviser as "a tireless zealot on behalf of the Indians."[638] Willis had come seeking expert legal help to get the Federation out of a contract they had signed with Ernest L. Wilkinson, an attorney specializing Indian Claims Cases who planned to clean-up on legal fees upon the final settlements. The lawyer had a cozy relationship with the chairman of the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs, Arthur Watkins, owing to their shared status as bishops in the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.[639] Wilkinson worked with Frederick Collette and the Indians of California, Inc., with whom the Federation had periodic, though always tenuous, relations. By the

---

House of Representatives, *Emancipation of Indians, Hearings on H.R. 2958, H.R. 2165, and H.R. 1113* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. G.P.O., 1947), 97.

[636] Norman M. Littell in United States Senate Committee on Public Lands, *To Remove Restrictions and Provide Per Capita Distribution of Funds to California Indians* (unpublished hearings, HRG-1948-PLS-0003), 105.

[637] Norman M. Littell to Katherine Mather, 17 July 1947, folder "BK #7, Feb 24, '46 – Dec 4(?) '47," box 2, NMLP.

[638] Ibid.

[639] Norman M. Littell to Katherine Mather, 17 July 1947, folder "BK #7, Feb 24, '46 – Dec 4(?) '47," box 2, NMLP.

time of Willis and Littell's meeting, however, the Federation had broken with Collette once and for all.[640]

Due to paternalistic fears of scheming lawyers taking advantage of Indian people that were, as in the case of Collette and Wilkinson, sometimes well founded, the Bureau fought the Federation and many other tribes over the right to private counsel. The government recommended that California Indians retain the state attorney general as their representative on the Court of Claims cases. However, for the Federation and many Indian tribes, private legal counsel was their basic right as citizens and they simply did not trust that the government, federal, state, or otherwise, had their best interests at heart.[641] They cited the diminutive settlement that the attorney general had engineered as reason enough to seek outside legal help.[642] Many individual tribes, as well as coalitions of tribes such as the Federation, demanded their right to private counsel and eventually won. Following a signature gathering campaign across the thirty-odd Mission Indian reservations, Littell entered into the Claims business, and the Mission Indian Federation found a good attorney to take them down the road to termination.

By the 1950s, the Mission Indian Federation and their forefathers had asked the federal government to give them clear titles to their lands and then to leave them alone to their own devices for nearly a century. In spite of decades of progress on legal fronts across the United States, including the granting of citizenship in 1924, by 1950 Indian

---

[640] Norman M. Littell to Katherine Mather, 17 July 1947, folder "BK #7, Feb 24, '46 – Dec 4(?) '47," box 2, NMLP. It was at this same meeting that Willis introduced Littell to Sam Akeah, then chair of the Navajo Nation, beginning his decades-long association with the Navajo as their tribal attorney.

[641] Norman M. Littell to Glenn Emmons, 26 May 1955, folder "Music from Guitar," box 9 of 17, C1366c, NMLP.

[642] Saubel and Elliott, *'Isill Héqwas Wáxish*, 501-4.

peoples continued to find themselves restricted legally as the Indian Bureau enforced more than 2,200 regulations upon tribally enrolled people.[643] Termination of the special relationship that tribes had with the federal government, which various politicians, reformers, and groups like the Federation had bandied about for some thirty years, finally gained an ear in post-War Washington and seemed to offer the prospect of freedom to Indian peoples. However, in order for the government to sever its relationship with and divest itself of any obligations it had to tribes, it first had to settle their outstanding Claims against the United States. Therefore, the first step to termination was the Indian Court of Claims and attorneys like Norman Littell.

This first-things-first approach to termination was nothing new for Mission Indian people. The Federation had been fighting to secure compensation for the Treaties of Santa Ysabel and Temecula for decades since its inception. Speaking at the Southern California Congress for the Indian Reorganization Act in 1934, Juanita Machado asked federal officials "don't you think that the only way to give full justice to California Indians is first for our government to fulfill the promises of our treaties before we can consider any other bill?"[644] The people of Southern California Indian Country, and the Federation in particular, had been petitioning the government for redress for their Unratified Treaties for decades. Some, such as the anti-Federationists on the Los Coyotes Reservation even demanded that the government *ratify* the treaties before they would

[643] Felix S. Cohen, "The Erosion of Indian Rights, 1950-1953: A Case Study in Bureaucracy," *Yale Law Journal*, vol. 62 (1953), 352.

[644] Juanita Machado in *Proceedings of the Southern California Indian Congress, Held at Riverside, California, March 17 and 18, 1934* (Washington D.C.: U.S. G.P.O., 1934), 34.

even consider changing their relationship with the federal government.[645] The Federation, however, pragmatically demanded compensation so that their members would have a solid financial base with which to resume their live free from Bureau control as private citizens.

California Indians had been under pressure to privatize their lands ever since word of the Decree of Secularization reached California in 1820, some seven years after the Córtes in Madrid so decreed.[646] Ten years later, the president of the Mexican Republic, Anastasio Bustamante, wrote the head of the Franciscan missions in California and asked, "What could be done to improve the natives materially and induce them to become private owners of land and cultivate the same."[647] Fr. Narciso Durán recommended establishing a new chain of inland missions. That way, coastal lands could be divided among the neophytes there and "surplus land be divided among settlers to encourage colonization," while the missionaries worked to bring interior Indian peoples into the Faith.[648] Durán's plan eerily presaged the General Allotment Act, passed by the United States Congress in 1887, which also sought to make yeoman farmer landowners out of Native people and distribute "surplus" lands to non-Indians. While allotting lands in severalty to individual Indian people accompanied a myriad of problems in arid Southern California including indifferent agents and bad land surveys, California Indians noted that without some form of private title to their lands, they risked losing everything.

---

[645] Resolution of Los Coyotes Indians, dated February 15, 1954 in Congress of the United States, *Termination of Federal Supervision over Certain Tribes of Indians: Hearings on S. 2749 and H.R. 7322* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. G.P.O., 1954), 140.

[646] George W. Beatty, *California's Unbuilt Missions: Spanish Plans for an Inland Chain* (Los Angeles: 1930), 33-5.

[647] Anastasio Bustamante in Beatty, *California's Unbuilt Missions*, 42.

[648] Fr. Narciso Durán in Beatty, *California's Unbuilt Missions*, 43.

In 1928, a federal commission released what the American public came to know as the Meriam Report. The damning issue exposed the impoverished conditions of Indian reservations throughout the United States. Lack of education, epidemics of disease and malnutrition, political and social oppression, and economic degradation filled the more-than eight-hundred page report. The commission made a number of recommendations to the government with an eye on ameliorating conditions in Indian Country. Among them, was a recommendation that the federal government remove trust restrictions from the Klamath and Menominee Reservations of Oregon and Wisconsin, respectively, and place the land under the ownership of "the modern business device of the corporation," in order to efficiently and profitably exploit each nation's timber resources.[649] The unworkability and unprofitability of allotments on timberlands and small allotments pushed the Meriam commission to argue for the corporate structure. Although designed with resource exploitation at heart and with destructive features such as non-Indian shareholders to guide the enterprise, its creators meant the plan to benefit the tribal people by giving them a voice in the management of their lands and income to care for themselves and their families. The commission even envisioned that "the government might withdraw if the development of the Indians warranted such a course."[650] The Meriam Report, therefore, marked the birth of the policy that became known as termination. Given the tiny, unprofitable allotments in Southern California Indian Country and the frustration and outright hatred for the Indian Bureau, it is not surprising that a good many tribal people in

[649] Institute for Government Research, *The Problem of Indian Administration* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins Press, 1928), 42.
[650] Ibid.

the region supported Bureau withdrawal or termination under the banner of the Federation when they it was codified by Congress.

The long and antagonistic commissionership of John Collier worked heavily against the Mission Indian Federation. By the time of his resignation in early 1945, the MIF had effectively ceased its operation as a government in the region and no longer exercised police power as a sovereign tribal entity. However, Collier could not kill the Federation, and its evolution into a political party was a natural outcome of the Bureau crackdown. It was also an outcome of the inherent political differences that exist among any group of peoples. Traditionally, when an element of a political unit or village disagreed with a decision of the majority, Southern California Indian peoples, like many Native people, would splinter off and form new groups. People from other villages who might share the same point of view or any other reason, could also join this new group.[651] The hemming-in of tribal populations on minimal land reserves removed such a contingency plan. Bureau policy at the outset of the "self-government" of the Indian Reorganization Act seemed, at least theoretically, to allow for the chartering of both smaller communities within a single reservation or a larger community comprised of a number of reservations (like the Mission Indian Federation), but only on Bureau terms and only after handing over significant powers to the Secretary of the Interior, which nearly everyone in Southern California Indian Country found unacceptable.[652] As such,

[651] Patencio and Boynton, *Stories and Legends*, 43. See page 41 and 42 in Chapter One for an example of such behavior.

[652] Walter Woehlke, 17 March 1934, in "Proceedings of Southern California Indian Congress Held at Riverside," 235-6.

the formation of a broader political party that united like-minded groups on various reservations was a natural coping mechanism.[653]

Bureau antagonism did not remit following the resignation of Collier in early 1945, however. One former employee remembered of the Collier years that the Bureau "didn't run smoothly…. I don't think that it worked generally. He was a visionary but he didn't have the ability to put it into practical effect."[654] Regardless of how bad Collier's tenure was for groups like the Federation, the Indian Service found itself even more adrift following his resignation, providing regional employees with the opportunity to very well act as they pleased.[655] In a political move, Harry S. Truman appointed Julius Krug Secretary of the Interior in 1946. Krug was a "wheeler-dealer type of person," whom employees of the Indian Bureau believed did not take his job seriously. The inappropriateness of the political appointment had a dampening effect on the bureaucracy.[656] This left the lower levels of the system operate as they pleased, a reality that only added to the acrimony between the Bureau and the Federation.

The Federation told the secretary of the interior that since the end of the Second World War, the Mission Indian Agency and the new "'Area Director' (the Bureau dictators are not designated as 'superintendent' any more)," exerted "a consistent drive to secure the election of tribal committees under a chairman or spokesman by Indians

[653] James Martinez in *Senate Interim Committee on California Indian Affairs, Progress Report to the Legislature* (Sacramento: California State Senate: 1955), 245.
[654] Singer, "Oral History Interview with Rita Singer," 32.
[655] Cowger, *The National Congress of American Indians*, 51.
[656] Singer, "Oral History Interview with Rita Singer," 31.

subservient to the Bureau."[657] This was a continued affront to the conservative Federation who chaffed at the Bureau's "deliberate effort to sweep aside the traditional tribal custom of electing and recognizing a captain of each band in accordance with the practice of these Indians since the days of Spanish occupation"[658] The Federation still pointed back to tribal tradition, and the ways they had governed themselves hundreds of years before and since the arrival of the United States in the region.

Legal expert and former Interior Department solicitor Felix Cohen also saw the larger arch of history and noted the cyclical nature of the government's plans to free Indian peoples from federal wardship. A seemingly insidious growth of the Indian Bureau and an expansion of its budget followed each effort to shrink federal involvement in Indian affairs. The statistics of the day proved that "between 1851 and 1951, a century in which the Indian Bureau kept talking about working itself out of a job and turning over responsibility to the Indians, congressional appropriations to Indian tribes decreased by approximately 80%, while appropriations to the Indian Bureau (chiefly for salaries) increased by approximately 53,000%."[659] Adam Castillo pointed out that although there was a new Commissioner of Indian Affairs in office in 1947, nothing had changed. "The Superintendent is still there. They have not made any changes. All the Government policemen are there…. The Government [sic] is paying a lot of money for salaries for

[657] Adam Castillo and Purl Willis to Representative Toby Morris, 22 February 1952, Cahuilla, Accession #1976-95 [NMNH-Harrington_mf3_r114_0429], JPHP.

[658] Juliana Calac, Clarence Lobo, and Adam Castillo, "Petition to the Honorable Oscar L. Chapman, Secretary of the Interior," received by the Department of the Interior 23 April 1953, folder Mission Indian Federation, box 27, Coded Records 1910-1958, R.G. 75, SAO, NARA SB.

[659] Felix S. Cohen, "The Erosion of Indian Rights, 1950-1953: A Case Study in Bureaucracy," *Yale Law Journal*, vol. 62 (1953), 388.

these men."[660] By highlighting the great expense at which the Indian Bureau operated, Castillo found an effective lobbying tool, particularly in the newly conservative Congress.

The congressional lobbying of the Federation began to pay off in the years immediately following the Second World War. Following more than a decade of monumental government growth from the New Deal to the War, the Congress took on a much more fiscally conservative nature. When Castillo spoke of saving tens of thousands of dollars by eliminating the Indian Bureau police he saw as redundant in favor of the county sheriff, many began to listen.[661] In 1947, the Mission Indian Agency found itself terminated, as the Interior Department took the first steps toward ending Bureau activities in or "withdrawing" from California by consolidating the state's individual agencies into the California Indian Agency. Suddenly, one of the Federation's biggest enemies, John Dady, found himself forced into retirement.[662] This tactic thus proved successful, as they had maneuvered to oust the superintendent since his installation in 1933.

The Federation and its supporters continued to point to the fiscal waste and redundancy that characterized the Indian Bureau and its programs. Federation ally J.P. Harrington lobbied conservative congressman John S. McGroarty, arguing that "The Indian in the public school and parochial schools and under the same administration as other mortals here in America, would eliminate all these trouble-making policemen, school officials, Soviet experimenters, wellfare [sic] workers, grafters, and similar

[660] Adam Castillo in United States House of Representatives, *Emancipation of Indians: Hearings on H.R. 2958, H.R. 2165, and H.R. 1113* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. G.P.O., 1947), 97.
[661] Adam Castillo in United States House of Representatives, *Emancipation of Indians: Hearings on H.R. 2958, H.R. 2165, and H.R. 1113* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. G.P.O., 1947), 99.
[662] John Dady to C.L. Lynch, 28 August 1947, personnel file of John Dady, folder 1, NPRC.

agencies which are duplicating already established state agencies."[663] Greatly influenced by his close contacts with Federation president Adam Castillo and other Federationists, Harrington noted the $75,000 taxpayers gave to the Mission Indian Agency with its fleet of 150 automobiles and claimed that if the government "entirely did away [sic] with the Riverside office nobody would know the difference, except that everything would go smoother than before."[664] Harrington and the Federation could hardly believe the expenditures for an agency that only stood in their way and robbed tribes of their sovereignty.

California Governor Earl Warren assured Second World War veterans throughout the state of decent incomes, healthcare, and housing upon their return home.[665] Why should the Mission Indian people, many of whom proudly served their country shoulder-to-shoulder with their non-Indian countrymen in the War, feel such promises would not apply to them? Instead, the federal government stood in their way and forced them into what they rightly viewed as a second-class status under federal wardship. The struggle against Bureau control thus quickly developed a "freedom" rhetoric in the post-War years, one that played upon the themes of that conflict. Mission Indian soldiers had fought for the freedom of Europe and the Pacific. It was time, the Federation argued, that they had theirs.

In 1946, Adam Castillo travelled to Washington, D.C., to lobby for freedom from the Bureau and per-capita distribution of Claims Case award monies. Adjusting his

[663] J.P. Harrington to John S. McGroarty, 13 February 1936, Letters Sent 1904-1960, Accession #1976-95 [NMNH-Harrington_mf9_r12_0638], JPHP.
[664] Ibid.
[665] Schuparra, *Triumph of the Right*, 5.

glasses, Castillo told the Senate Subcommittee that, "'What the Indian wants, above all else… is his freedom. The American way of life. Aren't Indians Americans[?]' Adam said – and he looked committee chairman Arthur Watkins of Utah right in the eye – that his folks back in California are smart enough to tend their own business."[666] Watkins responded that the subcommittee needed to gather opinions from as many Indian people as possible with regard to the "freedom business," to which the conservative, small-government Republican Senator of Montana Zales Ecton replied, "Nonsense. Did Congress send out a subcommittee to talk to all of the slaves before emancipation?"[667] Watkins worried of the many Indian people he claimed did not want to work, to which Ecton quipped "that was a normal thing – neither did he."[668] Committee members' fears that terminated lands would quickly be lost raised objection from Castillo who asserted that Indian people were not as ignorant and helpless as they thought. Indeed, many Indian people recognized that their "desires were [being] exploited by politicians" in the struggle over termination, but they too utilized the political goals of politicians for their own ends.[669] If non-Indian politicians wanted the federal government to get out of the Indian business and grant these citizens the same freedoms as non-Indian citizens, Native politicians like Castillo were ready to ally them in order to free themselves from Bureau control and enable them to carry on their lives as Native peoples in private.

---

[666] Harmon W. Nichols, "Indian Travels Across The Country To Plead With Congress," *Chronicle-Telegram*, Elyria, Ohio, 16 January 1946, pg. 13.

[667] Ibid.

[668] Ibid.

[669] "Comments and Revisions of the Pala Indians to the Proposed Bill S. 2749 (Senate) and H.R. 7322 (House)" in Congress of the United States, *Termination of Federal Supervision over Certain Tribes of Indians*, 491.

Indeed, some Federation members already boasted of their freedom. Owing to Southern California Indian Country's multifaceted history, a number of tribal people found themselves outside of the reservation system but not necessarily tribal life. The most prominent of these were members of unrecognized communities such as the Santa Ana-San Juan Capistrano Band, Juaneño or Acjachemen who lived around the mission at San Juan Capistrano near the coast in Orange County, and the San Luis Rey Band, Luiseños who lived near the Mission San Luis Rey near the coast in northern San Diego County. Given the value of their lands close to the sea and non-Indian settlements, the federal government of the United States never recognized these bands or held reservations for them. However, many of the people of villages like San Juan and San Luis Rey were very much citizens of Indian Country and members of the Federation. Most notably Juan Forster and Clarence Lobo of the Santa Ana-San Juan Capistrano Band served in key leadership positions in the Federation, as Secretary/Treasurer and an official delegate to Washington, D.C., respectively.[670] However, these and other Federationists such as Juan Tule of San Luis Rey found themselves outside of any of the few benefits available from the federal government that cast them off as wards of the state and directed them to appeal to the state or county for any assistance they might need.[671]

[670] "The Indian," vol. 4, no. 2 (June 1934); M.K. Clark to James Ring, 15 February 1951, Coded Records, R.G. 75, box 27, folder MIF, SAO, NARA SB.

[671] Charles Ellis to Adam Castillo, 11 January 1932, box 15, folder2, Tribal Relations, Business Committee, MIA CCF 1920-1953, Riverside.

At the same time, the Bureau found many ways to cheat Federation members enrolled on reservations out of their benefits as well.[672] As a result, many federally enrolled Federationists found themselves even worse off than non-enrolled members as they not only did not get the federal benefits, they had all of the restrictions of federal wardship that also precluded them from seeking assistance from state and local government agencies. Thus, at the time, Federationists saw very little benefit in retaining their relationship with the federal government. Those Federationists not enrolled on a reservation referred to themselves as "free Indians," as opposed to the "restricted" or "reservation" Indians, and justifiably claimed that they fared better dealing with the state and local governments as non-wards.[673]

The Federation also pointed to and fought against other injustices that separated them from their non-enrolled and non-Indian family, friends, and neighbors, the most notable being the prohibition of alcohol. The federal government had imposed prohibition upon enrolled Indian peoples since its founding and the various Indian agencies around the United States exerted significant efforts to enforce prohibition in the first half of the twentieth century.[674] Arguing "Indians, for the most part, [were] sober, industrious people," the Federation joined by Native groups throughout California explained the obvious, that Indian prohibition "discriminates against an Indian, and makes him feel

[672] Ibid.

[673] Richard L. Lobo in House of Representatives, *Interior Department Appropriations for 1951: Additional Hearings, Mission Indians of California* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. G.P.O., 1950), 12; Adam Castillo in House of Representatives, *Interior Department Appropriations for 1951*, 22.

[674] Jill E. Martin, "'The Greatest Evil:' Interpretations of Indian Prohibition Laws, 1832-1953," in *Great Plains Quarterly* (2003), 35.

humiliated when he is refused a drink or reads a sign, 'No Liquor Served to Indians.'"[675] Living on a reservation limited Indian peoples' access to capital as well, since banks would not loan money because Indian people could not put their federal trust property up for collateral.[676] The Federation told Congress that such degradation was unjust, after all, Castillo said, "We are the aboriginals of this country and still we are aliens in our own country."[677]

Still other distinctions, notably federal jurisdiction over tribal lands, also underscored differences forced upon enrolled Federationists. By the 1950s, Indian people were subject to not only the laws of their individual state in their dealings with non-Indians as well as all federal laws in general, they were also subject to some 800 special laws and 2,200 regulations that applied only to tribally enrolled peoples. Thus, although some argued that Indian reservations were lawless places, they were in fact subject to more laws and regulations than any other polities within the United States.[678] Enforcement, however, was where it all fell apart.

Since Collier's crackdown, the Federation had ceased to exercise police power in Southern California Indian Country. By the 1950s, Bureau law enforcement had degraded to the point where it left "the reservations totally without police protection and the

[675] Adam Castillo, et al to the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs of the Committee on Public Lands of the House of Representatives, 8 April 1947 in United States House of Representatives, *Emancipation of Indians: Hearings on H.R. 2958, H.R. 2165, and H.R. 1113* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. G.P.O., 1947), 93.

[676] Albert Banks in House Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, *Interior Department Appropriations for 1951*, 19.

[677] Adam Castillo in United States House of Representatives, *Emancipation of Indians: Hearings on H.R. 2958, H.R. 2165, and H.R. 1113* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. G.P.O., 1947), 99.

[678] Felix Cohen in House Subcommittee on Indian Affairs, *State Legal Jurisdiction in Indian Country: Hearings on H.R. 459, H.R. 3235, and H.R. 3624* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. G.P.O., 1952), 43.

peaceful residents totally at the mercy of the lawless…."[679] While Federation opponents complained of only two Bureau police officers for the entire state, one in the far-north at Hoopa and the other at Palm Springs, Castillo and others bitterly complained of police officers who turned deaf ears to their pleas and carried the Bureau line, interfering in tribal matters.[680] Armed Bureau police often intimidated voters during tribal elections that were more-or-less controlled by the local agent, and tribal politics inherently effected Bureau police and the administration of justice and law and order on reservations.[681] On the Campo Reservation, Bureau policeman Melvin Clark belligerently forced his way into tribal affairs with the expressed goal of removing the Federation committee, which he did via electoral fraud. He then did the same on the Barona, Mesa Grande, and Santa Ysabel Reservations.[682] Federation members claimed that Clark even went so far as to have them and their families wrongfully deported to Mexico in order to eliminate opposition to Bureau control in Southern California Indian Country.[683] At the same time, string of arson fires among the homes of Federation members created a reign of terror for the traditionalist population of Campo while the Bureau refused to file claims on the insurance of the residents.[684]

---

[679] Winona Adams to H. E. Knox, 27 September 1951, in the Earl Warren Papers, Interior – Bureau of Indian Affairs, 1951, State Archives of California, Sacramento.

[680] Edmund Rucker, "Indians Not Yet Prepared for Freedom, Leaders Say," *San Diego Union*, 11 January 1950, 24.

[681] Petition to the Honorable Oscar L. Chapman, received 23 April 1951, Coded Records, R.G. 75, box 27, folder MIF, SAO, NARA SB.

[682] Rosalie Pinto Henry to Governor Earl Warren, 18 October 1951, folder 1951, Interior – Bureau of Indian Affairs, Federal Files, Earl Warren Papers, California State Archives, Sacramento.

[683] Ibid.

[684] Santiago Meza to Winona Adams, 8 October 1951, folder 1951, Interior – Bureau of Indian Affairs, Federal Files, Earl Warren Papers, California State Archives, Sacramento; Ibid.

When a pro-termination Federationist on Mesa Grande telephoned the Bureau police officer (likely Clark) in an emergency in the early 1950s, the officer responded that they should have directed call to the county sheriff since they favored independence from the Bureau. As the sheriff lacked jurisdiction on reservations, Federation leaders reported that, "The Indian and his family were left to the elemental security of locked doors and a loaded rifle."[685] The scene on many Mission Indian Reservations had devolved into a Wild West atmosphere despite a federal agency with a multi-million dollar annual budget in place to prevent such a situation. It is therefore unsurprising that the Mission Indian Federation endorsed the strong Indian Bureau opponent and former congressman Will Rogers, Jr., for the position of Commissioner of Indian Affairs.[686] Rogers had joined the Federation in arguing that Indian people did not want to be federal wards or tourist attractions, but that they should have the same rights as their fellow non-Indian citizens, which included the rights of citizens to decide their own local political allegiances and structures.[687] The former California congressional representative and son of the famed Cherokee humorist of the same name indeed shared many of the same viewpoints as the MIF, and like the Federation, came to support termination to give tribes more control over their own affairs.[688]

---

[685] Juliana Calac, Clarence Lobo, and Adam Castillo, "Petition to the Honorable Oscar L. Chapman, Secretary of the Interior," received by the Department of the Interior 23 April 1953, folder Mission Indian Federation, box 27, Coded Records 1910-1958, SAO, NARA SB.

[686] Adam Castillo to J.P. Harrington, 23 January 1949, Letters Received, Accession #1976-95 [NMNH-Harrington_mf9_r2_0529 & 0530], JPHP.

[687] Philip, *Termination Revisited*, 58 & 87; Russel Lawrence Barsch and James Youngblood Henderson, *The Road: Indian Tribes and Political Liberty* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1980), 119.

[688] Cowger, *The National Congress of American Indians*, 102-3.

Adam Castillo began to struggle with his health in late 1948 and suffered a partial stroke around the New Year.[689] The fact that the president had slowed down due to poor health did not deter him from being among the delegation of Federation leaders arrived in Washington, D.C., in February 1950. This delegation tried a different approach, one Castillo had tried only once in years past.[690] Instead of going to the Committees on Indian Affairs, they instead lobbied the House Appropriations Committee and requested that Congress defund the Bureau's California budget.[691] One of the men, John La Chappa of the Santa Ysabel Reservation told the committee how the Japanese had captured him on Guam in the early days of the Second World War. He spent the remainder of the conflict as a prisoner of war. When he returned home at the end of the War, La Chappa tried to take advantage of the G.I. Bill and get a higher education, only to be shocked to learn that the high school education he thought he obtained at Sherman Institute was really only and eighth-grade education. "'The Indian Bureau is spending $882,000 to keep California Indians from getting and education. It's just a waste of money,'" he told reporters.[692] The tactic met with success in the newly conservative Congress and the Bureau soon found itself faced with no money to support operations within the state in the coming fiscal year.[693] The Federation found an ally in California's conservative Democratic senator Sheridan Downey who introduced the "Downey Indian Bill" that aimed to abolish the

[689] Adam Castillo to J.P. Harrington, 23 January 1949, Letters Received, Accession #1976-95 [NMNH-Harrington_mf9_r2_0529 & 0530], JPHP.

[690] Adam Castillo in House of Representatives, *Interior Department Appropriations for 1951*, 22.

[691] House Committee on Public Lands, *Mission Indian Problems in San Diego County*, 4; Frank Macomber, "Indian Freedom Bill Seen Dead for Year," *San Diego Evening Tribune*, 15 June 1950.

[692] "Indians Seek End of Bureau Control," *San Diego Journal*, 28 February 1950, Coded Records, R.G. 75, box 27, folder MIF, SAO, NARA SB.

[693] Frank Macomber, "Economy Ax Falls on Mission Bay, S.D. Indians," *San Diego Union*, 21 March 1950, Coded Records, R.G. 75, box 27, folder MIF, SAO, NARA SB.

Bureau. In Downey's eyes, "'federal guardianship of Indians [was] a burden both to the Indians and to the American taxpayers.'" The group also persuaded San Diego congressional representative Clinton McKinnon to introduce legislation in the House and Senate to emancipate Indian people from federal wardship, place reservations under state law, and protect their property from taxation.[694]

The cut was almost a coup for the Federation, as it would have forced the Bureau to leave the state at the beginning of the new fiscal year on July 1, 1950. In a circular sent out to all captains, leaders, and members of the Federation that year, Castillo reiterated that for which they were fighting. "Our Delegates do not go asking Charity!" he said, "No, we are asking only for our rights under law! We want and demand equality of opportunity with other people; that is our inherent right under the American Constitution, but… this right has been denied the Indian race in California by our Government since it took over control over our lives and property one hundred years ago."[695] Not everyone in the Mission Indian Country saw things along those lines, however. Opposition groups in Northern California cynically retorted that following the cut, the federal government would likely transfer administration of Indian affairs in the state either to the state government or to one of the federal Indian agencies in Oregon, Nevada, or Arizona, thus negating any Federation gains.[696] The cynical and pragmatic realism of the northern

[694] "Indians Seek End of Bureau Control," *San Diego Journal*, 28 February 1950, Coded Records, R.G. 75, box 27, folder MIF, SAO, NARA SB.

[695] Adam Castillo, "To All Captains and Leaders and Members," 19 February 1950, Coded Records, R.G. 75, box 27, folder MIF, SAO, NARA SB.

[696] Federated Indians of California, *The Smoke Signal*, vol. 9, no. 3 (March 1950), Coded Records, R.G. 75, box 27, folder MIF, SAO, NARA SB.

groups also marked the main opposition group in Southern California, the Spokesmen and Committee group.

The Indian Bureau created business committees and/or the position of spokesman on reservations throughout the area during the 1930s with the rollout of the Indian Reorganization Act. In Southern California, the superintendent imposed these positions to counter the traditional leadership and ordered that these "official" tribal governments appoint a committee to run the elections for those offices each year.[697] A number of election irregularities surfaced throughout the 1930s and into the 1950s, causing the Federation to conclude that the Bureau rigged elections against them. As such, many traditional Federationists often refused to participate in the elections (a very Native response to such a scenario), although electoral tensions between the two political parties reached a fevered pitch at times with armed Bureau police monitoring the situation.[698] The result of the hostile and unrepresentative elections was the Spokesmen and Committees, those officially recognized by the Mission Indian Agency. Moreover, they did exactly what Superintendent John Dady had hoped they would back in 1934: eroded the unifying base of the Mission Indian Federation. Much to the Agency's chagrin, however, they did not simply play toady to the Bureau. Rather, they cooperated with the government and worked within its structures, refusing to let the federal government off the hook for all of the obligations it had neglected.

[697] Petition to the Honorable Oscar L. Chapman, received 23 April 1951, Coded Records, R.G. 75, box 27, folder MIF, SAO, NARA SB.

[698] Ibid.; Clifford Trafzer, 24 April 2015, comments to panel, Nixon and the American Indian: Self-Determination and Tribal Sovereignty: The Lasting Impact of the Nixon Administration, Richard Nixon Library and Museum, Yorba Linda, California.

Steve Ponchetti, leader of what became known as the Spokesman and Committee group told the *San Diego Journal* that he and his group opposed the Federation's cutting of the California budget of the Bureau since it would adversely affect the education of the reservation youth. "'We are determined to fight back,' Ponchetti said. 'Before now we have delayed opposing the old people, but we have got to a point where we must speak for ourselves and our children.'"[699] The "old people" to which he referred were the traditionalist members of the Federation whose numbers, the paper pointed out, had dwindled in the recent years. There was a marked divide in reservation communities between the traditionalist elders who generally belonged to the Federation and the younger, boarding and high school educated population. Albert Banks of the Pechanga Reservation related that the tribal elders, ranging in age from eighty to one-hundred-and-fifteen years old, opposed suggestions of sending younger tribal members who had received formal non-Indian educations to lobby for them in Washington, D.C. They believed such people would do the community harm and opted instead to align themselves with the Federation.[700]

Ponchetti and other Indian and non-Indian people throughout the state pressed other members of congress and the state legislature to have the funding reinstated.[701] They organized the Spokesmen and Committee group in opposition to the Federation and lobbied Congress for an ordered withdrawal of the Bureau over a period of years. State area director for the Bureau James Stewart made it a point to inform Acting

[699] "S.D. Indians Cheered by Rogers' Reaction," 27 March 1950, *San Diego Journal*, Coded Records, R.G. 75, box 27, folder MIF, SAO, NARA SB.

[700] Albert Banks in House Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, *Interior Department Appropriations for 1951*, 18.

[701] "Senate Please for Indian Fund," *Riverside Press*, 12 April 1950;

Commissioner of Indian Affairs William Zimmerman that the anti-termination, anti-Federation "meetings [were] completely spontaneous on the part of the Indians and no Government participation or urgings have taken place."[702] Castillo, however, pointed to statements made by Josephine Cuero, chair of the committee on the Campo Reservation, who charged Officer Clark with rounding up attendees for the "Bureau Indian meeting."[703] Regardless of the mechanics behind the scenes, the lobbying work done by those opposed to the Federation paid off within months as they convinced Congressman McKinnon that depriving the Indian Bureau of funds to force its withdrawal from the state would be a great detriment to their communities and to the rest of the region.[704] Although the United States Senate reinstated the funds, Bureau officials worried that the Federation would continue to find success going "to Washington to work on the Republicans and the economy idea."[705]

The battles between Federationists who doggedly maintained their demands for immediate termination of Bureau control and oversight and their opponents who had organized as the Spokesmen and Committee Group in 1951 racked Southern California Indian Country throughout the decade and beyond, dividing many reservations and even families down solid political lines.[706] The Federation's non-Indian advisor, Purl Willis,

---

[702] J.M. Stewart to William Zimmerman, 6 March 1950, Coded Records, R.G. 75, box 27, folder MIF, SAO, NARA SB.

[703] Adam Castillo, "An Indian Appeals to the American Public," 28 March 1950, Coded Records, R.G. 75, box 27, folder MIF, SAO, NARA SB.

[704] Frank Macomber, "Indian Freedom Bill Seen Dead for Year," *San Diego Evening Tribune*, 15 June 1950, Coded Records, R.G. 75, box 27, folder MIF, SAO, NARA SB.

[705] M.K. Clark to James Ring, 14 December 1950, Coded Records, R.G. 75, box 27, folder MIF, SAO, NARA SB.

[706] Heather Ponchetti Daly, "'American Indian Freedom Controversy:' Political and Social Activism by Southern California Mission Indians, 1934-1958," (PhD diss. University of California, Los Angeles, 2012), 112-3. For an excellent analysis of the division that took place over termination in the

was also a major point of contention, and his influence over the Federation only grew with the worsening health of the president, Adam Castillo. Many people, both Indians and non-Indians, accused Willis of leaching off poor Federation members. Anti-Federationists refusing to join in a legal battle to include California's oil-rich tidelands if Willis were to remain connected to the case.[707] However, when the district attorney of San Diego County pressed the Bureau for hard evidence of the alleged financial impropriety, officials in the new Sacramento Area Office could not produce anything for prosecution.[708] Indian opponents labeled him "a radical agitator" and urged legislators to reject entirely his dangerous and radical recommendations."[709] Some even claimed to have seen him "camping on one of the reservations very busily staking our certain areas of Indian lands."[710]

Willis defended himself against the attacks by the Bureau and Federation opponents. In a letter to the editor of the *San Diego Tribune*, he showed the political logic of the Federation regarding termination as well as the ways in which they were so successful in advancing their plans: "The National Republican Committee proclaims

---

region, see the above and: Heather Ponchetti Daly, "Fractured Relations at Home: The 1953 Termination Act's Effect on Tribal Relations throughout Southern California Indian Country," *American Indian Quarterly*, vol. 33, no. 4 (Fall 2009), 427-439.

[707] Fred Hamlin, "Indian Groups Split over White 'Adviser,'" *San Diego Journal*, 20 July 1948, Coded Records, R.G. 75, box 27, folder MIF, SAO, NARA SB. In 1948, the opposition had united as the Mission Indian Chapter of the National Congress of American Indians. The National Congress of American Indians had an early presence in the region with the Mission Indian Chapter, but did not gain the same prominence as either the Mission Indian Federation or the Spokesmen and Committee groups at the time.

[708] Rita Singer to James B. Ring, 23 April 1951, Coded Records, R.G. 75, box 27, folder MIF, SAO, NARA SB.

[709] Bertha Stewart to Senator William F. Knowland, 9 March 1950, Coded Records, R.G. 75, box 27, folder MIF, SAO, NARA SB; Bertha Stewart to Chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, 9 March 1950, Coded Records, R.G. 75, box 27, folder MIF, SAO, NARA SB.

[710] Bertha Stewart to James Stewart, 10 March 1950, Coded Records, R.G. 75, box 27, folder MIF, SAO, NARA SB.

from Washington that it favors reducing taxes, balancing the budget, eliminating government waste, protecting the rights of minorities, safeguarding liberty against socialism, etc…. my efforts which appear to be gaining headway, absolutely match everyone [sic] of these challenges…. It is to be expected that the bureau will not release its stranglehold. It makes no move to voluntarily release Indians. Now, only Congress can act. Both parties must stand firm and not weaken. Indians must be free now!"[711] The Mission Indian Federation's fight for freedom was also not radical in the light of its perpetuation of the traditional tribal governments of the region. Still, fewer and fewer Indian people agreed with such sentiments as the struggle dragged on, and in 1951, Clarence Lobo and his brother Richard left the Federation. The Juaneño captain told the Commissioner of Indian Affairs that he had made a "frightful mistake when I allowed myself to be led around by… Adam Castillo and his counselor Purl Willis."[712]

Lobo's letter to the commissioner exposed deep rifts in the political fabric of California Indian Country. He wondered why as free Indians he and his people would have gotten involved in the struggle to free those held under wardship when they had no dealings with the Bureau themselves. Describing the Federation as "an old worn down unrecognized [sic] organization whose members are the very old," Lobo wondered why it was "that the young people never do get a chance to participate and they are never elected to any position," within the MIF. The divide between younger Indian people who had received formal, non-Indian educations and the older traditionalists had grown bitter, as the consequences grew larger. For Lobo, too much was riding on the line to sign "any

[711] Purl Willis, "Willis Tells Position on Affairs of Indians," *San Diego Tribune*, 11 April 1950.
[712] Ibid.

important papers with an X. We have too many Indians who are educated, but we still cater to the old Chiefs who still sign our lives away with the same little X of long ago." He worried that although some might have been able to manage their lands and affairs without the Indian Bureau the majority would not. After all, he wondered, "If the Captains sign their names with an X, then I just wonder what the poor private looks like."[713] The former Federationist then suggested a middle-of-the-road plan for the future of those enrolled on reservations in which the Bureau would operate a jobs and limited relief program to encourage Indian people to work for their livings while ensuring their survival.

Clarence Lobo ended the letter with the warning that "The freedom stampede which has been started is dangerous to the Indians…. When anyone talks of removing the Indian Bureau from the state they are talkking [sic] of throwing the Indians to the lions, (real estate lions)."[714] To that end, the Bureau planned to prolong its existence with a slower withdrawal to manage the transition of trust land to title in fee simple. When a congressional delegation came to San Diego, California, to hear both sides of the fight, Castillo stuck to the economy approach, maintaining that the Bureau was "nothing but an agency of the Government working for salaries, working for their money, but here they interfere on land. This matter has nothing to do on land." When conservative Congressman Norris Poulson of Los Angeles interjected that "They are also working to keep the job alive to handle that," Castillo simply responded, "Yes, sir, that is very true,"

[713] Ibid.

[714] Clarence Lobo to Dillon S. Meyer, 11 June 1951, Coded Records, R.G. 75, box 27, folder MIF, SAO, NARA SB.

a comment that garnered a round of applause from the audience.[715] The Federation remained committed to its cause, insisting that there was "absolutely no hope for California Indians unless they [were] given complete freedom from this iniquitous wardship status."[716]

Great divides had developed on the issue of the new Claims Case, as well, so much so that Littell pushed for another attorney from San Diego to take over the case from him. "Let him be sucker number two, I sure am sucker number one," the barrister reportedly told a Bureau agent.[717] The Federation took a difficult position for their attorney when it insisted that because of the offsets, Bureau properties like Sherman Institute belonged to the California Indian people, a situation exacerbated by the fact that since 1947, the Bureau had not permitted their children to enroll at Sherman while hundreds of Navajo and O'odham children from neighboring states filled the desks.[718] They also began to reject the very idea of Indian reservations, dubbing them "so-called" and placing the word within quotations, given that they again had millions taken out of their Claims settlement to pay for the activities of the Bureau over the decades.[719] Castillo and others no doubt wanted to distance themselves from the "reservation system" that only existed under the Bureau, as well.

---

[715] Adam Castillo and Norris Poulson in House Committee on Public Lands, *Mission Indian Problems in San Diego County*, 42.

[716] "Indian Bureau in California Deceives Congress!" Coded Records, R.G. 75, box 27, folder MIF, SAO, NARA SB.

[717] M.K. Clark to James Stewart, 27 March 1950, Records, R.G. 75, box 27, folder MIF, SAO, NARA SB..

[718] Memorandum, Comments on Hearings before the Sub-committee on Interior Appropriations…," Coded Records, R.G. 75, box 27, folder MIF, SAO, NARA SB.

[719] Adam Castillo to James Stewart, 25 July 1949, Coded Records, R.G. 75, box 27, folder MIF, SAO, NARA SB; Adam Castillo, "An Indian Appeals to the American Public," 28 March 1950, Coded Records, R.G. 75, box 27, folder MIF, SAO, NARA SB.

The nearly successful defunding of the Bureau and the strong headway the pro-termination lobbyists had made in the Capital set off alarm bells throughout Southern California Indian Country, showing people that the Federation could actually win its long fight to rid the region of federal control. When termination of the special relationship between the federal government and California tribes blossomed from a decades-long, seemingly quixotic crusade to a looming reality, many tribal people began to wonder what it might actually entail. Many feared the very real possibility that the state and local governments would tax their lands, which would mean their loss to most cash-poor reservation residents. One non-Indian observer noted that the supporters of termination throughout Mission Indian Country tended to control more assets on the reservations and usually belonged to leadership families.[720] Indeed, Spokesman of the Campo Reservation Eddie Largo pointed out that such individuals were much better prepared to pay on their lands when they ended up on tax rolls.[721]

There were also broader issues of social integration and out-right racism in the non-Indian world that many of the reservation residents knew and feared.[722] Such realities instilled a spirit of isolationism and an intense desire for privacy that still runs strong among tribal communities throughout the region today.[723] Lack of non-Native education among the adult tribal population, particularly among the leadership, was also a wavering point for many who saw the young generation, at school in those years, as the

[720] Lowell Bean, personal interview with the author, 24 January 2014, Palm Springs, California.
[721] Eddie Largo to Stewart Udall, 18 April 1961, folder 3600-1960-055, box 9, CCF 1958-75 – M.
[722] Cruz Siva in Congress of the United States, *Termination of Federal Supervision over Certain Tribes of Indians*, 485.
[723] Clifford Trafzer, personal interview with the author, 22 June 2015, Twenty-Nine Palms Indian Reservation, California.

ones who should make the determination for or against termination in later years.[724] Many argued for a slower phase-out of federal wardship over a period of fifteen to twenty years, while the Bureau had implemented what the Federation deemed a "communistic 5-year plan," for withdrawal.[725]

For Adam Castillo and members of the Mission Indian Federation, termination meant nothing other than eliminating the interference and oversight of the Indian Bureau in their lives. For him and other Federationists, their lands would remain free from taxation as they had when held in trust by the federal government.[726] Although they rightfully claimed that they paid taxes as any other Americans through sales taxes, they argued that they should retain their Native right to not have their lands taxed after termination. The Federation also argued that the $12 million deducted from their Claims settlement meant that they owned not only their reservations, which the federal government held *in trust* for them anyway, but that they had even paid the United States for them. They maintained that it was the responsibility of the traditional leadership to make land assignments and decide who lived where on each reservation, not of the Indian Bureau. Likewise, the Federation held that the reservations would continue to be exempt from taxation following termination by virtue of the fact that they were still Indian

[724] Cruz Siva in Congress of the United States, *Termination of Federal Supervision over Certain Tribes of Indians,* 482.

[725] John P. James, "Hold up 'Freedom,' County Indians Ask," *San Diego Daily Journal*, 4 March 1950, 1; Adam Castillo to James Stewart, 27 August 1949, Coded Records, R.G. 75, box 27, folder MIF, SAO, NARA SB.

[726] Cruz Siva in Congress of the United States, *Termination of Federal Supervision over Certain Tribes of Indians,* 485.

lands.[727] For the MIF, termination meant overnight freedom from the Indian Bureau with no change in their lands' statuses. The reservations would remain tax-free, but under tribal control.[728]

Castillo charged the Bureau with spreading the lies on the reservations that the state would tax their lands if termination were to go through.[729] Unfortunately, for the Federation president, in the minds of nearly everyone else, including members of Congress, the government would add tribal lands to the state tax rolls following termination. While scholars have typically viewed non-Indian support for the policy as a reiteration of the veiled goal of allotment to remove even more land from the Indian estate, other issues were at play in the American West, as well. Federal ownership of land in the West has been and continues to be a contentious issue. Many politicians such as then-senator Richard Nixon and New Mexico Commissioner of Public Lands, Murray J. Morgan, complained of the large tracts of land that the federal government had removed from local taxation with the creation of national parks and forests, military bases and Indian reservations.[730] State governments saw termination as a source for new tax revenue as tribes would become taxable corporations, persons in the legal sense.[731] Indeed, the lobbying efforts of the Interstate Association of Public Land Counties, which

[727] Adam Castillo in House Committee on Public Lands, *Mission Indian Problems in San Diego County*, 41-2.

[728] Cruz Siva in Congress of the United States, *Termination of Federal Supervision over Certain Tribes of Indians*, 485.

[729] Adam Castillo in House Committee on Public Lands, *Mission Indian Problems in San Diego County*, 41-2.

[730] "G.O.P. Planks Urge Return of Land to States," *San Diego Union*, 11 July 1952, pg. a2; Murray J. Morgan, "To All Newspaper Publishers and Editors in New Mexico," 27 March 1957, folder Federal Papers; Legislation – Federal 1954-1958, box 77, Goodwin J. Knight Papers, California State Archives, Sacramento.

[731] Gordon Morris Bakken, personal email to the author, 7 August 2013.

sought to transfer lands from federal to local control with the aim of increasing tax revenues to local coffers, swayed many conservatives in the United States Congress.[732]

The policy of termination was part of this broader, national movement to privatize federal lands and assets that had grown under the New Deal and World War II to some thirty billion dollars in 1955.[733] The Bureau felt considerable pressure at the time from outside interests to dispose of its property into private ownership so that it could find its way onto the tax rolls of government at every level. Moreover, while such moves pointed towards the abolition or "withdrawal" of the Bureau from California, agents saw their roles change to that of brokers to deal with such land transfers.[734] While indeed some within the Indian Bureau saw such an angle as a reason to remain active (or save their jobs), others were genuinely committed to termination as the right thing to do, and advocated for it. In later years, some Bureau officials pointed to land taxation as the core cause for the opposition to termination among tribal communities. If the Indian Bureau offered guarantees of tax-exempt status, one bureaucrat averred, termination might have met with more success in the region.[735] Tribal people agreed, though some of those against termination still wished to have other issues such as poor Bureau infrastructure taken care of before any federal withdrawal.[736] Castillo and the Federation held to their position and told the director the Bureau in the state that they would "never submit

[732] Philip, *Termination Revisited*, 83.

[733] Leonard M. Hill to R.C. Smith, 2 May 1955, Soboba 1950-1957, 1 of 2, box 72, Tribal Group Files, 1915-1972, SAO, NARA SB.

[734] Ibid.

[735] Associate Commissioner Officer to Commissioner Bennett, 19 May 1966, folder 2949, Part 1, 2/2, Box 8, Bureau of Indian Affairs Central Classified Files 1958-75, Sacramento Area Office, R.G. 75, Archives I, hereinafter referred to as CCF 1958-75, SAO, Archives I.

[736] Clara Helms in Senate Interim Committee on California Indian Affairs, Progress Report to the Legislature (Sacramento: California State Senate: 1955), 257.

willingly to the continued rule over our lives…."[737] The situation on the ground was bad enough for them to demand immediate withdrawal.

The former head of the War Relocation Authority and Commissioner of Indian Affairs in the Truman Administration Dillon S. Meyer largely ignored the "sovereignty" of the IRA governments in the 1950s, overriding tribal elections and increasing the Bureau's police presence on reservations. Interestingly, though, Meyer was one of the principal advocates of the Federation's main policy goal, termination.[738] Former superintendent of the Mission Indian Agency John Dady, of all people, also saw his job as having a seemingly self-destructive purpose: "My aim was to clear up their problems and help them, so that the Reservation could be divorced from the Service and the Indian people become helpful citizens of the State."[739] Combined with the harsh administrations of both men, these philosophies evince a truly assimilationist spirit that loathed traditionalism and an autonomous Indian identity.

However, the Bureau itself stressed that, should the people of the community wish, tribal life could continue after termination, free from federal interaction.[740] Throughout the twentieth century, even during the termination years, the people of Southern California Indian Country continued to practice their culture, sing their songs,

[737] Adam Castillo to James Stewart, 27 August 1949, Coded Records, R.G. 75, box 27, folder MIF, SAO, NARA SB.

[738] Richard Drinnon, *Keeper of Concentration Camps: Dillon S. Myer and American Racism* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987), 229-33.

[739] John Dady to Robert T. Lansdale, 6 December 1932, personnel file of John W. Dady, NPRC.

[740] Glenn L. Emmons, "Emmons Affirms Policy on Tribal Rights after Termination," 7 December 1957, folder Federal Papers; Interior – Bureau of Indian Affairs, box 77, Goodwin J. Knight Papers, California State Archives, Sacramento.

and honor their dead in their traditional ways.[741] As Adam Castillo saw it, the people of the Mission Indian Federation had already lost most of what was theirs to lose, and yet they still survived. "From the very beginning we have lost everything," he told a congressional committee, "We are still surviving and we will live many years more just the same without this Bureau control."[742] In essence the Federation sought to privatize their indigeneity. Pointing to unrecognized or "free" tribes such as the Juaneños, the Federation knew that they could maintain their tribal lives without their special relationship with the federal government.[743] At the time, that relationship did not afford Indian peoples many advantages. It did, however, make them wards, tied up their tribal funds in the federal treasury, limited their abilities to own homes and property or secure capital for businesses, and hurt their ability to bequeath their belongings to their children and heirs. The Federation's plan for termination kept the tax-exempt status of their lands and held them in the name of the individual tribes held in tribal corporations.[744] Tribes would thus secure their reservation lands and would be free to practice their religion and continue their cultural lives as private citizens without interference from the Indian Bureau.

Termination was, for the Federation, a form of cultural and political sovereignty, anachronistically speaking, which would take their political structure and their very

---

[741] Nattie Costo and family to Mrs. And General Barrows, 6 September 1952, Costo Family folder, box 15, David Barrows Papers, Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.

[742] Adam Castillo in United States House of Representatives, *Emancipation of Indians*, 98.

[743] "Indians Seek End of Bureau Control," *San Diego Journal*, 28 February 1950, Coded Records, box 27, folder MIF, R.G. 75, SAO, NARA SB.

[744] Adam Castillo in United States Senate Committee on Public Lands, *To Remove Restrictions and Provide Per Capita Distribution of Funds to California Indians*, 97-8 & 140-1; Norman M. Littell in House, *Interior Department Appropriations for 1951*, 5.

identity as Indian people away from the federal government and even non-Indian society. They believed they could maintain their own governance within their private tribal corporations while availing themselves of the protection a corporation offered. Their attorney assured them that such an entity was more secure than federal trust protections (which the federal government could revoke for a number of reasons and through a number of channels) in their minds, and would have enabled them more leeway in their use of their land. They did not seek government sanction or recognition when they first organized to implement and practice tribal self-government in 1919 and they did not see a reason to do so decades later, either. They had simply had enough of the federal government and wanted to go it their own as private citizens.

The Federation did not fight against all government, tribal or non-tribal, as it fought for the same state and local benefits their non-recognized and non-Indian neighbors received. They wished to send their children to the same schools as non-Indians in order to compete at the same levels they did politically, economically, and otherwise. The Federation worked against appropriations to the Bureau for schools as well as to distribute as aid for the indigent since they paled in comparison to the help non-ward individuals could receive from the social services offered at the state and county levels.[745] That their wardship prevented them from receiving such aid, particularly in San Diego County, only made their struggle to throw off the Indian Bureau even more urgent. The Mission Indian Federation sued the County of San Diego in the case *Rosalie Acosta v. County of San Diego* in an attempt to force the county to provide hospitalization

[745] Adam Castillo to James Stewart, 25 July 1949, Coded Records, box 27, folder MIF, R.G. 75, SAO, NARA SB.

and welfare services to reservation residents.[746] Although the State took the view "that Indians living within the tribal relations upon Indian reservations [were] components of alien nations and hence not 'lawful' residents of the county," Judge Arthur L. Mundo handed the MIF a victory in July 1953 when he ruled "that all reservation Indians in the State are entitled to the benefits of the State Welfare and Health and Hospitalization laws enacted in 1937…."[747] Though their efforts to defund the Bureau had stalled, their initial and subsequent second judicial victory when the Fourth District Appeals Court affirmed Judge Mundo's ruling in February of 1953 buoyed Castillo and the Federation.[748]

The Federation leveraged the ruling as support for their argument to Congress that it should transfer legal jurisdiction over California Indian Country away from the Indian Bureau and hand it over to the state. After all, they were now able to obtain all of their government assistance and hospitalization needs from the state and local governments, why not their police protection as well? The argument swayed at least one key local politician. In 1952, Los Angeles congressional representative Norris Poulson introduced another Federation-sponsored bill to transfer jurisdiction over California reservations to

[746] James Martinez and Purl Willis to Senator Arthur Watkins, 4 March 1954 in United States House of Representatives and Senate Subcommittees on Interior and Insular Affairs, *Termination of Federal Supervision over Certain Tribes of Indians: Hearings on S. 2749 and H.R. 7322, Part 5* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. G.P.O., 1954), 541; *Rosalie Acosta vs. County of San Diego, et al*, Indian Correspondence from John Rockwell, carton 1, Charles Elkus Papers, C-B 837, Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.

[747] Edmund G. Brown, "Opinion of Edmund G. Brown, Attorney General; Lee D. Stanton, Deputy Attorney General," 22 August 1951 in United States House of Representatives Committee on Appropriations, *Interior Department Appropriations for 1953. Part 4: Testimony of Members of Congress, Interested Organizations, and Individuals* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. G.P.O., 1952), 1697; Purl Willis to Rep. William H. Harrison, 8 June 1953 in House Subcommittee on Indian Affairs, *State Jurisdiction Over Offenses Committed by or Against Indians in the Indian Country, and To Confer on the State of California Civil Jurisdictions Over Indians in the State* (unpublished hearings, HRG-1953-IIA-0232).

[748] Willis to Harrison, 8 June 1953.

the state.[749] The Federation demanded that the Bureau transfer jurisdiction to the state lest Congress "delay and thus perpetuate and make permanent the iron rule of the Indian Bureau!"[750] Poulson advanced the Federation's bill, which became H.R. 1063 the following year. Following committee hearings in both houses of Congress, the bill grew from effecting California alone to include Indian country in four other specific states as well as to allow other states to assume jurisdiction over Indian country within their territories.[751] This enlarged Federation bill passed the Eighty-Third Congress on August 15, 1953, to become Public Law 280, the infamous legislation that transferred civil and criminal jurisdiction from the federal government to a number of individual states, including California. After decades of struggle, the Federation finally managed to free the reservations from Bureau police power.[752]

From a twenty-first century perspective, it may seem odd for an organization like the Mission Indian Federation to support a measure that many see today as having removed legal jurisdiction from sovereign nations. However, one must remember that the Bureau crushed the efforts of the Federation to exercise such sovereignty, which supplanted Native law enforcement with its own police force. Thus, many Southern California Indians, especially those in the Federation, did not view P.L. 280 as

---

[749] Adam Castillo and Purl Willis to Representative Toby Morris, 22 February 1952, Cahuilla, Accession #1976-95 [NMNH-Harrington_mf3_r114_0429], JPHP.

[750] Adam Castillo and Purl Willis to Representative Toby Morris, 22 February 1952, Cahuilla, Accession #1976-95 [NMNH-Harrington_mf3_r114_0429], JPHP.

[751] Carole E. Goldberg, "Public Law 280: The Limits of State Jurisdiction over Reservation Indians,"
UCLA Law Review, vol. 22, 540.

[752] "Law Enforcement Topic for Indians," *San Diego Union*, 6 September 1953, 25; Felix Cohen in House Subcommittee on Indian Affairs, *State Legal Jurisdiction in Indian Country: Hearings on H.R. 459, H.R. 3235, and H.R. 3624* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. G.P.O., 1952), 38. Southern California reservation residents also won the right to sell cattle that were descended from government issued cattle though the Indian owner had full title to the stock.

surrendering sovereignty or police powers over to law enforcement at the local level. Rather, from their perspective, it was purely an anti-BIA measure meant to remove power from the Indian Bureau. Indeed, such a view remains among some today, as members of the Sycuan Reservation of San Diego County told researchers that, "in 1953, PL-280 stripped the BIA of much of its authority, establishing it as merely the keeper of the reservation land's trust status."[753] However, the increased self-determination and strengthened sovereignty of the twenty-first century have led most to demonize the legislation. It is important, though, to note the specific circumstances in which it arose and why the Federation fought for it.

In September of that year, a victorious Adam Castillo convened a meeting of the Federation in the Veterans' War Memorial Building in San Diego's Balboa Park to explain the new Public Law 280 to the people of Southern California Indian Country.[754] Victory and jubilation for the Federation, however, were short-lived. That December was cool, clear, and dry in Southern California.[755] As Christmas approached, the Federation president lay dying in his home on the Soboba Reservation with a broken heart. The year prior he told his friend and ally, anthropologist J.P. Harrington, "I do not feel the same. I believe Prudence was called away before her time. I cannot get over it."[756] He never did. Adam Castillo, the longtime president of the Mission Indian Federation, a man who

[753] See "San Pasqual" and "Sycuan," *Tiller's Guide to Indian Country: Economic Profiles of American Indian Reservation*s, Veronica E. Velarde Tiller, ed. (Albuquerque, NM: BowArrow Publishing Company, 2005), 472 & 487. This work utilized a number of tribal consultants to write very brief, encyclopedic histories of American Indian Communities. Tilda Green helped on the project from San Pasqual and Anthony Collins and Georgia Tucker helped on Sycuan.

[754] "Law Enforcement Topic for Indians," *San Diego Union*, 6 September 1953, 25.

[755] "Detailed Weather Report," *San Diego Union*, 24 December 1953, 6.

[756] Adam Castillo to J.P. Harrington, 22 June 1952, Letters Received, Accession #1976-95 [NMNH-Harrington_mf9_r2_0532], JPHP.

embodied the spirit of the Federation like no other, the man in the brown derby, passed on Christmas Eve, 1953, following his wife after a year and a half of sorrow. His family laid him to rest in the cemetery of Saint Joseph's Mission on the Soboba Reservation with the simple epitaph, "Cousin. Rest in Peace."[757] Just as Castillo never got over the death of his wife, the Federation never recovered from his passing. Indeed, much of the success of the Federation hinged upon the political skills and prowess of Adam Castillo whom critics recognized was the driving force behind the MIF.[758] During the years that followed, the Federation experienced a decline in both membership and fortunes.

After a brief period, Santiago "Jim" Martinez, a Luiseño of the La Jolla Reservation in San Diego County, succeeded Castillo as the third president of the Federation.[759] In Castillo's absence, however, control of the Federation fell more and more into the hands of its non-Indian advisor, Purl Willis. Willis's work only added fuel to the political fires burning among the region's reservations and caused many Federationists to leave the organization after decades of devoted membership. However, the Federation had left such a mark upon Southern California Indian Country and so many people had invested so much into it, that its decline proved protracted. The Federation's legal counsel, Norman Littell noted that Federationists had followed Willis "for years and he did a lot of good for them in the earlier days." However, by the end of the 1950s, Littell noted that Willis had "gotten to be a disgruntled, beaten old guy," who was "just garrulous and hipped on his own love of power." The Federation still took up

[757] "Adam Castillo," *Find a Grave*, http://www.findagrave.com/cgi-bin/fg.cgi?page=gr&GRid=108518512, accessed 20 March 2015.

[758] Trafzer, *The People of the Pines*, 126; Thomas L. Sloan to John Collier, 20 January 1938, folder 33247 pt. 3, box 17, CCF 1907-39 – M.

[759] Edward Castillo, personal interview with the author, 29 April 2015, Riverside, California.

collections to send him to Washington, D.C. to lobby on their behalf for settlement of their Claims and relief from federal intrusion in their lives, although he had become less and less effective in his advanced age. For Littell, the Federation had become "a very, very sad, confused picture," by the end of the 1950s, leaving Southern California Indian Country even more bitterly divided down partisan lines.[760] Today, Willis is widely derided by elders in Southern California Indian Country who remember him as a schemer who endeavored to use Indian people for personal gain, although one elder remembered that he encouraged her and her siblings to go to law school when they grew up to help their people every time he visited their home.[761]

Shortly after Castillo's death, Willis approached cousin and closest relative, Prudencio Resvoloso, and had him sign some papers. Resvoloso later revealed that he did not know what the papers were, but in all probability, the papers were later filed with the Riverside County Superior Court and made Willis the executor of Castillo's estate. When Willis began to move forward with executing the estate, Resvoloso asked the Soboba tribal council to step in and handle the disposition.[762] That Castillo made Willis his executor shows the strong friendship between the two men, but Resvoloso's reaction to his executorship shows the tenuous position the non-Indian held among others in the tribal communities. The late president's estate revealed that, though he did have some

[760] Norman M. Littell, 6 May 1959, recorded telephone conversation, Mission/Lindsley and Staniforth, BANC MSS 71/233, Norman M. Littell Papers, 1929-1969, Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.

[761] Patricia Dixon, personal interview with the author, 5 October 2012, California Indian Conference, California State University, San Marcos; Rupert and Jeannette Henry Costo, *Natives of the Golden States: The California Indians* (San Francisco, CA: The Indian Historian Press, 1995) 318; Carmen Lucas, personal interview with the author, 2 November 2013, Borrego Springs, California.

[762] Rita Singer to Hayden L. Hews, 27 April 1954, Soboba 1950-1957, 2 of 2, box 72, Tribal Group Files, 1915-1972, R.G. 75, SAO, NARA SB.

measure of wealth in the form of twenty-two head of cattle, an older automobile, some furniture, and a home, his funerary expenses consumed the amount of cash money he left.[763] This at least brings into question the years of allegations of financial impropriety against him.

Opponents likewise accused other leaders of selfishly seeking personal gain within the Federation, as well. Back in the 1920s, Bureau officials criticized those whom they identified as a minority group that controlled a disproportionate share of tribal resources and objected to an equalized allotment system.[764] Following Castillo's death in the 1950s, some tribal members objected to some having more resources than others on the reservations, arguing that is was not "fair for one person to hold so much land when there is [sic] others who need it."[765] Again, disputes over traditional land use patterns on the reservations played into such struggles when women enrolled on a reservation married out and attempted to remain and secure an assignment on their reservation. Such actions ran counter to the local patrilineal and patrilocal cultures, especially when the woman married a non-Indian man.[766] Such scenarios pointed most plainly to economically depressed communities with increasingly limited resources, forced to work within non-Native systems imposed upon their traditional cultures. Inheritance of assignments of tribal lands was particularly messy as the Bureau often deferred to the

[763] Rita Singer to Lee Silvas, 13 July 1954, in ibid.

[764] Elizabeth Green, "The Indians of Southern California and Land Allotment," June 1923, 8-9, folder Palm Springs Indians, C. Hart Merriam papers relating to work with California Indians, 1850-1974, Bancroft Library, Internet Archive, https://archive.org/details/bancroft_chartmerriam_1556_86, accessed 18 May 2015.

[765] Eleanor H. Gomez to Leonard Hill, 11 May 1955, Soboba 1950-1957, 1 of 2, box 72, Tribal Group Files, 1915-1972, R.G. 75, SAO, NARA SB..

[766] W. C. Straka to Leonard M. Hill, 11 May 1955, in ibid.

spokesman and committees, which most traditional Federationists refused to acknowledge, even if the latter were the majority of the tribe.[767]

Cruz Siva, a representative of the Los Coyotes Reservation, explained his opposition to the Federation to a Congressional hearing in 1954. Careful not to attack the traditional Federation captain of Los Coyotes personally, Siva said that he was opposed to immediate termination since he believed it akin to, "throwing a child out to the hungry wolves."[768] He credited the reservation system with saving Indian peoples' lives, "otherwise we would be in museums now…." Siva spoke in bashful tones and told the plight of his people, many of whom he described as uneducated and dependent upon welfare. Like many others who opposed the Federation, he merely felt they needed more time to become educated and self-sustaining before they were on an equal plane with their non-Indian neighbors. "An uneducated Indian cannot compete with his white neighbor," he said. Looking back on the Unratified Treaties of 1852, anti-Federationists saw not only a loss of land and wealth, but also of "a complete plan for the education and support of the tribes in order to teach them to eventually earn their own livelihood in a civilized state."[769] Once again, Native memory surveyed a larger arch of history than those of government bureaucrats, and many Indian people, one that remembered that the government owed them and was not about to let it off of the hook.

The new leader of the opposition to the Federation, Max Mazzetti of the Rincon Reservation, echoed the voices of Federationists when told Congress how California

[767] Dale M. Baldwin and W.C. Straka, 6 July 1956, in ibid.

[768] Cruz Siva in Congress of the United States, *Termination of Federal Supervision over Certain Tribes of* Indian, 483-4.

[769] Max Mazzetti, "Historical Overview of P.L. 280," Max Mazzetti folder, Sherman Indian Museum.

Indian peoples already paid taxes, such as the gasoline tax that the state levied to repair roads. The key difference between Mazzetti and the Federationists, however, was that Mazzetti demanded that the Bureau or the state bring the roads upon the reservation up to county standards before tribes made any move towards termination.[770] Throughout Southern California Indian Country, the question was not whether one supported termination or withdrawal of the Indian Bureau; it was how quickly one thought tribes should severe the relationship.

In 1955, the nephew of Federation president Jim Martinez, Wallace J. Newman, told the California Senate Interim Committee on California Indian Affairs that he was "for termination. As far as I am concerned, immediate termination is all right, and for the most part of my people it would be all right."[771] Newman recognized, however, that for some people, the immediate termination of the Indian Bureau would hamper their efforts for justice on a variety of issues ranging from water rights to land heirship. He recommended the government create something resembling the Hoover Commission to offer recommendations for a gradual and eventual termination of tribal entities and the Bureau of Indian Affairs.[772] Newman knew that the federal government had "vested interests in this thing, and the Indians themselves have vested interests, and they clash."[773] He insisted that an entity outside of the federal government, "interested in

[770] Max Mazzetti in Congress of the United States, *Termination of Federal Supervision over Certain Tribes of Indians*, 502.

[771] Wallace J. Newman in Senate Interim Committee on California Indian Affairs, *Progress Report to the Legislature* (Sacramento: California State Senate: 1955), 246.

[772] Ibid. Interestingly, the Hoover Commission itself, focused on government efficiency, really initiated the drive towards termination within the federal government. Roberta Ulrich, *American Indian Nations from Termination to Restoration, 1953-2006* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2010), 237.

[773] Ibid.

profit enterprise," make a more detailed analysis of the termination process in the state. The Hoover Commission, which recommended the assimilation of Indian people into non-Indian society and served as a launching point for termination policy, also suggested transforming IRA tribal governments Act from socialist institutions to capitalist business enterprises.[774] Newman, as well as many others, clearly supported such moves and did not hide their desires to develop their reservation lands in order to make money and provide for themselves and their families. Newman indeed favored termination as his tenure as president of the Mission Creek Reservation later proved.

Even with the majority of the population favoring termination of the special relationship between Southern California tribes and the federal government, nearly none of them ever came close to such an eventuality. Indeed, the statuses of only two Southern California reservations changed in the post-World War II era: those of the Laguna and Mission Creek Reservations. Although these two unique cases deserve closer examination in their own studies, they merit at least brief discussion here given their connection to the Mission Indian Federation.

Despite the claims of some in Indian Country, the Laguna Reservation and its Kwaaymii people never terminated their special relationship with the United States. Instead, it bears the unique distinction as the only reservation in the United States believed to have ever deeded over to tribal members. By 1924, the enrolled population of

[774] Kenneth R. Philip, *Termination Revisited: American Indians on the Trail to Self-Determination* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1999), 78.

the Laguna Reservation numbered a single adult, Thomas Lucas.[775] His four minor children were the only other tribal members. Lucas had been a member of the Federation until he left the organization to work for the federal government in 1934.[776] During the Second World War, he worked on a number of defense jobs in San Diego County and returned to live on the reservation at the end of the conflict.[777] In early September 1945, the superintendent of the Mission Indian Agency forwarded to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs an application from Lucas requesting title patent in fee for the reservation. Describing him as "one of the most competent Indians enrolled on any reservation in this district, the superintendent explained that Tom Lucas wished to use his savings to invest in the reservation but would not do so while it remained in trust.[778] Members of the Lucas family relate that there was also significant fear that the Bureau would sell the land out from under the family and that a survey by the new owners of adjacent lands threatened to remove the reservation's sacred spring, water tank, road right-of-way, and the cemetery where they had buried generations of their family.[779]

Even with the backing of the superintendent, however, the Indian Bureau could not easily fulfill the request to deed the reservation over to its sole adult member. Nine months after his application, Lucas told the superintendent that he was "very anxious to start development on my land with the view of making it income producing sufficient to

[775] Lora L. Cline, *Just Before Sunset* (Jacumba, California: J and L Enterprises, 1984), 3; Walter Woehlke in United States Senate Committee on Public Lands, *To Remove Restrictions and Provide Per Capita Distribution of Funds to California Indians*, 192.

[776] Tom Lucas to John Dady, 18 January 1934, personnel file of Thomas Lucas, NPRC; John Dady to Commissioner of Indian Affairs, 23 January 1934, personnel file of Thomas Lucas, NPRC.

[777] Urith Lucas to Robert Hays, 19 November 1945, 36818-1945, box 19, CCF 1940-57 – M.

[778] John W. Dady to Commissioner of Indian Affairs, 8 September 1945, 36818-1945, box 19, CCF 1940-57 – M.

[779] Carmen Lucas, personal interview with the author, 2 November 2013, Borrego Springs, California; Urith Lucas to Robert Hays, 19 November 1945, 36818-1945, box 19, CCF 1940-57 – M.

care of and for myself and family."[780] Under the advice of the Indian Bureau, the secretary of the interior recommended that the bill not pass since Lucas enjoyed already exclusive use of the land, even though they knew he wished to use the land as collateral for a loan, which he could not do with trust property, and because they believed that it would not be in the best interests of his children to privatize the reservation.[781]

Lucas was no doubt used to the bureaucratic inefficiencies of the federal government. A decade before, he Congress literally had to pass an act in order for the Bureau to pay him nearly $600 for mileage he accumulated as an Indian sub-foreman for Emergency Conservation Work.[782] The same measures proved necessary in order for Tom Lucas to secure a fee patent to his ancestral lands. Lucas found an ally in a personal acquaintance, his newly elected Republican congressman Charles K. Fletcher of San Diego. Fletcher drafted a bill that authorized and directed the secretary of the interior to issue fee patent to the reservation.[783] Interior Department communications reveal that Fletcher was "zealous in his desire to protect… the 'rights of Tom Lucas,'" and that he felt that the outside membership claim "may be a dodge on the part of someone by which some other interested person would get the water" of the reservation.[784] As such, the legislator pushed had and emphasized the competency of Lucas as well as his desire to develop the reservation lands during a series of committee hearings. The Republican

[780] Thomas Lucas to John Dady, 18 June 1946, 36818-1945, box 19, CCF 1940-57 – M.
[781] Secretary of the Interior to Representative Richard Welch, 36818-1945, box 19, CCF 1940-57 – M; William Zimmerman to Representative Charles K. Fletcher, 7 April 1947, 36818-1945, box 19, CCF 1940-57 – M.
[782] John Collier to John Dady, 1 April 1935, personnel file of Thomas Lucas, NPRC.
[783] House Resolution 3064, 15 April 1947, 80th Congress, 1st Session.
[784] R.C. Price to William Zimmerman, 20 March 1948, box 19, CCF 1940-57 – M.

lawmaker even expressed his own willingness as a banker to loan funds for the new venture should Lucas receive title.[785]

The bill passed in August 1947, with a stipulation that the government affix a waiting period of six months to ensure there were no other claimants to the reservation. Unsurprisingly, a letter from longtime Federation opponent and Bureau employee Ramón Ames noted that a resident of the Cuyapaipe (now Ewiiaapaayp) Reservation who had previously released his supposed claim as a member of the Laguna Reservation the previous month, had come to him asking for help in securing a share of the lands.[786] The claim proved illegitimate, however, and the Bureau reluctantly transferred a patent in fee simple on the reservation to Mr. Lucas in February 1948.[787] Regardless of the fact that he portrayed himself as a progressive in his bid to receive patent to his land, Tom Lucas was a strong culture bearer and not simply an "assimilated" Indian man. He recorded much of his knowledge with local historians to ensure that the lives and legacy of his Kwaaymii people lived on.[788] Despite his efforts, the reservation, or Lucas Ranch, remains undeveloped and today, and one of Lucas's daughters, former United States Marine Carmen, resides on the Lucas Ranch today.[789] Carmen Lucas remains on federal rolls as a recognized Indian person, maintains much traditional knowledge, and is active in efforts

[785] Charles Fletcher in House Subcommittee of the Committee on Public Lands, 18 June 1947 (unpublished hearings, HRG-1947-PLH-0167).

[786] Ramón Ames to Charles Graves, 10 November 1947, box 19, CCF 1940-57 – M; Walter Woehlke in United States Senate Committee on Public Lands, *To Remove Restrictions and Provide Per Capita Distribution of Funds to California Indians*, 192-3.

[787] Walter Woehlke in United States Senate Committee on Public Lands, *To Remove Restrictions and Provide Per Capita Distribution of Funds to California Indians*, 191.

[788] Cline, *Just Before Sunset*.

[789] Carmen Lucas, personal letter to the author, 9 August 2015.

to preserve the heritage of Indian peoples from the incessant developmental sprawl of Southern California.[790]

The Federation came to idolize the privatization of the Laguna Reservation in later years. In a letter no doubt written by Purl Willis and signed by then-President Dan Pico and Secretary-Treasurer Katherine Howard in 1962, the Federation noted the deeding of the Laguna Reservation to Tom Lucas, remarking, "this is probably the happiest group of Indians in the Nation…." The letter went on to say that the act of deeding the reservation over to the tribe "is an example of what Congress should immediately do for all Indian groups within the State of California – thus eliminating all Indian problems."[791] The Bureau deeding over the entire Laguna Reservation to the tribe, even if it consisted of only one adult member, was exactly that for which the Federation had fought and was fighting. It was an exceptional case, however, principally because of its tribal population.

The story of the Mission Creek Indian Reservation remains largely clouded. Although it is an exceptional case, many aspects are indicative of Southern California Indian Country broadly and it has a strong link to the Federation. Some facts have emerged to offer something of a picture of how the band and its experience with termination. One man lay at the center of the drive to terminate Mission Creek: Wallace J. Newman. Newman first organized the Mission Creek Band and the "suggestion" of the

[790] Clifford Trafzer, personal interview with the author, 22 June 2015, 29 Palms Indian Reservation, California.

[791] Dan Pico and Katherine Howard to Michael J, Kirwan, 14 January 1962 in House Committee on Appropriations, *Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations for 1963* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. G.P.O., 1962), 1538.

Riverside Area Office, successor of the Mission Indian Agency, in 1957.[792] Though it is no doubt strange that the Bureau willingly contacted and worked with the nephew of the president of the Mission Indian Federation, a man who was enrolled on the La Jolla Reservation, Newman was one of the few who held an allotment on the traditionally Serrano reservation of Mission Creek.[793] Newman is a very interesting figure, not least because he was the famed college football coach of President Richard Nixon at Whittier College.[794]

Surrounding ranchers had long desired the water supply of the desert reservation, even going so far as to brutally murder its sole resident to get the rights in 1921.[795] The erratic flow of Mission Creek, however, was insufficient to enable residents to raise crops and make anything close to a living on the reservation.[796] Nevertheless, neighbors filed a condemnation suit against the reservation in 1953 and destroyed a diversion dam threatening reservation residents not to repair it the following year.[797] Band members moved to organize to deal with such threats while the second Claims Case provided

[792] "Information requested: Wallace J. Newman," Newman, Wallace folder, Sherman Indian Museum, Riverside, California.

[793] Indian Census Roll, Mission Creek Reservation, 1 January 1937, personal copy given to the author by Sean Milanovich.

[794] T. Robert Przeklasa, "Dickie, Don't Forget the Indians," symposium presentation, Nixon and the American Indian: Self-Determination and Tribal Sovereignty, 24 April 2015, Richard M. Nixon Presidential Library, Yorba Linda, California.

[795] "Oil Drillers Find Murdered Man's Body," *Riverside Daily Press*, 6 June 1921, 4.

[796] John Dady to Rosemarie Carter, 26 November 1943, folder 060 Mission Creek 1943-1963, Tribal Group Files, 1915-1972, box 92, SAO, NARA SB.

[797] "Mission Creek Water Dispute, 14 July 1954, folder 060 Mission Creek 1943-1963, Tribal Group Files, 1915-1972, box 92, SAO, NARA SB; Henry Harris, Jr. to Acting Commissioner of Indian Affairs, 10 August 1953, folder 060 Mission Creek 1943-1963, Tribal Group Files, 1915-1972, box 92, SAO, NARA SB.

additional impetus. In December 1959, the band passed a resolution naming Raymond Simpson their attorney in the suit.[798]

Owing to a need to make a living, members of the Mission Creek Band lived in various suburban areas of Southern California, including Palm Springs, Riverside, and Whittier. The final band member left the reservation by 1960 given its acute lack of water and poor soil.[799] As Newman put it, "most of the members of the Mission Creek Band of Indians need financial assistance badly."[800]As a friend and political supporter of his former student Richard Nixon, Newman gained valuable political connections within the Republican Party. In a personal letter to Senator Thomas Kuchel of California, the band president attempted to double the size of the reservation with the addition of surrounding public lands to enable the band to graze cattle as a way to support themselves.[801] The Bureau, however, did not believe the plan would add sufficient range and pushed instead for the sale of the entire reservation for desert home sites.[802]

Newman responded that the band was "trying desperately to do all we can to better ourselves and solve our problems." However, five years of attempts to work with the Bureau generated only "some voluminous paperwork," as their program to develop

[798] " Resolution," 13 December 1959, folder 060 Mission Creek 1943-1963, Tribal Group Files, 1915-1972, box 92, SAO, NARA SB.

[799] "Data on the Mission Creek Reservation, California," 29 March 1960, folder 15977-1959-007, Box 9, CCF 1958-75, California, Archives I.

[800] Wallace Newman to W. Darlington Denit, 31 January 1968, folder 6341-1965-007, Box 10, CCF 1958-75, California, Archives I.

[801] Wallace Newman to Senator Thomas Kuchel, 21 September 1960, folder 11828, Box 22, CCF 1958-75, California, Archives I.

[802] Leonard Hill to Commissioner of Indian Affairs, 21 February 1961, folder 11828, Box 22, CCF 1958-75, California, Archives I.

their water resources and to improve sanitation proved futile.[803] Frustrated at their inability to work successfully with the Bureau to create living incomes from their lands and with no members living on the Mission Creek Reservation, the band voted to approve a legal agreement binding all members to sell or lease the entire reservation in 1962.[804] As they saw it, it was the only way left for them to "help themselves," make a living and deal with their lands, which had in fact become a liability.[805] Indeed, the reservation was a potential burden to its members as the Bureau charged a number of construction and maintenance debts to the band. As the band navigated the plodding bureaucracy of the Indian Service, they negotiated plan for the distribution of reservation assets included a provision that cancelled more than $16,000 of reimbursable debt owed to the Bureau, which the commissioner approved in 1966.[806] After years of painfully slow progress, Newman and the Mission Creek Band had identified a buyer in 1968: the Crocker Land Company.[807] Even after six years of cutting through red tape, the Mission Creek Band had to wait still two more years for the close of the decade and an end to their struggle with the Bureau.

On a broader level, things had deteriorated for and within the Federation by the late 1950s and into the 1960s. The Claims Cases had dragged on so long that their ten-

[803] Wallace Newman to Leonard Hill, 8 August 1962, folder 4705-308.2, Box 24, CCF 1958-75, California, Archives I.

[804] "Mission Creek Band of Mission Indians, Minutes of July 14, 1962," folder 11289-1958-054.3, Box 9, CCF 1958-75, California, Archives I.

[805] Newman to Kuchel, 21 September 1960.

[806] Robert Burnett to Leonard Hill, 19 August 1966, folder 11289-1958-054.3, Box 9, CCF 1958-75, California, Archives I.

[807] Newman to Kuchel, 21 September 1960.

year attorney contracts had expired.[808] Willis and others in the Federation had become frustrated paranoid after years of struggle with little success and lashed out at the United States Congress, which it had come to view as party to "the whole conspiracy" of the "communistic Bureau."[809] It went against its core constituency, too, when it joined Rupert Costo and Billy Salgado in campaigning for the Mission Indian people to reject the proposed $29.1 million Claims Case settlement pushed by the Bureau.[810] The Indian Claims Commission had settled upon the final award amount in 1958 and sent it to the California Indian people for approval by ballot.[811] The Federation argued that the sum was entirely inadequate, believing that joining the Claims of the Southern California bands with those in the rest of the state severely diminished the sum.[812] Many traditional tribal elders, however, pushed acceptance of the settlement, "before it [was] too late for them to enjoy it."[813] One man from a Juaneño leadership family wrote seeking presidential intervention to order a per capita distribution, vividly describing how his elderly, bed-ridden mother "always has the Rosary in her frail hands, praying that you, President Kennedy, may be God's answer to our prayers."[814] Time was running out for many of the elderly traditionalists and their economic needs began to overpower their

[808] Norman M. Littell to Purl Willis and Mary Matteson, 6 May 1959, dictated letter, Mission/Lindsley and Staniforth, BANC MSS 71/233, Norman M. Littell Papers, 1929-1969, Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.

[809] James E. Officer to Commissioner Bennett, 19 May 1966, folder 2949, Part 1A, Box 8, CCF 1958-75, SAO, Archives I.

[810] Ibid.

[811] Sanchez, "The Selling of California," 205 & 211-2.

[812] Mission Indian Federation, Inc., "California Indians Charge Violation of 'Indian Claims Act of 1946: Indians Refuse to Accept the $29.1 Million Dollar Award!" folder 33-69, Box 8, CCF 1958-75, SAO, Archives I.

[813] Florence Shipek to Representative James A. Haley, 18 May 1966, folder 9342-63, Part 2, 2/3, Box 2, CCF 1958-75, California, Archives I.

[814] John Leonard Quiroz to President John F. Kennedy, 6 June 1964, folder 11091-59, 1/3, Box 6, CCF 1958-75, California, Archives I.

loyalty to the Mission Indian Federation. In the end, some seventy percent of the Indian people of California voted to accept the final settlement.[815]

Former Federationist Clarence Lobo joined scores of other California Indians in San Francisco to lobby the Republican National Convention in 1964 to insert a plank in the party's platform renouncing the second Claims award of $29.1 million. A statewide poll of those enrolled in the Claims Cases voted to accept the awards, though Lobo and the Federation rejected what they considered a paltry sum and decried what they saw as an election tilted with many people of dubious Indian heritage.[816] Lobo and some 21 other Juaneños rejected the settlement and occupied the Upper San Juan Campground along the Ortega Highway in the Cleveland National Forest. Instead of miniscule checks, they told the government, they wanted their lands back.[817] Days later, nearly seventy-percent of California Indian people voted to accept the final Claims settlement.[818] In the end, the Claims settlements were proverbial slaps in the faces of California Indians that did not do much to help them to stand on their own two feet as Adam Castillo had planned. Tribal elders recall the government made one of the payouts right around Christmas time. Whether intentional or not, it made it difficult for many Indian people with little money to reject the small pittance of a sum for the vast areas taken from them and their ancestors. Some, however, had either the means or the wherewithal to either frame their checks or send them back to the federal government in stern refusal.[819]

---

[815] Sanchez, "The Selling of California," 226-8.
[816] Milt Brouhard, "Indians to Seek GOP Help on Land Claims," *Los Angeles Times*, 8 July 1964, OC9.
[817] Ibid.
[818] Sanchez, "The Selling of California," 218.
[819] Edward Castillo, personal interview with the author, 29 April 2015, Riverside, California.

The shift of criminal jurisdiction to the state and counties did not play out exactly as the Federation had hoped, either. Some reservation residents, particularly those living in the more remote regions, such as the mountainous Los Coyotes Reservation, came to look back on the sporadic and biased police protection administered by the Bureau as preferable to the nearly non-existent sheriff's presence. "We used to have Indian police, then in the 50s [sic]," remembered one Los Coyotes elder. "I think it was when we went under P.L. 280 and that was the end of them (Indian Police). There is no law enforcement on the reservation as we are under P.L. 280 and the young people are trying to do as they please."[820] The law also brought county building and health codes to reservations, threatening much of the housing supply. In response, the Federation joined with three Republican congressional representatives of Southern California, John Phillips of Banning, Bob Wilson of San Diego, and James Utt of Santa Ana, to fight Bureau opposition to the transfer of surplus prefabricated military housing to reservations in 1955.[821]

As they had in the past, the Federation deftly played local conservative populations to their advantage, arguing that unless the government made new, safe housing available to tribes, the task of dealing with shoring up the substandard housing found in many Indian communities would fall to counties such as San Diego.[822] While

[820] Los Coyotes Band of Mission Indians, 1989, in Stubben, *Native Americans and Political Participation*, 41.

[821] "U.S. Action Asked on Funds for Moving Indian Housing Units, *San Diego Evening Tribune*, 28 February 1955, "Indian File First-Half 1955," Charles Elkus Papers, C-B 837, Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.

[822] "U.S. Action Asked on Funds for Moving Indian Housing Units, *San Diego Evening Tribune*, 28 February 1955, "Indian File First-Half 1955," Charles Elkus Papers, C-B 837, Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.

some may rightly argue that the imposition of non-Indian building codes upon reservation lands was an infringement on tribal sovereignty, they also forced the issue of poor, inadequate housing and eventually brought about some improvement in conditions. Because of the Federation's skillful political maneuvers on the housing front, the federal government delivered two hundred and fifty manufactured homes to tribal communities throughout San Diego, Imperial, and Riverside Counties.[823]

Though most had left the Federation by the 1960s, the general feeling on many Southern California reservations remained solidly against federal interference. Bureau agents reported that many tribal politicians maintained anti-Bureau images as a result despite their necessary dealings with federal officials. [824] On the Cahuilla Reservation in 1966, for example, where many had left the Federation decades before due to discomfort with many of the non-Native features it took on, tribal officials and residents refused to create or provide information for a tribal roll or a record of land assignments.[825] Federal agents even dubbed Cahuilla Reservation spokesman and onetime Federation member Rupert Costo a "full-time professional Bureau hater."[826] Like every other reservation in the MIA except for Capitan Grande, Cahuilla rejected the Indian Reorganization Act in 1934, refusing to bow to the strictures and non-Native structure of federally imposed

[823] "Indians Will Get Linda Vista Units," *San Diego Union*, 18 October 1955, 23.

[824] James E. Officer to Commissioner Bennett, 19 May 1966, folder 2949, Part 1, 2/2, Box 8, CCF 1958-75, SAO, Archives I. Bureau estimates put Federation membership at around one hundred people in 1967. Robert L. Bennett to Julius Butler Hansen, 3 March 1967, folder 2949, Part 1, 1/2, Box 7, CCF 1958-75, SAO, Archives I.

[825] Annie Hamilton in Hanks, *This War is for a Whole Life*, 139.

[826] Ibid.

"self-government."[827] Instead, Cahuilla operated its tribal government as it does today, in a traditional manner.

The region remained neglected by the Bureau as well, as the Riverside Field Office that oversaw more than half of the tribal land in California, maintained a staff smaller than that of the Hoopa Reservation in Northern California, alone. And yet, bureaucrats more than four-hundred miles away in the Sacramento Area Office moved to sell the Twenty-Nine Palms, Ramona, La Posta, and Cuyapaipe (now Ewiiaapaayp) Reservations without telling the tribal people, just as Tom Lucas feared would happen to the Laguna Reservation.[828] The Bureau claimed the reservations were uninhabited; however, economic circumstance forced their members to live elsewhere to earn a living, and they did not wish their lands sold out from under them. In some cases, as on Ramona, it was obvious that families such as the Hamiltons had been living and working on the reservations, though many bureaucrats could not be bothered to venture into Indian Country to see.[829] Vociferous objections from Rupert Costo and Purl Willis among others ended such activities, however.[830] For its part, the Federation continued to fight against "the communistic Bureau" and what it termed the "whole conspiracy" to rob the people of the Agua Caliente Reservation through the guardianship system established to manage

[827] Theodore Haas, *Ten Years of Tribal Government under I.R.A.* (Washington, D.C.: United States Indian Service, 1947), 14-5. The Chumash Santa Ynez Reservation in Santa Barbara County approved the IRA, but to the best of the author's knowledge, never maintained ties with the other reservations in the agency and were not involved in the Federation. The reservations along the Colorado River that participated in the Federation, including Cocopah, Colorado River Indian Tribes, Fort Mohave, and Fort Yuma all voted in favor of the legislation.

[828] James E. Officer to Commissioner Bennett, 19 May 1966, folder 2949, Part 1, 2/2, Box 8, CCF 1958-75, SAO, Archives I.

[829] James E. Officer and Peter F. Waltz, California Trip Report, 23 May 1966, folder 2949, Part 1, 2/2, Box 8, CCF 1958-75, SAO, Archives I; Sean Milanovich, personal email to the author, 5 May 2015.

[830] James E. Officer to Commissioner Bennett, 19 May 1966, folder 2949, Part 1A, Box 8, CCF 1958-75, SAO, Archives I.

its allotments as the resorts of Palm Springs expanded across the reservation through the 1960s.[831]

The year 1970 was a turning point for Indian affairs nationally as well as for Southern California Indian Country, locally. The federal government and the Mission Creek Band terminated their special relationship on the first of July, making it the only reservation terminated in Southern California, despite decades of pro-termination advocacy and leadership by the Mission Indian Federation. Exactly one week later, on the eighth of July, President Richard Nixon, himself a conservative Southern Californian and a student and friend of the president of Mission Creek, Wallace Newman, announced a monumental change in federal Indian policy towards what he termed "Self Determination without Termination."[832] This policy shift had an enormous impact upon Indian Country both locally and throughout the United States in the decades that followed, as tribes gradually gained more control over their own affairs in the decades that followed. The new orientation eventually led to the crucial *Cabazon v. California* ruling in the United States Supreme Court in 1987. Victory in the case centered on the Cabazon Band of Southern California, confirmed the right of tribes as sovereign nations to operate gaming facilities on their lands, and revolutionized Indian Country. In October 1972, Purl Willis passed away at the age of ninety-three. A Senate oversight hearing the following year contained what may be the final reference to the Mission Indian Federation while still

[831] Dan Pico to Representative John Tunney, 1 February 1968, folder 2949, Part 1A, Box 8, CCF 1958-75, SAO, Archives I.

[831] James E. Officer to Commissioner Bennett, 19 May 1966, folder 2949, Part 1A, Box 8, CCF 1958-75, SAO, Archives I.

[832] Richard M. Nixon, Special Message on Indian Affairs, 8 July 1970, personal copy in author's possession.

extant: an address listed for Temecula, California.[833] The listing shows that the MIF faded from history on the Pechanga Reservation, no doubt with its final president, Dan Pico, at the helm.[834] Although the Federation ceased to exert a direct influence upon Southern California Indian Country as it vanished, its legacy remains widely felt throughout the region and, in little-recognized ways, thought out Indian Country as a whole.

[833] "Purl Willis," Ancestry.com, http://records.ancestry.com/purl_willis_records.ashx?pid=32911396, accessed 30 May 2015; United States Senate, *California Indian Oversight Hearings, Part 1* (Washington, D.C., U.S. G.P.O., 1978), 23.

[834] Osevio Salgado to Orlando Garcia, 5 November 1959, Raymond Basquez, Sr. Collection, Pechanga Cultural Resources.

EPILOGUE
THE AMERICAN INDIAN TEA PARTY: CLINGING TO OUR GUNS, BIBLES, AND SOVEREIGNTY

The history of the origin of Indian reservations and purposely unratified treaties is know[n]. The relationships between the government and Indian is also know[n]… It has not been an honorable relationship regardless of cause. This is all in the past now but is inseparable from the future of the Indian.

-MORONGO INDIAN RESIDENT COMMITTEE, 1955

The Cahuilla people say that early in the history of the world, the Creator was suspicious of Coyote and warned the people that, should he die, they were to be wary of him.[835] When the Creator passed, the people mourned and began the funeral. They prepared to cremate him, placing his body on a pile of wood, and they sent Coyote for fire in the west, fearing he would make trouble. He came back from the west unsuccessful, so the people then sent him, in turn, to the south, north, and east. Each time he was away, they began to make fire with a drill. Finally, Coyote captured fire in the east; at the same time, however, the people kindled their own fire. As he began his return, Coyote saw billowing smoke and raced back.

"Then he saw the people all standing close to each another around the fire from a long way, and he called: 'My brothers and my sisters, look at my face, the tears running

---

Title: Ernest Salgado, Jr., "The American Indian Tea Party," *The Indian Reporter*, www.theindianreporter.com/tea_party/.

Epigraph: Morongo Indian Resident Committee to Senate Interim Committee on California Indian Affairs, in California Senate Interim Committee on California Indian Affairs, *Progress Report to the Legislature by the Senate Interim Committee on California Indian Affairs*, (Sacramento: Senate of the State of California, 1955), 240.

[835] Anthropologist J.P. Harrington commissioned Adam Castillo to collect what anthropologists call "creation stories." In his correspondence with the scholar, Castillo referred to the Cahuilla "creation story" as "*la historia del mundo*," or the history of the world, evincing a powerful connection to tradition. Indeed, it underscores the very traditional nature of "*la Mission Indian Federation*" and the mindset of its members and leaders. They grounded their worldviews in their beliefs about creation. Adam Castillo to J.P. Harrington, 13 October 1938, Letters received, 1904-1960 bulk 1935-1954, Accession #1976-95 [NMNH-Harrington_mf9_r2_0523], JPHP.

out of my eyes. Let me get through and see my father.'"[836] By the time he returned however, the fire consumed all except the heart, for tradition says the heart is always the last to immolate. "But the people saw him coming, and told each another not to allow him to get in. When he came up there was no place, so he said: 'My brothers and sisters, give me an open place, so that I can see our father.'"[837] Coyote finally leapt over the shortest members of the circle, landing on the remains of the pyre, whereupon he snatched up the Creator's heart, ran off to the east, and consumed it.[838]

Though a seemingly simple story, Coyote acted this way for a number of reasons, proving him a complicated character. He wanted the Creator's power, and went over his fellows to get it. Though he selfishly desired the power for his own, the side of the story most see, he also craved it out of sheer love for the Creator, and needed it because of his great responsibility to the people.[839] The people of Southern California say that Coyote was one of the first beings created, not born, who loved the Creator deeply and had a great respect for the teachings he imparted.[840] It was Coyote who helped the people cope with life without the Creator, their new life. For the Cahuilla, he brought the sacred

[836] Patencio and Boynton, *Stories and Legends*, 21.

[837] Ibid.

[838] Ibid., 19-22; This motif of Coyote stealing the Creator's heart from the funeral pyre is found among most Southern California peoples from the Yuman-speaking Cocopah, Kumeyaay, Kwaaymii, Mohave, and Quechan, and to the Uto-Aztecan-speaking Cahuilla, Chemehuevi, Cupeño, Juaneño, Luiseño, and Serrano. This shared patrimony is therefore appropriate to draw on for moral issues surrounding an international group composed of these peoples: Mission Indian Federation. Edward S. Curtis, *The North American Indian: Being a Series of Volumes Picturing and Describing the Indians of the United States and Alaska*, vol. 15 (1926), 21, 35, 120-3; Ibid, vol. 2, 56-7 & 76.

[839] Sean Milanovich, personal interview with the author, Torres-Martinez Indian Reservation, 23 January 2015.

[840] Strong, *Aboriginal Society*, 171.

materials to Momtakwit, the first net, or chief, to make the first *maiswat*, sacred bundle.[841]

The Cahuilla say these actions made *'isil^{y}*, Coyote, the first paxaa'.[842] He established many of the duties of a paxaa' at the first nukil ceremony, leading the people as they mourned the dead. Throughout his adult years, the longtime Mission Indian Federation president Adam Castillo served as the paxaa' of the village of Soboba.[843] Castillo, perhaps, fit the role of Coyote very well. A sizable portion of Southern California Indian people, whether the Indian Bureau influenced them or not, came to view Castillo and other leaders of the Federation as greedy confidence men, living off monies donated by poor people.[844] Though there may indeed have been some selfishness and impropriety by some leaders, Adam Castillo was genuine in his desires to help his people, and he and the Federation helped shepherd the people of Southern California Indian Country through a difficult period of massive transition: the twentieth century.

It was a period marked by increased federal involvement and intrusion upon reservations and into tribal affairs. For centuries, the Native people of Southern California governed themselves, pointing to their creation stories for their sovereignty. Even after the Spanish, Mexican, and American periods brought dramatic change and innovation to tribal politics, the people of Southern California Indian Country largely governed their own affairs. Though they adapted their political system to deal with the realities of lineage collapse and the threat of colonization, traditional leadership families

[841] Bean, *Mukat's People*, 88.
[842] Bean, *Mukat's People*, 137; Strong, Aboriginal Society, 108.
[843] Kim Marcus, personal interview with the author, 10 October 2014, California Indian Conference, California State University, San Bernardino.
[844] Dozier, *Standing Firm*, 24.

maintained their roles as leaders of their peoples. This continuity threatened the federal officials of the Indian Bureau who wanted to direct the lives of tribal people instead of letting them decide for themselves. That history led to the anti-federalism of the Mission Indian Federation and their support for termination as the final way to rid themselves of government interference in their lives and affairs.

Examining the many unrecognized groups or tribes in California today as they attempt to gain recognition proves what the Federation fought for during the termination period. These groups had continued their lives as tribal peoples, but away from the eye and hand of the federal government. They lived their lives as private Indian citizens, as free to practice their religion and culture as any other group was at the time, though with the security of private property, adequate law enforcement, and state courts that were much more efficient than the clogged federal dockets Indian people enrolled on reservations faced. It is important to note that during the years prior to the 1970s, and even the 1980s and 1990s, being a member of a federally-recognized tribe did not afford one with the same benefits and possibilities it does today. Significantly, the federal government did not legally sanction tribal gaming (and thus the income it entails), though a some Southern California Reservation residents attempted to exercise such sovereignty years before the right was affirmed in *Cabazon v. California* in 1987. In recent years, however, gaming has enable tribes to exercise their governmental functions in areas such as business and cultural development, housing, and education. Most of the Southern

California tribal governments still operate in a very Native fashion as very few ever organized under the IRA.[845]

In the end, the Federation was correct about the Indian Reorganization Act. Current scholarship shows that the IRA has been largely detrimental to those tribes who adopted the legislation, economically, educationally, and socially.[846] The Bureau of Indian Affairs also largely ignored the "sovereignty" of the IRA governments across Indian Country and increased its militant presence on reservations, though not as brutally in Southern California given its lack of IRA governments.[847] On the national stage, this repression famously came to a head on the Pine Ridge Reservation in South Dakota as Lakota traditionalists allied with the American Indian Movement to oppose the dictatorial practices of Dick Wilson's Bureau-backed IRA government. Though complex in its own right, the situation on Pine Ridge in the 1970s bore some similarities to the events that took place in the Mission Indian Country in the previous decades. The split between traditionalists and cooperatives developed into a violent affair and the federally sanctioned tribal government met tribal conservatives with brutal violence. The conversation between Native and non-Native politics had changed, however, and the traditionalist cause on Pine Ridge became the *cause célèbre* of many non-Native liberals.[848] Scholars still classify AIM, equally complex in its own right, as a radical

[845] Duane Champagne, personal interview with the author, 24 April 2015, Yorba Linda, California.

[846] Dustin Frye, "The Indian Reorganization Act, Tribal Sovereignty, and Economic Development," poster presentation, Good Native Governance: Innovative Research in Law, Education, and Economic Development Conference, 6 March 2014, University of California, Los Angeles.

[847] Richard Drinnon, *Keeper of Concentration Camps: Dillon S. Myer and American Racism* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987), 229-33.

[848] Allyn Baskerville & Bill Gillespie, *Honk If You Love J. Edgar Hoover* (Orlando, FL: Firstpublish, 2001), 81.

organization, a label that given AIM's support of the traditionalists on Pine Ridge, no doubt becomes associated with tribal conservatives.[849]

Though the imposition of non-Native forms of governance has been detrimental throughout Indian Country, Indian people have benefitted by pragmatically appropriating outside ideas. Indeed, some in Southern California see a chance today of tribes utilizing their sovereignty in much the same, innovative way as the Federation did in the past. Luiseño leader Juana Majel-Dixon attributed much to such methods, even arguing that, "Tribes have largely succeeded in retaining their inherent right to govern by custom and tradition by incorporating the workable aspects of the non-Indian governmental model that have been developed throughout the years by tribal policy or partnerships with other tribes or federal programs, for the good of the people."[850] As the Federation showed, however, such a task is a delicate balancing act. Speaking on tribal politics, T'rowt'raahl Salinan/Rumsien Ohlone leader Gregg Castro noted that whenever California Indians adopted non-Indian forms of governance, the results have been disastrous.[851] Indeed, one need only look to the most advanced Native adaptation of non-Indian government structure, the Cherokee Republic, to see the unfortunate outcomes. The Cherokee Civil War raged for decades following removal on up through the United States Civil War and

[849] Amanda Laugesen, "American Indian Movement," in *Conspiracy Theories in American History: An Encyclopedia*, Peter Knight, ed. (Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO, 2003), 55; Robert Warrior, "Activism Since 1980," in *Handbook of North American Indians, Volume 2, Indians in Contemporary Society*, Garrick A. Bailey, William C. Sturtevant, eds. (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution, 2008), 45.

[850] Juana Majel-Dixon in Richard Walker, "NCAI's 4 Presidential Candidates Discuss Issues Within Indian Country," Indian Country Today, http://indiancountrytodaymedianetwork.com/2013/10/11/ncais-4-presidential-candidates-discuss-issues-within-indian-country-151711, accessed 6 August 2015.

[851] Gregg Castro, personal interview with the author, 7 November 2014, Riverside, CA.

arguably in a more covert manner into the twenty-first century with the Freedmen Controversy.[852]

A contemporary to the Federation noted Ohíye S'a, the Dakota physician Charles Eastman, saw problems with leaving the Native world for the non-Native. "Once we had departed from the broad democracy and pure idealism of our prime, and had undertaken to enter upon the world's game of competition, our rudder was unshipped, our compass lost, and the whirlwind and tempest of materialism and love of conquest tossed us to and fro like leaves in a wind," he eloquently opined.[853] Of course, his argument is representative of an idealistic view of the Native condition, both before and after contact. In addition, Indian people had to deal with the non-Indian world that established itself in their homelands. The Federation knew that it had to react to the modern world and did so pragmatically in an effort to maintain their culture and tribal sovereignty. Unfortunately, many activists and government officials classified Federationists as assimilated peoples because of their attempt to rid themselves of the Indian Bureau and their interactions with the outside world, especially off-reservation employment.

Assimilation is a troubled term scholars are best to avoid. Inevitably, one imagines the most simplistic concept of assimilation in which a person completely abandons their cultural identity, language, and religion to live in the dominant society that surrounds them. Such is rarely, if ever the case among any group of people or individuals who find themselves in such situations as American Indians who had a

[852] Robert J. Conley, *Cherokee Thoughts: Honest and Uncensored* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2008), 56-8.

[853] Charles Eastman in *The Soul of an Indian and Other Writings from Ohiyesa (Charles Alexander Eastman)*, Kent Nerburn, ed. (San Rafael, CA: New World Library, 1993), 55.

culture grow up around them or immigrants who came to a new culture. Their past inevitably and irrevocably influences them. Wallace Newman lived in suburban Los Angeles most of his life and graduated from the University of Southern California before he coached football at Whittier College. In an oral history, he noted that while he visited the reservation less and less over the years, he still spoke the Luiseño language better than some of the reservation residents did. Newman also believed that culture was not static and that Indian people needed to move with the times. However, that did not mean that they "pulled away" from their people and culture. He noted that while many reservation residents suffered from segregation and intense poverty, it would be wrong to paint Indian people as a whole as backward and impoverished since there were many Indian people, maybe half of the entire population, who never had anything to do with the government as unenrolled or off-reservation people. [854]

In making that argument, Newman echoed the feelings of many California Indians, who knew that they were capable of making their own way in life. Wardship and the restrictions placed upon them by the federal government was an insult. In a letter to Congressman Toby Morris, Adam Castillo said that, "From the record made over the years by the Indian race in California, it must be admitted that these people are just as capable as any other race, not excepting the 'best' of the white race," wrote.[855] California Indians repeat this refrain to this day, and have proved it time and again.[856] Perhaps the

[854] Wallace Newman, oral history, 8 November 1970, Indian Urbanization Project, Center for Oral and Public History, California State University, Fullerton.

[855] Adam Castillo and Purl Willis to Rep. Toby Morris, 22 February 1952, Cahuilla, Accession #1976-95 [NMNH-Harrington_mf3_r114_0429], JPHP.

[856] Dean Mike, speech to the attendees of Chancellor's Native American Advisory Committee Meeting, 3 December 2013, Twenty-Nine Palms Indian Reservation, Coachella, California.

most visible example of this sentiment is a man who has expressed it both verbally and in his life: San Bernardino County Supervisor and former Chairman of the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians James Ramos. "California Indians are just as qualified for these elected positions, we're just as good as the non-Indians, we can do these jobs just as good as they can," he told an audience at the Dorothy Ramon Learning Center. A singer of his Serrano people's Bighorn Sheep Songs, Ramos knows that Indian people have much to gain from and to offer non-Indian society, and declared that Indian people "need to move beyond tribal politics into the surrounding communities."[857] Ramos does not, however, advocate leaving Indian culture behind, but rather reclaiming positions of leadership within the broader community of their ancestral homelands as he himself has done.

Within the tribal world, other organizations attempted to organize Southern California Indians on an inter-reservation basis following the collapse of the Federation, including Diegueno Inc., run by the traditional captain of Santa Ysabel, Winslow Couro.[858] Such groups proved fleeting, however, and nothing has yet approached the level of inter-reservation unity achieved by the Mission Indian Federation. After decades of work with Southern California Indians, anthropologist Florence Shipek "found each Indian to be very individualistic, independent and jealous of his prerogative to decide each and every issue for himself."[859] Her quotation of Spanish captain Pedro Fages describing California Indians as "'full of the spirit of independence,'" fits with the great

[857] James Ramos, Dorothy Ramon Learning Center lecture on leadership, 9 June 2014, Banning, California.

[858] Eddie Largo to Stewart Udall, 18 April 1961, 3600-1960-055, box 9, CCF 1958-75 – M; "Before the Indian Claims Commission: Findings of Fact," 13 Ind. Cl. Comm. 369, 461.

[859] Florence Shipek to Representative James A. Haley, 18 May 1966, folder 9342-63, Part 2, 2/3, Box 2, CCF 1958-75, California, Archives I.

freedom characteristic of aboriginal California before colonization. That such a spirit remained well into the twentieth century, if not beyond, is indicative of a remarkable cultural continuation within Southern California Indian Country and shows an almost inevitability of failure for organizations like the Federation. Some Southern California Indian people see little wonder that that the international unity the Federation sought failed and feel that such a common effort would be impossible today.[860]

Yet others at least give credence to the idea of intertribal unity. For Cahuilla scholar Anthony Madrigal, Sr., "the important question today is where do we go now? A loose association like the Southern California Tribal Chairman's Association or something like the Federation."[861] Founded in 1972, the Southern California Tribal Chairman's Association describes itself as a consortium of nineteen federally recognized tribes that coordinates services from grant programs to digital infrastructure for its member Nations.[862] The Inter-Tribal Court of Southern California is another consortium with twelve member tribes. First opened in 2008, it aims to fill in the holes left by Public Law 280, which the federal government never funded, never permitted counties to enforce codes in Indian Country, and never allowed for the enforcement of tribal codes in state courts.[863] However, these two institutions pale in comparison to the governmental goals of the Mission Indian Federation in terms of reach and authority.

---

[860] Sean Milanovich, personal interview with the author, 15 May 2015, March Air Reserve Base, California.

[861] Anthony Madrigal, Sr., personal conversation with the author, 7 May 2015, Riverside, California.

[862] L. Frank & Kim Hogeland, *First Families: A Photographic History of California Indians* (Berkeley, CA: Heyday Books, 2007), 154.

[863] Victor Morales, "Intertribal Court Has New Home on Rincon Reservation," *Indian Country Today,* http://indiancountrytodaymedianetwork.com/2008/09/01/intertribal-court-has-new-home-rincon-

The limited membership of these institutions shows the continued strong sense of independence among the individual tribes of the region. However, the organizations themselves point to the pragmatic relationships that modern tribal governments have had to forge with the federal government. Though the Bureau of Indian Affairs is still present in Southern California, indeed throughout all of Indian Country, tribes have largely taken over many of its responsibilities and assumed many of its former powers.[864] Many of the employees of the Bureau are also Native. Still, resistance to outside threats to tribal sovereignty, whether from the federal or state government or otherwise, remains in Southern California Indian Country.

A terrible spat of shootings between Riverside County Sheriff's deputies and tribal members broke out on the Soboba Reservation in 2008 launched a battle over sovereignty and criminal jurisdiction over tribal lands. Upset at the deaths of tribal members and the quarantine the Sheriff's Department enacted on the reservation, Chairman Robert Salgado vigorously opposed what he viewed as a major imposition upon the sovereignty of the Soboba Nation. Referring to county law enforcement in a statement to the press, he said, "'the Justice Department has told them in these meetings that, as chairman, I am like the president of the United States… We are a sovereign nation.'"[865] Salgado, a hardline sovereignty advocate, joined many tribal leaders in

---

reservation-79884, accessed 3 August 2015; Anthony J. Brandenburg, Testimony, Indian Law and Order Commission Field Hearing, 16 February 2012, Palm Springs, California, http://www.aisc.ucla.edu/iloc/resources/index-p=8&c=6.html, accessed 3 August 2015.

[864] Anthony Madrigal, Sr., personal conversation with the author, 7 May 2015, Riverside, California.

[865] Robert Salgado in David Kelly, "Sovereignty is at Heart of Tribe's Dispute with Sheriff," *Los Angeles Times*, 10 June 2008, http://articles.latimes.com/2008/jun/10/local/me-soboba10, accessed 5 May 2015.

Southern California who today are concerned about the presence of local non-tribal law enforcement upon their lands as an affront to their sovereignty.[866] Public Law 280 lies at the heart of these feelings and at the center of the conflict between the Soboba tribe and the County Sheriff.

Interestingly, writing on a forum on Public Law 280 the tribe held in the wake of the crisis, Chairman Salgado's brother, Federation admirer Ernie Salgado, Jr., wrote that some say Adam "Castillo died of a broken heart because Public Law 280 destroyed the life's work of the Mission Indian Federation."[867] Salgado's statement shows the way in which many have either forgotten or elided the truth of the Federation for the advancement of modern goals. On Castillo, the facts show otherwise, for though he did die with a broken heart, it was for the loss of his wife, not because of the passage of Public Law 280, which he fought for and heralded. One must remember that before Public Law 280, there were no tribal police forces. The Federation police were the only attempt at a tribal police force in early-twentieth-century Southern California, and they had discovered on numerous occasions that federal, state, and local officials would not allow such an institution to keep the peace upon the reservations. The only law enforcement on the reservations answered to the hated Indian Bureau and administered a lop-sided form of justice against traditionalists. At the time, turning civil and criminal jurisdiction on their reservations over to local county authorities was the only way to rid the reservations of an abusive Bureau police force.

---

[866] Carole Goldberg-Ambrose, "Of Native Americans and Tribal Members: The Impact of Law on Indian Group Life," *Law & Society Review*, vol. 28, no. 5 (1994), 1137.

[867] Ernie C. Salgado, "Soboba Indian Reservation Public Law 280 Forum," California Indian Education, http://www.californiaindianeducation.org/education_resources/soboba_public_law.html, accessed 3 August 2015.

It is evident that Native conservatism has not ossified and collapsed on the ashes of termination. Rather, in Native fashion, it has evolved with the changing political realities of Indian Country. Today, those who support tradition and home rule or tribal sovereignty and point proudly to the Mission Indian Federation vilify the policy of termination and Public Law 280, both policies for which it fought. However, the authority and powers of the Bureau have decreased and the increased sovereignty that came with the Self-Determination policy of President Richard Nixon has added value to the special relationship between the federal government and tribes and thus also increased the value of federal recognition. In practice, state jurisdiction created many legal problems and loopholes while adding a new avenue of outside infringement of tribal rights.[868] Combined with new economic realities wherein tribes can now afford to organize their own police forces on a reservation-by-reservation basis, sovereignty advocates no view Public Law 280 negatively. "Why do we still have this damn law on the books? Why don't we repeal it?" wondered Joe Myers, the Pomo executive director of the National Indian Justice Center, at the Soboba forum.[869]

Given the Federation's leading role in the passing of Public Law 280 and advocacy of termination, it is at least interesting that many in Southern California Indian Country remember it fondly today. The evidence points to a simple lack of knowledge about actual Federation history as the root cause of such admiration. Of course, as this work has shown, the people of the region should be proud of the MIF and it was a

[868] Ibid.

[869] "Hundreds attend Soboba Band forum on Public Law 280," *The Riverside Press-Enterprise* 12 August 2008.

conservative, traditionalist organization that fought for tribal sovereignty. However, the past is much more complex than most public deployments of the Federation and its memory make out to be, today. In addition to its deployment in the fight for tribal sovereignty, tribes and tribal people have used it in a number of different ways, including in efforts for Juaneño and Gabrieleno/Tongva tribal recognition, in museum exhibits at the Malki Museum on the Morongo Reservation and in the Riverside Metropolitan Museum, and as a welcoming display at one of the main entrances to the Pala Nation's casino.[870]

Ernie Salgado, Jr., of the Soboba Reservation has commemorated the Federation in one of the most intriguing ways through a website. Salgado is the grandson of one-time Federationist O.J. Salgado of the Pechanga Reservation. The younger Salgado is a firm believer in the Mission Indian Federation, having attempted to resurrect the organization in the 2000s.[871] In 2006, he proposed to "re-establish the Mission Indian Federation with only one political agenda, 'Human Rights and Home Rule,'" or to protect tribal sovereignty from incursions by states and the federal government.[872] Though the rebirth of the Federation has not met with much traction, Salgado launched a documentary project on the Federation entitled "Forgotten Warriors," and hosted something of an

[870] Carl J. Artman, "Proposed Finding Against Acknowledgement of the Juaneño Band of Mission Indians of the Acjachemen Nation (Petitioner #84A)" 23 November 2007, http://www.bia.gov/cs/groups/xofa/documents/text/idc-001619.pdf, accessed 5 August 2015; Hilda Solis, "Introduction of the Gabrieleno/Tongva Act," 1 24 July 200147 Congressional Record, H. 4431.

[871] "San Diego County/Regional Native American Organizations and Native American Nations," California Indian Education, http://www.californiaindianeducation.org/education_resources/Native_Americans_Organizations2010.pdf, accessed 3 August 2015.

[872] Ernie C. Salgado Jr., "Mission Indian Federation: 'Human Rights and Home Rule,'" July 2006 Newsletter from "This Day in North American Indian History," http://americanindian.net/newsletter0706.html, accessed 3 August 2015.

online shrine to the MIF on his "California Indian Education" website.[873] Ernie, Jr. also liberally applied Federation iconography throughout his campaign website and posters during his run for chair of Soboba. In these materials, he stated that he "was raised with the greatest respect for our Tribal traditions, values and customs. My home schooling was based on the political views of the Mission Indian Federation. The basic principles were 'Home Rule' (Sovereignty), 'Tribal Rights' and 'Individual Responsibility.'"[874] The mingling of the sovereignty central to Native conservatism with the non-Native conservative ethos of "individual responsibility" or the bootstrap philosophy shows the continued evolution of Native conservatism in the region.

Salgado's grassroots political movement, the American Indian Tea Party, is perhaps the most striking examples of the Native conservatism in the region today and evinces the ongoing conversation between Native and non-Native conservatism. With a motto of "Clinging to Our Guns, Bibles, and Sovereignty," the American Indian Tea Party bears striking similarity to the political rhetoric Federation in its claim to "opposing the current Congress and White House's Socialist Agenda."[875] With an appeal for both Native and non-Native members, the group marks another avenue through which Native politics and politicians are interacting with the broader political world of Southern California in addition to Ramos's call for outside involvement. Ramos, a Democrat, and

[873] Ernie Salgado Jr., "'Forgotten Warriors:' The Mission Indian Federation," California Indian Education, http://www.californiaindianeducation.org/projects/mif_documentary/, accessed 3 August 2015.

[874] Ernie Salgado Jr., "Elect Ernie Salgado Jr. Soboba Tribal Chairman," California Indian Education, http://www.californiaindianeducation.org/tribes/elections/chairman_salgado/, accessed 3 August 2015.

[875] Ernie Salgado Jr., "The American Indian Tea Party," The Indian Reporter, http://www.theindianreporter.com/tea_party/, accessed 3 August 2015.

Salgado evince the diversity of opinion and political views within Southern California Indian Country, a diversity also represented on the national level.[876]

Spokane and Coeur d'Alene writer Sherman Alexie once noted that Indian people "are actually probably a lot more conservative" than most people would think. "It's funny. Politically, we give our money to the Democrats, but we vote for Republicans," he quipped.[877] The author reportedly sent conservative Comanche pundit David Yeagley an email in which he said, "I'm very liberal and disagree with your politics but you are so accurate when describing the conservative nature of Indians. Can an Indian be a conservative? I think just about every Indian is a conservative."[878] Yeagley, the late Comanche composer and political commentator, became the face of conservative American Indians in the early twenty-first century. Author of a number of books including *Bad Eagle: The Rantings of a Conservative Comanche*, Yeagley made many appearances on the Fox News Network and in the *Washington Times*, and maintained a website, BadEagle.com. Though highly controversial and often maligned, Yeagley evinced a deep understanding of a complex modern American Indian conservatism that evolved from the termination era into self-determination and tribal sovereignty.

Indeed, the Comanche pundit outlined a nuanced explanation of his American Indian conservatism in a piece titled, "Liberals, Conservatives, and Indians." "Liberals

---

[876] Timothy Thomason, "Counseling Native Americans and Social Justice," in *Counseling for Multiculturalism and Social Justice: Integration, Theory, and Application*, Manivong J. Ratts & Paul Pedersen, eds. (Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association, 2014), 159.

[877] Sherman Alexie in "A Dialogue on Race with President Clinton," PBS News Hour, http://www.pbs.org/newshour/bb/white_house-july-dec98-clinton-race_07-09/, accessed 8 August 2015.

[878] Sherman Alexie quoted in David Yeagley, "I Was Right All Along," Bad Eagle Journal, BadEagle.com, 16 July 2003, http://www.badeagle.com/journal/archives/2003_07.html#000309, accessed 8 August 2015.

like to use Indians as a prick against America," he wrote, whereas "Conservatives apparently wish Indians did not exist—at least not as 'nations within a nation.' Indians simply wish to be Indians." Yeagley decried non-Native critics of Native exemptions from taxation and other treaty provisions as bordering on treason for advocating against historic agreements and policies of the United States. Though he held American Indians to be "natural patriots, and natural conservatives," he differed from the conservatism of the Federation in that he labeled an article published in the *Oklahoman* calling for the abolition of the Bureau of Indian Affairs in 2009 a hate crime.[879]

No doubt, time and the growth of tribal sovereignty have given the Bureau value in Yeagley's eyes. For the Federation in the early and mid- twentieth century, the Bureau was "a monument of misgovernment."[880] Adam Castillo saw meddling, corrupt, and paternalistic superintendents and Bureau employees were the cause for a great many of the problems in Southern California Indian Country. "[T]he bitter memory of these people will remain with the Mission Indians across the next century – their record has been so disgraceful," he wrote.[881] Yet, like Yeagley, Castillo and the Federation were proud to be Americans. "America needs the Indian and we need America," Castillo wrote in his appeal to the American public in 1950. "[I]t is our America; it is our flag! Again we repeat, give us freedom and let us take our places beside the loyal white man in

[879] David Yeagley, "The Oklahoman Commits Hate Crime against Indians," Bad Eagle Journal, BadEagle.com, 30 October 2009, http://www.badeagle.com/2009/10/30/the-oklahoman-commits-hate-crime-against-indians/, accessed 8 August 2015.

[880] Purl Willis to Senator Elmer Thomas. 9 July 1937 in Senate Committee on Indian Affairs, *Palm Springs Band of Mission Indians: Hearings on S. 1424 and S. 2589* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. G.P.O., 1937), 199.

[881] Adam Castillo to C. L. Graves, 15 November 1947, Coded Records, box 27, folder MIF, R.G. 75, SAO, NARA SB..

preserving this nation!"[882] It was the government that the Federation opposed, specifically the Indian Bureau, which sought what it called the "cooperation" of Indian people in its governance of them. While some eventually found value in working within the system, the Mission Indian Federation refused to bow to domination by the Indian Bureau and could not trust the government. After all, as one Southern California elder told her daughter, "They've never kept a promise to us."[883]

[882] Adam Castillo, "An Indian Appeals to the American Public," 28 March 1950, Coded Records, box 27, folder MIF, R.G. 75, SAO, NARA SB.

[883] Rene Owen to Representative John V. Tunney, 1 February 1966, folder 9342-63, Part 2, 2/3, Box 2, CCF 1958-75, California, Archives I.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Archival Sources

C. Hart Merriam Papers Relating to Work with California Indians, 1850-1974, Bancroft Library, Berkeley, California.

Central Classified Files, Mission Indian Agency, R.G. 75, National Archives and Records Administration, Washington, D.C.

Central Classified Files, Mission Indian Agency, R.G. 75, National Archives and Records Administration, Riverside, California.

Charles Elkus Papers, Bancroft Library, Berkeley, California.

Clarence Lobo Collection, Juaneño Band of Mission Indians, Acjachemen Nation, San Juan Capistrano, California.

David Barrows Papers, Bancroft Library, Berkeley, California.

Earl Warren Papers, State Archives of California, Sacramento.

Goodwin J. Knight Papers, California State Archives, Sacramento.

John Peabody Harrington Papers, National Anthropological Archives, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

L.T. Eugene Ness Collection, Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, Ohio.

Max Mazzetti Files, Sherman Indian Museum, Riverside, California.

National Personnel Records Center, St. Louis, Missouri.

Norman M. Littell Papers, 1929-1969, Bancroft Library, Berkeley, California.

Norman M. Littell Papers, Special Collections, University of Washington, Seattle.

Office File of Commissioner John Collier, R.G. 75, National Archives and Records Administration, Washington, D.C.

Papers of the California League for American Indians, Bancroft Library, Berkeley, California.

Raymond Basquez, Sr. Collection, Pechanga Cultural Resources, Temecula, California.

Records of the Mission Indian Agency, R.G. 75, National Archives and Records Administration, Riverside, California.

Records of the Sacramento Area Office, R.G. 75, National Archives and Records Administration, San Bruno, California.

State Government Oral History Program, California State Archives, Sacramento, California.

Newspapers and Periodicals

California Indian News

Los Angeles Herald

Los Angeles Star

Los Angeles Times

Riverside Enterprise

Riverside Daily Press

Riverside Independent Enterprise

Riverside Press

San Diego Evening Tribune

San Diego Herald

San Diego Union

The Indian

The Indian's Friend

The Mission Indian Booster

Washington Daily News

Washington Post

Oral Histories and Interviews

Raymond Basquez, Sr. – Luiseño elder

Lowell Bean – Scholar

Edward Castillo – Cahuilla scholar and elder

Duane Champagne – Scholar from the Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa

Patricia Dixon – Luiseño scholar and elder

Patricia Duro – Luiseño elder

Laurence Hauptman – Scholar

Raymond Huaute – Cahuilla scholar

Carmen Lucas – Kwaaymii elder

Anthony Madrigal, Sr. – Cahuilla scholar and elder

Kim Marcus – Cahuilla/Serrano leader

Sean Milanovich –Cahuilla leader

Emanuel Olague – Payuche elder

James Ramos – Serrano leader

Lorene Sisquoc – Cahuilla and Apache elder

Ernest Siva – Cahuilla/Serrano elder

Clifford Trafzer – Scholar of Wyandot heritage

Jeanette Henry Costo – Eastern Cherokee scholar and elder. Interview by Jan Erickson. "Transcription of Oral History Interview with Jeanette Henry Costo." July 27, 1998. Oral History Project, University of California, Riverside. http://www.ucrhistory.ucr.edu/pdf/costo.pdf.

Primary Sources

Boscana, Gerónimo. *Chinigchinich: A Historical Account of the Origin, Customs, and Traditions of the Indians at the Missionary Establishment of St. Juan Capistrano, Alta-California*. Alfred Robinson, trans. New York: Wiley and Putnam, 1846.

Browne, J. Ross. *Crusoe's Island: A Ramble in the Footsteps of Alexander Selkirk*. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishing, 1867.

Bryant, George and Amy Miller. *Xiipúktan (First of All): Three Views of the Origins of the Quechan People*. Cambridge, UK: Open Book Publishers, 2013.

California Senate Interim Committee on California Indian Affairs. *Progress Report to the Legislature by the Senate Interim Committee on California Indian Affairs*. Sacramento: Senate of the State of California, 1955.

Deloria, Jr., Vine, ed. *The Indian Reorganization Act*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2002.

General Land Office, Department of the Interior. *Annual Report of the Commissioner of the General Land Office to the Secretary of the Interior*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. G.P.O., 1886.

Hyde, Villiana Calac and Eric Elliott. *Yumáyk Yumáyk: Long Ago*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994.

Jackson, Helen Hunt. & Valerie Sherer Mathes. *The Indian Reform Letters of Helen Hunt Jackson, 1879-1885*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1998.

Miguel, Patrick, "The Quechan Tribe," in *Quechan Voices: Lee Emerson and Patrick Miguel*. Clifford Trafzer, ed. Riverside: California Center for Native Nations, 2012.

Painter, Charles Cornelius, *A Visit to the Mission Indians: Of Southern California, and Other Western Tribes*. Philadelphia: Indian Rights Association, 1886.

Patencio, Francisco. *Stories and Legends of the Palm Springs Indians*. Los Angeles: Times-Mirror, 1943.

Patencio, Francisco and Margaret Boynton. *Stories and Legends of the Palm Springs Indians*. Palm Springs, CA: Palm Springs Desert Museum, 1943.

Ramón, Dorothy and Eric Elliot. *Wayta' Yawa': Always Believe*. Morongo Indian Reservation, Banning, CA: Malki Museum Press, 2000.

Saubel, Katherine Siva and Eric Elliott. *'Isill Héqwas Wáxish: A Dried Coyote's Tail*. Malki Museum Press: Morongo Indian Reservation, Banning, California, 2004.

United States Congress. *Termination of Federal Supervision over Certain Tribes of Indians: Hearings on S. 2749 and H.R. 7322*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. G.P.O., 1954.

United States House of Representatives, *California Indians Jurisdictional Act: Hearings on H.R. 3765*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. G.P.O., 1939.

———. *Interior Department Appropriations for 1951: Additional Hearings, Mission Indians of California*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. G.P.O., 1950.

United States House of Representatives, Committee on Indian Affairs. *California Indians Judgement Fund, 1966: Hearings before the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs on H.R. 8021*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. G.P.O., 1966.

———. *California Indian Jurisdictional Act: Hearings on H.R. 3765*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. G.P.O., 1939.

———. *Emancipation of Indians, Hearings on H.R. 2958, H.R. 2165, and H.R. 1113*, Washington, D.C.: U.S. G.P.O., 1947.

———. *Indian Conditions and Affairs: Hearings, etc., on H. R. 7781 and Other Matters*. Washington, D.C.: United States G.P.O., 1935.

———. *Indians of the United States: Investigation of the Field Service*, vol. 3. Washington, D.C.: U.S. G.P.O., 1920.

———. *Interior Department Appropriations for 1951*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. G.P.O., 1950.

———. *Interior Department Appropriations for 1953. Part 4: Testimony of Members of Congress, Interested Organizations, and Individuals*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. G.P.O., 1952.

———. *Palm Springs Band of Mission Indians: Hearings on H.R. 7450*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1938.

———. *Palm Springs Band of Mission Indians: Hearings on S. 1424 and S. 2589*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. G.P.O., 1937.

———. *Readjustment of Indian Affairs, Part 7*. U.S. G.P.O.: Washington, D.C., 1934.

———. *State Legal Jurisdiction in Indian Country: Hearings on H.R. 459, H.R. 3235, and H.R. 3624*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. G.P.O., 1952.

———. *State Jurisdiction over Offenses Committed by or Against Indians in the Indian Country, and To Confer on the State of California Civil Jurisdictions Over Indians in the State*. Unpublished hearings, HRG-1953-IIA-0232.

United States House of Representatives, Committee on Public Lands. *Mission Indian Problems in San Diego County, Hearing Held 13 October 1950*. Unpublished hearings, HRG-1950-PLH-0021.

———. *To Remove Restrictions and Provide Per Capita Distribution of Funds to California Indians*. Unpublished hearings, HRG-1948-PLS-0003.

United States House of Representatives and Senate Subcommittees on Interior and Insular Affairs. *Termination of Federal Supervision over Certain Tribes of Indians: Hearings on S. 2749 and H.R. 7322, Part 5*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. G.P.O., 1954.

United States Senate Committee on Indian Affairs. *Klamath Indians, Oregon: Hearings before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Public Lands on S. 1222*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. G.P.O., 1947.

———. *Old Age Pensions for Indians: Hearings on S.3293*. U.S. G.P.O.: Washington, D.C., 1935.

———. *Survey of Conditions of the Indians in the United States: Part 29, California*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. G.P.O., 1934.

———. *Wheeler-Howard Act – Exempt Certain Indians: Hearings on S.2103*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. G.P.O., 1940.

Secondary Sources

Bahr, Diana Meyers. *From Mission to Metropolis: Cupeño Indian Women in Los Angeles*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1993.

Barsch, Russel Lawrence and James Youngblood Henderson. *The Road: Indian Tribes and Political Liberty*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1980.

Bean, Lowell. *Mukat's People: Cahuilla Indians of Southern California*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974.

Bean, Lowell J. and Thomas C. Blackburn, eds. *Native Californians: A Theoretical Retrospective*. Ramona, California, Ballena Press, 1976.

Carrico, Richard L. "The Struggle for Native American Self-Determination in San Diego County." *Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology*, vol. 2, no.2, 199-213.

Castillo, Edward. "An Indian Account of the Decline and Collapse of Mexico's Hegemony over the Missionized Indians of California." *American Indian Quarterly*, vol. 13, no. 4 (autumn, 1989), 391-408.

———. *Indians, Franciscans, and Spanish Colonization: The Impact of the Mission System on California Indians*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1997.

Cline, Lora L. *Just Before Sunset*. Jacumba, California: J and L Enterprises, 1984.

Cohen, Felix S. "The Erosion of Indian Rights, 1950-1953: A Case Study in Bureaucracy," *The Yale Law Journal*, vol. 62, no. 3 (February 1953), 348-390.

Cowger, Thomas W. *The National Congress of American Indians: The Founding Years*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2001.

Curtis, Edward S. *The North American Indian: Being a Series of Volumes Picturing and Describing the Indians of the United States and Alaska, vol. 15*. 1926.

Daily, David W. Battle for the B.I.A.: G.E.E. Lindquist and the Crusade against John Collier. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2004.

Daly, Heather Ponchetti. "'American Indian Freedom Controversy:' Political and Social Activism by Southern California Mission Indians, 1934-1958." PhD dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 2012.

———. "Fractured Relations at Home: The 1953 Termination Act's Effect on Tribal Relations throughout Southern California Indian Country." *American Indian Quarterly*, vol. 33, no. 4 (Fall 2009), 427-439.

Deloria, Jr., Vine and Clifford Lytle. *The Nations Within: The Past and Future of American Indian Sovereignty*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1998.

Dozier, Deborah. *Standing Firm: The Mission Indian Federation Fight for Basic Human Rights*. Banning, CA: Ushkana Press, 2005.

Du Bois, Constance Goddard. “Ceremonies and Traditions of the Diegueño Indians.” *Journal of American Folklore*, vol. 21 (1908), 228-236.

———. “Early Ethnographic Notes from Constance Goddard DuBois on the Indians of San Diego County.” *Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology*, vol. 26, no. 2, 205-214.

———. “The Religion of the Luiseño Indians of Southern California.” *University of California Publications in Archaeology and Ethnography*, vol. 8, no. 3, 69-186.

Engelhardt, Zephyrin. *San Luis Rey Mission*. San Francisco: James H. Barry Company, 1921.

Farris, Glenn J. “José Panto, ‘Capitan’ of the Indian Pueblo of San Pascual, San Diego County.” *Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology*, vol.16, no. 2 (1994), 149-61.

Fixico, Donald L. *Bureau of Indian Affairs*. Santa Barbara, CA: Greenwood, 2012.

Forde, C. Daryll. “Ethnography of the Yuma Indians.” *University of California Publications in Archaeology and Ethnography*, vol. 28, no. 4, (1931), 83-278.

Gerston, Larry & Terry Christensen. *California Politics and Government: A Practical Approach*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning, 2003.

Gifford, Edward W. “Clans and Moieties in Southern California.” *University of California Publications in Archaeology and Ethnography*, vol. 14, no. 2, (1918), 155-219.

Goldberg, Carole E. “Of Native Americans and Tribal Members: The Impact of Law on Indian Group Life.” *Law & Society Review*, vol. 28, no. 5 (1994).

———. “Public Law 280: The Limits of State Jurisdiction over Reservation Indians.” *UCLA Law Review*, vol. 22, 535-594.

Guest, Florian F. “The Indian Policy under Fermin Francisco de Lasuen, California's Second Father President,” *California Historical Society Quarterly*, vol. 45, no. 3 (1966), 195-224.

Gunther, Vanessa. *Ambiguous Justice: Native Americans and the Law in Southern California, 1848-1890*. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 2006.

Gustafson, Sandra M. *Imagining Deliberative Democracy in the Early American Republic*. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 2011.

Hanks, Richard. *This War is for a Whole Life: The Culture of Resistance among Southern California Indians, 1850-1966*. Banning, California: Ushkana Press, 2012.

Harmon, Alexandra. *Rich Indians: Native People and the Problem of Wealth in American History*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2010.

Hauptman, Laurence. "The American Indian Federation and the New Deal: A Reinterpretation." *Pacific Historical Review*, vol. 52, no. 4, (Nov. 1983), 378-402.

———. *The Iroquois and the New Deal*. Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Press, 1981.

Hertzberg, Hazel W. *The Search for an American Indian Identity: Modern Pan-Indian Movements*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1971.

Hill, Jane H. and Rosalinda Nolasquez, eds. *Mulu'wetam: The First People*. Morongo Indian Reservation, Banning, CA: Malki Museum Press, 1973.

Hudson, Millard F. "The Pauma Massacre." *Annual Publication of the Historical Society of Southern California*, vol. 7, no. 1 (1906), pp. 13-21.

Hurtado, Albert. *Indian Survival on the California Frontier*. New Haven, CN: Yale University Press, 1988.

Kickingbird, Kirke & Karen Ducheneaux. *One Hundred Million Acres*. New York: Macmillan, 1972.

Krober, Alfred. "Ethnography of the Cahuilla Indians." *University of California Publications: American Archaeology and Ethnology*, vol. 8, no. 2 (1908), 29-68.

Laird, George and Carobeth Laird. *Mirror and Pattern: George Laird's World of Chemehuevi Mythology*. Morongo Indian Reservation, Banning, CA: Malki Museum Press, 1984.

Lech, Steve. *Pioneers of Riverside County: The Spanish, Mexican and Early American Periods*. Charleston, SC: History Press, 2012.

Madrigal, Anthony. *Sovereignty Land and Water: Building Tribal Environmental and Cultural Programs on the Cahuilla and Twenty-Nine Palms Reservations*. Riverside: California Center for Native Nations, 2008.

Martin, Jill E. "'The Greatest Evil:' Interpretations of Indian Prohibition Laws, 1832-1953." *Great Plains Quarterly* (2003), 35-53.

McGirr, Lisa. *Suburban Warriors: The Origins of the New American Right*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2001.

Micklethwait, John & Adrian Wooldridge. *The Right Nation: Conservative Power in America*. New York: Penguin Press, 2004.

Nash, Gerald. *The Federal Landscape: An Economic History of the Twentieth-Century West*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1999.

Nuñez, Wa Wa Chaw Calac. *Spirit Woman: The Diaries and Paintings of Bonita Wa Wa Calachaw Nuñez*. Sam Steiner, ed. San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1980.

Parman, Donald L. and Lewis Meriam. "Lewis Meriam's Letters during the Survey of Indian Affairs 1926-1927 (Part II)." *Arizona and the West*, vol. 24, no. 4 (winter, 1982), 341-70.

Perdue, Theda, ed. *Sifters: Native American Women's Lives: Native American Women's Lives*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Pfister, Joel. *Individually Incorporated: Indians and the Multicultural Modern*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2004.

Philip, Kenneth R. *Termination Revisited: American Indians on the Trail to Self-Determination*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1999.

Phillips, George Harwood. *Chiefs and Challengers: Indian Resistance and Cooperation in Southern California*. 2nd ed. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2014.

———. "Indians and the Breakdown of the Spanish Mission System in California." *Ethnohistory*, vol. 21, no. 4 (autumn 1974), 291-302.

Prucha, Francis Paul. *American Indian Treaties: The History of a Political Anomaly*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994.

———. *The Great Father: The United States Government and the American Indians*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1995.

Sanchez, Susan. "The Selling of California: The Indian Claims Commission and the Case of the Indians of California v. the United States." PhD diss., University of California, Riverside, 2003.

Santiago, Mark. *Massacre at the Yuma Crossing: Spanish Relations with the Quechans, 1779-1782*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2010.

Schuparra, Kurt. *Triumph of the Right: The Rise of the California Conservative Movement, 1945-1966*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe, 1998.

Shipek, Florence. "Kumeyaay Socio-Political Structure." *Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology* vol. 4, no. 2 (1982), 296-303.

———. *Pushed into the Rocks: Southern California Indian Land Tenure, 1769-1986*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1987.

Smith, Andrea. *Native Americans and the Christian Right: The Gendered Politics of Unlikely Alliances*. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 2008.

Stanley, Sam, ed. *American Indian Economic Development*. The Hague: Mouton Publishers, 1978.

Strong, William Duncan. *Aboriginal Society in Southern California*. Morongo Indian Reservation, Banning, CA: Malki Museum Press, 1987.

Stubben, Jerry D. *Native Americans and Political Participation: A Reference Handbook* Santa Barbara, CA: ABC CLIO, 2006.

Thorne, Tanis. *El Capitan: Adaptation and Agency on a Southern California Indian Reservation, 1850-1937*. Morongo Indian Reservation, Banning, CA: Malki-Ballena Press, 2012.

———. "The Death of Superintendent Stanley and the Cahuilla Uprising of 1907-12." *Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology*, vol. 24, no. 2 (2004): 233-258.

———. "On the Fault Line: Political Violence at Campo Fiesta and National Reform in Indian Policy." *Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology*, vol. 21, no. 2 (1999), 182-212.

Trafzer, Clifford. *A Chemehuevi Song: A History of the Chemehuevi of the Twenty-Nine Palms Tribe*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2015.

———. *The People of the Pines*. Patton, CA: San Manuel Band of Mission Indians, 2002.

———. *Quechan Indian Historic Properties of Traditional Lands on the Yuma Proving Ground*. Riverside, CA: California Center for Native Nations, 2013.

Trafzer, Clifford, Matthew Sakiestewa Gilbert, and Lorene Sisquoc, eds. *The Indian School on Magnolia Avenue: Voices and Images from Sherman Institute*. Corvallis: Oregon State University Press, 2012.

Ulrich, Roberta. *American Indian Nations from Termination to Restoration, 1953-2006*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2010.

Waterman, T.T. "The Religious Practices of the Diegueño Indians." *University of California Publications in Archaeology and Ethnography*, vol. 8, no. 6, 271-358.

Wax, Murray L. and Robert W. Buchanan. *Solving "'The Indian Problem': The White Man's Burdensome Business*. New York: New York Times Books, 1975.

Welch, Deborah. *Political Issues, Contemporary Native American Issues*. New York: Chelsea House Publishers, 2006.