

Bates College

SCARAB

Honors Theses

Capstone Projects

5-2021

Unvanquished: the Kumeyaay and the 1775 Revolt

Catherine Joan Buse

Bates College, cbuse@bates.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scarab.bates.edu/honorsthesis>

Recommended Citation

Buse, Catherine Joan, "Unvanquished: the Kumeyaay and the 1775 Revolt" (2021). *Honors Theses*. 371.
<https://scarab.bates.edu/honorsthesis/371>

This Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Capstone Projects at SCARAB. It has been accepted for inclusion in Honors Theses by an authorized administrator of SCARAB. For more information, please contact batesscarab@bates.edu.

Unvanquished:
The Kumeyaay and the 1775 Revolt

An Honors Thesis
Presented to
The Faculty of the Department of History
Bates College
In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
Degree of Bachelor of Arts

By
Catherine Joan Buse
Lewiston, Maine
May 5, 2021

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	3
Introduction.....	4
Chapter 1: The Kumeyaay Before 1769	20
Chapter 2: The Spanish Arrival and Settlement	38
Chapter 3: The Revolt.....	50
Chapter 4: The Investigation.....	70
Chapter 5: The Sound of Silence	85
Conclusion	94
Bibliography	98

Acknowledgements

To name all those who deserve acknowledgement for helping me complete this thesis is to accept a Bilbo Baggins truism that “I know half of you half as well as I should like.”

To Karen, my thesis advisor, who taught me that great history starts not when you have a great answer but a great many questions. Fortunately, I know that you’re only ever as far away as the closest Ingla Clenndinnen book. To Andrew Baker, my academic advisor, who taught a lover of Dickens the value of writing like Hemingway and whose absolute standards are to thank for some of my greatest academic growth at Bates. To the Bates History Department whose support from the Cole Fund made my archival research possible amidst a global pandemic.

I’d like to thank Bryan Stevenson, collections and program manager at the Santa Barbara Mission Archive Library, whose counsel responsible for the selection of an access to the archival primary sources that are the foundation of this thesis. To Tony Falcon, docent at Mission San Diego, who generously offered access to mission records and rare books. To Mr. Savagian for thoughtfully sending me articles about my topic, even before meeting me.

To Dad, thank you for teaching me that nobody can tell me there is one song worth singing. To mom, I now know you were right believing-in me-for so long. To Nikos, Amanda, Helen, and Mike without whom I would have finished this thesis far earlier and been all the unhappier for it.

Finally, thank you to Mr. Yap. You are the reason I am a history major.

Introduction

In the dead of night on November 4, 1775, between 600 and 1,000 Kumeyaay Indians crept onto the grounds of the Mission San Diego de Alcalá (Mission San Diego). Inside the mission slept two Franciscan missionaries, four soldiers, a handful of Spanish servicemen, and a number of Kumeyaay Indians recently converted to Catholicism. The armed Kumeyaay rushed in, looting religious objects from the chapel, and setting the whole compound ablaze. By morning, the structure was in ashes, and head missionary Father Luis Jayme, who was among the missionaries when the Indians attacked, was found beside a nearby creek, mutilated and murdered by the assailants.¹

The story of what happened that night has been used as an early example of the struggles the Spanish faced in California and as evidence of the tensions between Indians and Spaniards in California during the Mission Era. This era, from 1769 until the 1830s, is the period when the Bourbon Spanish monarchs sent Franciscan missionaries and Spanish soldiers to California in an effort to protect claims to the potentially lucrative lands of coastal California.²

California was not Spain's first missionized frontier in North or South America: Spanish missions had been established with varying success in modern-day Florida, Texas, Mexico, and as far south as Paraguay before the California project began. Spain needed a way to colonize one of the most populous Indian territories cost-effectively. The missionaries of the order of Saint Francis were the Spanish government's solution. The plan was for the missionaries to convert the California Indians to Catholicism, assimilate them culturally by housing and educating them at

¹ Vicente Fuster to Junípero Serra, November 28, 1775, JSC 583, Junípero Serra Collection, Santa Barbara Mission Archive Library, translation mine.

² Kent G. Lightfoot, *Indians, Missionaries, and Merchants: The Legacy of Colonial Encounters on the California Frontiers* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005), 1-5.

mission sites, then allow the military to conscript the Hispanicized California Indians to labor for the profit of the Spanish government.³

This dual Spanish conversion and colonization effort struggled because of strife among the Spanish and between the Spanish and the Indians, among other reasons. Missionaries and military officers competed for political and social authority on the California frontier. The question of who had jurisdiction over how to control and treat the Indians was the source of most of their conflicts.⁴ Meanwhile, California Indians frequently subverted and even directly challenged Spanish advances on native land and culture. Disparate world views, competition for natural resources, newly-introduced diseases, and Spanish military sexual and physical violence against the Kumeyaay at San Diego created Kumeyaay antipathy towards the Spanish. Although California Indian resistance to the Spanish was endemic to the colonization effort, the revolt at San Diego was one of the most destructive of the uprisings during the California Mission Era.⁵

The revolt at Mission San Diego frequently appears in monographs about California Spanish mission history broadly and is commonly cited as one of the few instances of large-scale violent Indian rebellion during the Mission Era in California. These works often examine the context of the revolt, its causes, and aftermath relying almost exclusively on Spanish primary material. As a result, the story of the 1775 revolt is told from Spanish perspectives—not those of the Kumeyaay.

³ Lightfoot, *Indians, Missionaries, and Merchants*, 5-7.

⁴ Steven W. Hackel, *Children of Coyote, Missionaries of Saint Francis: Indian-Spanish Relations in Colonial California, 1769-1850* (Chapel Hill: Published for the Omohundro Institute of Early American History and Culture, Williamsburg, Virginia, by the University of North Carolina Press 2005), 648, Apple Books.

⁵ Hackel, *Children of Coyote*, 736.

In contrast, I seek to examine the 1775 revolt from Kumeyaay perspectives, incorporating a rich body of interdisciplinary sources to investigate what might have motivated the Kumeyaay to revolt and how the revolt affected Spanish-Kumeyaay relations. I represent how Spanish actions might have been viewed through the lens of a Kumeyaay worldview, seeking to understand how the physical environment influenced how the Kumeyaay and Spanish interacted. I explore the many types of Kumeyaay resistance and response.

I carefully chose the methodologies and terms I use to examine Kumeyaay perspectives, and it is important to explain how I chose them. Throughout this thesis I use the term “Indian” to refer to the indigenous people of the Americas. This word is often used synonymously with the terms “Native Americans,” or “Indigenous Peoples.” There is an ongoing debate among scholars, and within individual Indian communities, about which of these terms is best.⁶ The current standard is to ask members of individual tribal nations which term they prefer, and where possible, to refer to a person, or group of people, by the name of their tribe or nation to avoid generalizing across different nations.⁷ Therefore, I would have preferred to have asked a member of the Kumeyaay nation how they would like to be identified, but given the constraints of a global pandemic, I was not able to interview anyone. Instead, I followed the nomenclature that Kumeyaay-authored articles use to identify their community, which, in the instances when “Kumeyaay” is not used, is the term “Indian.”⁸

⁶ Perry G. Horse, “Native American Identity,” *New Directions for Student Services*, no. 109 (2005): 61-68, <https://doi-org.lprx.bates.edu/10.1002/ss.154>.

⁷ Andrew Galvan, “A Native American Discussion: The Statues of Junípero Serra” (panel discussion, 38th Annual California Missions and Presidios Conference, February 12, 2021).

⁸ “The Indians of San Diego County,” Kumeyaay.com, accessed May 4, 2021, <https://www.kumeyaay.com/the-indians-of-san-diego-county.html>; “Tribal Band Names: Who Are We?” Viejas Band of Kumeyaay, accessed May 4, 2021, <http://viejasbandofkumeyaay.org/viejas-community/kumeyaay-history/tribal-and-band-names/>.

I have used the word “Indian” only when referring to trends or laws that applied to multiple tribes, and likewise the term “Kumeyaay” when referencing a trait, law, or event that apply to a member of the tribe or the tribe itself. Where possible, I have cited sources that refer to the Kumeyaay culture or people specifically so as not to conflate their views or traditions with those of other tribes. Failing to do so would, in the words of one Kumeyaay historian, render the Kumeyaay subjects, “faceless backdrops to Eurocentric discussions of California history.”⁹ I cite research and make claims specific to the Kumeyaay and the Spanish at Mission San Diego to write a history that is both accurate and humanizing.

This principle informs the sources I cite. I have drawn from interdisciplinary sources because the Kumeyaay’s was an oral culture, without a written record.¹⁰ Primary historical sources alone give only a partial view of who the Kumeyaay were, so I studied anthropology, archaeology, and linguistic sources together to analyze the circumstances and actions of the Kumeyaay and to discern their motivation. Where possible, I draw on sources authored or co-authored by Kumeyaay people. I cite the Spanish primary material and the work of preeminent anthropologists, as have other scholars, but these sources are analyzed and challenged in light of my set of sources. I have translated some of the Spanish material in an effort to find mentions or glimpses of the Kumeyaay that might otherwise be omitted from other widely-available translated works. This approach, “reading against the grain,” is a common method used amongst historians, especially those writing about pre-contact cultures that have limited or no written

⁹ Michael Connolly Miskwish, *Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology* 28, no. 2 (2008): 195, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27825895>.

¹⁰ Margaret C. Field and Jon Meza Cuero, “Kumeyaay Oral Tradition, Cultural Identity, and Language Revitalization,” *Oral Tradition* 27, no. 2 (2012): 319, doi:10.1353/ort.2012.0013.

records. I used it to search through documents written from a dominant point of view, the Spanish, to find the nondominant point of view, the Kumeyaay.

Necessarily with this approach, whatever evidence I extract is inferred, not explicitly stated. To account for this, I have tried to be explicit about the degree of certainty I have about my conclusions. I cannot claim that the conclusions I have drawn from my evidence are either definitive or singular. When making claims, I use terms such as “suggesting,” “pointing to,” and “indicating,” rather than asserting my claim. I do not purport to be the authority on the perspective of the Kumeyaay. Rather, I hope these sources can contribute to an ongoing conversation in California mission histories that include California Indian perspectives on and experiences during Spanish colonization.

The methods I use are necessary because of the dearth of Kumeyaay perspectives found in secondary material or preserved primary material. Spanish authors were not what historians refer to as “sensitive ethnographers.”¹¹ Their records detail the actions and interactions of Spanish people yet lack discussions of those of the Kumeyaay. When discussions of Kumeyaay and their culture was included, it was done so in its approximation to Spanish people and culture. Effectively, Kumeyaay in the record exist insofar as they are relevant to Spanish narratives. The byproduct of these records is that they silence Kumeyaay voices. While it does not seem to have been the goal of the Spanish to mute the Kumeyaay, silencing of Indigenous culture was consistent with Spanish political goals of Hispanicizing the Indians. This dominance of the Spanish voice in the historical record was reflected initially in secondary stories written about

¹¹ Inga Clendinnen, *Ambivalent conquests: Maya and Spaniard in Yucatan, 1517-1570* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 148, doi:10.1017/CBO9780511800528.

this period, many of which similarly failed to account for Kumeyaay experiences of Spanish colonization.

Scholarly opinion about the experiences of and interactions between California Indians was, for a long time, deeply polarizing. Historian Hubert Bancroft wrote one of the first histories of California in a seven-volume work published in the 1880s.¹² His work emphasized Spanish cruelties perpetrated against the California Indians and was emblematic of the Spanish California history during this time: scholarship of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century largely villainized the Spanish who colonized North America as a way of supporting a larger narrative of United States superiority to its colonial past. Spanish soldiers and Franciscan missionaries were portrayed as conquerors, instruments of the Spanish crown whose colonizing activities, especially the missions, were a categorical failure. Central to this view was Bancroft's isolation of California Spanish colonial history from a larger United States history. Bancroft's approach implied that the Spanish colonization did not shape modern California.

This view remained dominant until the mid-twentieth century when University of California Berkeley History professor Herbert Eugene Bolton proposed a new concept of Spanish California history.¹³ He argued that European frontiers needed to be considered as a part of modern United States history, not siloed into periods that supposedly had no effect on modern life. He believed that North America was the result of both precolonial and colonial contexts and its history should not be considered without both. He also disputed the view that the Spanish

¹² Hubert Howe Bancroft, *History of California: 1542-1800*. 7 vols. San Francisco: A.L. Bancroft & Company, 1884-1890, HathiTrust Digital Library.

¹³ Herbert Eugene Bolton, *The Spanish Borderlands: A Chronicle of Old Florida and the Southwest* (United Kingdom: Yale University Press, 1921), Google Books; Herbert Eugene Bolton, *Spanish Exploration in the Southwest, 1542-1706* (New York: C. Scribner's sons, 1916), Google Books.

were cruel and unsuccessful in their colonizing effort, asserting that scholars had relied solely on United States documents to support their claims, rather than including, as he had, Mexican and Spanish archival material. His work attempted to paint the Spanish in a positive light and to advocate for including California and Spanish “borderlands”¹⁴ in mainstream American history. His influence ushered in a new era of mission history, one that promoted the efforts of Spanish colonization and connected California colonial history to United States history.

Bolton’s work was supported by the work of Catholic clerical historians. The Catholic community emphatically disputed the narrative of Franciscan cruelty. Historians Maynard Geiger, Francis Guest, and accomplished translator Zephyrin Engelhardt began publishing works emphasizing the dedication and achievements of the missionaries.¹⁵ What made these works noteworthy, and standard even in today’s studies of mission history, is their anthology of translated Spanish manuscripts, official documents, diaries, and letters from missionaries and military officials. The volume of primary material from which they drew to counter criticisms of Spanish actions fortified Bolton’s conclusions. “Boltonians” and the Franciscan historians of the early twentieth century formed an entirely new, opposing school of thought to that of Bancroft—and one that was equally polarized.

Thus, two major, opposing schools of mission thought emerged: the “Black Legend” in which the Spanish are portrayed as cruel, unsuccessful colonizers and the “White Legend” which

¹⁴ Bolton, *The Spanish Borderlands*.

¹⁵ Francis F. Guest, *Fermín Francisco de Lasuén (1736-1803); a biography* (Washington: Academy of American Franciscan History, 1973); Maynard J. Geiger, *The Life and Times of Fray Junípero Serra, O.F.M.; or, the Man Who Never Turned Back, (1713-1784), a Biography*, vol. 2 (Washington: Academy of American Franciscan History, 1959), HathiTrust Digital Library; Zephyrin Engelhardt, *The Missions and Missionaries of California*, vol. 2 (San Francisco: The James H. Barry Company, 1912).

ennobles them.¹⁶ These polarized narratives focused on Spanish missionaries, soldiers, and settlers. Notably absent from these narratives were the Indians. When they were described, it was as passive, docile actors in their own assimilation. Historians Robert Jackson and Edward Castillo put it bluntly when they wrote that “the vast majority of inhabitants of the missions, appear only marginally and almost as shadows in the Franciscan version of history.”¹⁷

This dichotomy dominated until the late 1960s when the postmodern movement caused a shift away from polemic histories towards more socio-cultural histories. Historians began incorporating central anthropological, archaeological, and ethnographic questions and research into their work. Scholars across disciplines began looking at the people living within the missions, not just the mission institutions themselves.

This movement brought two important changes to mission history: the restoration of Indians as central actors in Spanish borderland histories and the deconstruction of the Spanish-Indian binary. As scholars began examining the experiences and perspectives of Indians within the missions, they uncovered evidence for how distinct different groups of California Indians were politically, linguistically, and culturally. It became clear that the earlier scholarship amalgamating California Indians into one, large group underrepresented the heterogeneity of the Indians. Tension was not only prevalent between the Indian and Spanish cultures but also within the various Indian cultures themselves.

Central to the deconstruction of the Spanish-Indian binary were discussions of Indian agency within the missions. Scholars explored the ways in which Indian actions were intentional

¹⁶ David J. Weber, *The Spanish Frontier in North America: The Brief Edition* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), 6, ProQuest Ebook Central.

¹⁷ Robert H. 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, 1995), 4.

moves rather than mere reactions to the Spanish. The scope of what scholars considered to be examples of Indian resistance broadened. Frequent instances of Indian laborers fleeing the mission were now seen as a form of active resistance that threatened mission economies; Spanish complaints of sluggish workers were reimagined as quotidian acts of defiance.¹⁸ Implicit in these characterizations of California Indians as agents of opposition within the mission system was the recognition that Indian tribes had polities and cultures to defend. Disruption and degradation of these pre-contact ways of life motivated their opposition. Scholars began to explore the impact that missions had on Indian social and political hierarchies and cultural practices, which led them to reframe Indian actions within the missions as examples of conscious agency during what ethnohistorian Randall Milliken described as a “time of little choice.”¹⁹

Books published in the late 1990s proposed what I refer to as the “gray” between the Black and White legends. This era’s research examined how Indians and the Spanish molded one another on the California frontier. This line of thinking motivated another generation of scholars who, similar to Bolton, advocated for including Spanish borderland history within the larger context of American history. Unlike Bolton, these scholars recognized that the borders between Indian and Spanish culture were porous as opposed to existing independently. These scholars concluded that colonial encounters caused socio-cultural changes in both the Spanish and Indian populations in California.

One of these published works is David Weber's 1995 book *The Spanish Frontier in North America* which argued that Indian and Spanish societies mutually, though not proportionately, transformed one another’s cultures through clashes on the California frontier, resulting in a new

¹⁸ Jackson and Castillo, *Indians, Franciscans, and Spanish*, 73-74.

¹⁹ Randall Milliken, *A Time of Little Choice: the Disintegration of Tribal Culture in the San Francisco Bay Area, 1769-1810* (Menlo Park: Malki Museum, 2009), xiv.

California identity.²⁰ Scholar Kent Lightfoot, however, claimed in his book *Indians, Missionaries, and Merchants: The Legacy of Colonial Encounters on the California Frontiers* that colonial interactions were not mutually transformative, and it was the identities of California Indians that suffered severely at the hands of the Spanish.²¹ He argues that Indians were constantly in “negotiation” with their colonial surroundings—navigating alien hierarchies in the way that afforded them the most social and economic freedom.²² Historian Steven Hackel’s conclusion in his book *Children of Coyote* agrees with Lightfoot’s assertion that California Indians were “negotiating” their position in relation to the Spanish. Hackel asserts that Indian and Spanish goals and practices were often so similar in mission life that they were indistinguishable, but unlike Weber, he claims the reason for this was not cultural interplay but Spanish dependence on Indians for a functioning mission system. Hackel cites Indian rebellions as actions that “laid bare the dependence of the colonial system on Indian authority, for they showed once again how Indian officials frequently held the fate of the missions in their hands.”²³

Richard Carrico, an anthropologist and historian of the San Diego area, is responsible for some of the most detailed scholarship on the events of the revolt in detail. His book *Strangers in a Stolen Land* gives a general history of San Diego County’s Indians, and the second chapter of the book explores Spanish-Kumeyaay relations with special attention paid to the events of the revolt. He argues that the revolt was an important manifestation of indigenous agency that underscores how through “revolt, appeasement, and cooperation” the Kumeyaay continually

²⁰ Weber, *The Spanish Frontier*, 11.

²¹ Lightfoot, *Indians, Missionaries, and Merchants*, 81, 237.

²² Lightfoot, *Indians, Missionaries, and Merchants*, 23-24.

²³ Hackel, *Children of Coyote*, 758.

struggled for power and survival against the Spanish.²⁴ Historian Michelle Lorimer’s chapter on the revolt in her book *Resurrecting the Past: The California Mission Myth* takes a more singular stance, claiming that the causes and actions of the revolt were neither an example of appeasement nor cooperation, but an attack that Spanish actions provoked and that illustrated “wider [Kumeyaay] discontent with colonization.”²⁵ Historian James Sandos in his book *Converting California* concludes something similar to Lorimer, writing that the revolt symbolized the broad, inescapable “tensions among Indians, missionaries, and soldiers.”²⁶ None of these three historians’ claims is mutually exclusive. Carrico analyzes the revolt from the perspective of what it said about the Kumeyaay whereas Lorimer and Sandos analyze the revolt from what it said about the Spanish. Combining these three claims leads to the conclusion that the revolt was a product of tension and Spanish actions that forced certain Kumeyaay people to respond. The responses of the Kumeyaay illustrate how the Kumeyaay constantly managed, leveraged, and negotiated their interactions with the Spanish.

There is also rich, largely anthropological, scholarship about the society and culture of the Kumeyaay that informed why they chose to revolt. The first ethnographies of the Kumeyaay were written in the early twentieth century by anthropologists Thomas Talbot Waterman and Leslie Spier.²⁷ These ethnographies are commonly referred to as “salvage ethnographies”

²⁴ Richard L. Carrico, *Strangers in a Stolen Land: Indians of San Diego County from Prehistory to the New Deal* (San Diego: Sunbelt Publications Inc., 2008), x.

²⁵ Michelle Marie Lorimer, *Resurrecting the Past: The California Mission Myth* (Pechanga: Great Oaks Press, 2016), 143.

²⁶ James A. Sandos, *Converting California: Indians and Franciscans in the Missions* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004), 55, ProQuest Ebook Central.

²⁷ Leslie Spier, “Southern Diegueño Customs,” in *The Early Ethnography of the Kumeyaay*, ed. M. Steven Shackley (Berkeley: Phoebe Hearst Museum of Anthropology, University of California, Berkeley, 2004), 151-217; T. T. Waterman, *The Religious Practices of the Diegueño Indians*, vol. 8, no. 6 (Berkeley: The University Press, 1910).

because they recorded the life and practices of a people who were believed to be on the brink of cultural extinction. Waterman and Spier focused on observations of traditional ceremonies and spiritual beliefs. However, early twentieth century ethnographies have been criticized for instances of unethical methodologies and racist misconceptions characteristic of the time the ethnographies were being recorded. Nevertheless, the research still provides a useful view into what pre-contact Kumeyaay culture may have been.²⁸ To reconcile their value with their limitations, Spier and Waterman's observations should, ideally, be examined in concert with Kumeyaay-authored or co-authored scholarship. When this standard cannot be met, their works should at least be considered in tandem with other recent ethnographic and anthropological research. Corroboration of evidence from other scholars can call into question, complicate the conclusions these anthropologists made.

Research such as that of famed ethnographer Florence Shipek, who is considered a leading authority on Southern California Indians, took ethnographic research of the Kumeyaay in a more detailed and ethical direction. Shipek began as a volunteer and activist for the Kumeyaay tribe in the 1950s, and as her relationship with the Kumeyaay deepened, she began to work closely with members of the Kumeyaay community to produce pivotal ethnographies from the late 1960s to early 1990s. Her work would serve as evidence in court cases arguing for Kumeyaay rights. Her article "KUUCHAMA," which documented Kumeyaay spiritual beliefs, helped prevent construction on a sacred Kumeyaay landmark in the San Diego area.²⁹ Her book

²⁸ Les W. Field, "Who Is This Really About Anyway? Ishi, Kroeber, and the Intertwining of California Indian and Anthropological Histories," *Journal of Anthropological Research* 61, no. 1 (2005): 81-93, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3631298>.

²⁹ Florence C. Shipek, "'KUUCHAMAA: The Kumeyaay Sacred Mountain,'" *Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology* 7, no. 1 (1985), 67-74, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27825214>.

The Autobiography of Delfina Cuero secured citizenship in the United States for a Kumeyaay woman Delfina Cuero who had fought for over fifty years for her right to return to live in San Diego after being forced off the land.³⁰ Shipek's ethnographies analyzing pre-contact Kumeyaay society argued that the hostile environment of the physical landscape of San Diego molded the Kumeyaay before their contact with the Spanish. The environment was material to the evolution of the Kumeyaay socio-political structure, nomadic patterns, and even the Kumeyaay's persistent ability to resist the Spanish.³¹

This thesis ties these various disciplines of history, anthropology, and ethnography together, using the 1775 revolt as an event around which to analyze Kumeyaay views on the Spanish settlement in San Diego. The analysis covers the period before Spanish contact through 1785. An analysis of the revolt within a longer time frame affords a better understanding of Kumeyaay culture—how their beliefs, traditions, and cultural norms informed how they interpreted and responded to the Spanish. I anchor my research of pre-contact Kumeyaay culture in Shipek's ethnographies and in oral histories co-authored by Kumeyaay people.

When discussing the period after Spanish settlement, I draw from the wealth of Spanish material from this time period. Spanish authors describe the colonial goals of the Spanish, what they witnessed, and how they responded to various different Kumeyaay actions. Most of my material comes from either the archival records kept at the Santa Barbara Mission Archive

³⁰ Delfina Cuero and Florence C. Shipek, *The Autobiography of Delfina Cuero, a Diegueño Indian*, ed. Sylvia Brakke Vane, trans. Rosalie Pinto Robertson (Banning: Malki Museum Press, 1970).

³¹ Florence C. Shipek, "A Native American Adaptation to Drought: The Kumeyaay as Seen in the San Diego Mission Records 1770-1798," *Ethnohistory* 28, no. 4 (1981), 295-312, doi:10.2307/481135; Florence C. Shipek, "Kumeyaay Socio-Political Structure," *Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology* 4, no. 2 (1982), 296-303, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27825128>.

Library or Spanish primary sources as they appear in published material. I cite primary letters from Antonine Tibesar's volumes of the *Writings of Junípero Serra* who was the Franciscan leader of the California missions, and Zephyrin Engelhardt's tome *San Diego Mission* which includes reprints of over one hundred letters from Spanish missionaries, governmental officials, or military leaders either at San Diego or related to the mission.³² Missionaries are the most common authors of the letters I cite. I include letters from Luís Jayme who served at missionary in San Diego from 1771-1775, missionary Vicente Fuster who served at San Diego from 1773-1777, and missionary Fermín Francisco de Lasuén who served from 1777-1785.³³

To gain insight into activities of the missionaries not included in their letters, I turn to *The Journal of Pedro Font* and the works of missionary Francisco Palóu.³⁴ Pedro Font was a missionary diarist who spent a number of weeks at San Diego during the post-revolt investigation. His observations of captured Kumeyaay and the relationships between missionaries and soldiers at San Diego provide useful insights into tensions at San Diego that were not always explicit in the writings of those directly involved in the events. Palóu was also a missionary and dear friend of Junípero Serra whose works *Historical Memoirs of New California* and *Life and Apostolic Labors of the Venerable Father Junípero Serra* provide a level of detail

³² Zephyrin Engelhardt, *San Diego Mission*, repr. ed. (1920; London: Forgotten Books, 2012); Junípero Serra, *Writings of Junípero Serra*, trans. and ed. Antonine Tibesar, 4 vols. (Washington: Academy of American Franciscan History, 1955-1966), HathiTrust Digital.

³³ Maynard J. Geiger, *Franciscan missionaries in Hispanic California. 1769-1848: A biographical dictionary* (San Marino: The Huntington Library, 1969), 91, 128, 138.

³⁴ Francisco Palóu, *Francisco Palou's Life and Apostolic Labors of the Venerable Father Junípero Serra, Founder of the Franciscan Missions of California*, trans. C. Scott Williams (Pasadena: G.W. James, 1913), HathiTrust Digital Library; Francisco Palóu, *Historical Memoirs of New California*, ed. Herbert Eugene Bolton (New York: Russell & Russell, 1966), 4 vols., HathiTrust Digital Library; Pedro Font, *With Anza to California, 1775-1776: The Journal of Pedro Font, O.F.M.*, trans. and ed. Alan K. Brown (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2011).

about life and circumstances at San Diego that is difficult to find in such depth in other works.³⁵ Similar to the works of the salvage ethnographies previously referenced, these works are also biased, looking to paint Spanish missionaries in a disproportionately positive light. Bearing this in mind, I have treated these sources as I do other missionary letters, as an example of a missionary's opinion of events rather than an objective record of what happened.

What emerges from the study of this rich material is that the 1775 revolt was a flashpoint in a long history of Kumeyaay people resisting against the Spanish. Baptism and Spanish encroachment on Kumeyaay land threatened Kumeyaay culture. As the Kumeyaay came to realize the cultural danger that the Spanish posed, they revolted, burning down the mission, the center of Spanish cultural influence in the area. Spanish punishments in the wake of the revolt discouraged further another armed Kumeyaay attacks. Instead of attacking again, the Kumeyaay protected their culture from the Spanish through linguistic resistance. Kumeyaay translators and leaders, baptized and unbaptized alike, refused to teach the Spanish their language, and in so doing, prevented the Spanish from learning about or influencing their culture.

In chapter one, I describe how Kumeyaay culture and society functioned prior to permanent Spanish settlement in 1769. I illustrate how the variable, unforgiving physical environment of Kumeyaay territory molded their culture, forcing the Kumeyaay to develop flexible and resilient socio-political structures. Because the environment had such an influence on Kumeyaay culture, the land itself is imbued with cultural and spiritual significance. In chapter two, I argue that Spanish permanent settlement in 1769, therefore, posed a cultural threat to the Kumeyaay: if the land was part and parcel of Kumeyaay culture and physical survival then Spanish control of that land imperiled the both. In chapter three, I cover the events of the revolt

³⁵ Palóu, *Historical Memoirs.*; Palóu, *Life and Apostolic Labors.*

itself. I track how a few instances of missionaries attempting to prohibit or control the culture of baptized Kumeyaay exposed more clearly the cultural threats that the Spanish posed.

In chapter four, I describe the investigation that followed the revolt and trace how Spanish punishment of alleged Kumeyaay aggressors may have been interpreted by the Kumeyaay and how they responded. I point to the post-revolt investigation as a watershed moment in which Spanish military punishment of Kumeyaay became a mainstay. Chapter five moves beyond the investigation and analyzes Kumeyaay-Spanish relations after the revolt. It is here that I show how Kumeyaay resistance towards the Spanish changed as a result of Spanish brutality during the investigation proceedings. I argue that the Kumeyaay participated in a pattern of linguistic resistance, refusing to speak Spanish or teach the Spanish Kumeyaay languages, in an attempt to insulate their culture in a manner less likely to provoke further punishment from the Spanish.

Chapter 1: The Kumeyaay Before 1769

“I tell you that on the right-hand side of the Indies there was an island called California... This island was inhabited by black women and there were no males among them... Their armor was made entirely out of gold—which was the only metal on the island—as were the trappings of the fierce beasts they rode once they were tamed.”¹ This is the first appearance of the name “California” in written records in Spain. It appeared in 1510 in Garci Rodríguez de Montalvo’s novel *The Labors of the Very Brave Knight Esplandián*, which reflects the tall tales that swirled around sixteenth century Spain about the then “unexplored” Americas. By the eighteenth century, after two centuries of Spanish interaction with Indians in America, images of beasts and Amazonian women roaming California’s coasts had been traded for a different fiction: that of violent, ignorant, pagan Indians. Two centuries of Spanish colonization in the Americas had reinforced Spanish resolve to expand their borders to gain economic profit and cultural, religious supremacy.

It was this economic and religious agenda, and the accompanying presumption of spiritual, intellectual, and ethnic superiority that legitimized it, that colored Spaniards’ relationship with the Kumeyaay.² Before the first Spanish ships sailed into San Diego, Spanish

¹ Garci Rodríguez de Montalvo, *The Labors of the Very Brave Knight Esplandián* in Rose Marie Beebe and Robert M. Senkewicz, *Lands of Promise and Despair: Chronicles of Early California, 1535-1846* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2015), 11.

² I carefully chose the word “Kumeyaay” by which to refer to the tribe living in the southern California and northern Baja California region. Early anthropologists referred to them as the “Kamia.” Later, scholars began to distinguish groups within the tribe based on linguistic variation, referring to them as the northern “Ipai” and the southern “Tipai.” Most commonly, scholars have used the term “Diegueño,” the name by which the Spanish referred to them as converts of the San “Diego” mission. This term, however, holds little weight since the missions at which Indians were converted are not related to the ethnicity or tribe of the converted. Conversion records substantiate this, showing that members of the Kumeyaay tribe were converted at Mission San Diego, San Miguel, and San Tomas. Furthermore, since my project strives to promote a Kumeyaay perspective in an event in which Spanish record dominates, I

missionaries and military onboard were armed with presumptions and expectations that would dictate how they perceived and interacted with the Kumeyaay. The cultural, political, and economic context from which Spaniards came governed those interactions. An understanding of context, as I will discuss in the next chapter, helps explain why the Spanish acted the way they did and what motivated their actions.

The motivations for Kumeyaay actions may also be understood from a study of their cultural, social, and spiritual context. Determining Kumeyaay motives is less straightforward than determining those of the Spanish since the Kumeyaay were steeped in an oral historical tradition at the time of permanent Spanish settlement.³ Therefore, there is no Kumeyaay-authored written record explaining the motivations driving their actions. We can recapture approximate Kumeyaay perspectives on Spanish actions by reconstructing the framework of their point of view. So, what did Kumeyaay life—cultural customs, spiritual beliefs, agricultural practices, and socio-political systems—look like before permanent Spanish settlement in 1769? Do aspects of their life pre-settlement foreshadow, inform, or explain their response to the invading Spanish? What does this context reveal about how the Kumeyaay may have interpreted Spanish actions?

I argue that there are two central tenets of Kumeyaay life that most influenced their reaction to the Spanish—their intimate relationship with their land and their socio-political

have chosen to refer to them as their stated, as posted on their website, preferred nomenclature, “Kumeyaay.” See Anthony R. Pico, “The Kumeyaay Millennium,” *Kumeyaay.com*, n.d., <https://www.kumeyaay.com/the-kumeyaay-millennium.html>; Ken Hedges, “Notes on the Kumeyaay: A Problem of Identification,” *The Journal of California Anthropology* 2, no. 1 (1975): 71-83, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27824812>; Margaret Field, “Kumeyaay Language Variation, Group Identity, and the Land,” *International Journal of American Linguistics* 78, no. 4 (2012): 557-73, doi:10.1086/667451.

³ Margaret C. Field and Jon Meza Cuero, “Kumeyaay Oral Tradition, Cultural Identity, and Language Revitalization,” *Oral Tradition* 27, no. 2 (2012): 319, doi:10.1353/ort.2012.0013.

flexibility. Their indivisible connection to the land spiritually, culturally, and historically meant that Spanish permanent settlement on their land was likely interpreted as a threat to both their resources and their culture. Their actions when the Spanish first arrived reflect this, including patterns of resistance that correspond to instances of Spanish encroachment on Kumeyaay land. Their relationship with the land comes into view through their refined agricultural practices, oral traditions to transmit horticultural knowledge, and spiritual beliefs which personify the land, encouraging its maintenance and care. Through this lens, their resistance can be understood as an act of cultural defense, aiming to protect both a physical space they understood as sacred and the integrity of their culture that relied comprehensively on the land.

Why it took six years after the initial Spanish arrival for the Kumeyaay to revolt can perhaps be explained by their socio-political flexibility that had evolved in response to the harsh environmental circumstances of their surroundings. The flexible migratory patterns and tribal hierarchies that allowed them to survive in their highly variable environment also equipped them to subvert the Spanish, and continue to resist them, delaying the felt consequences of Spanish settlement that would eventually culminate in rebellion.

It is also important to clarify how I define Kumeyaay concepts and uses of land since it held a position of cultural and spiritual significance that defied Spanish, and even modern, concepts of property. I use words and phrases such as “physical surroundings,” “environment,” “land,” “landscapes,” and “territory” interchangeably to refer to the physical space in which the Kumeyaay lived. I describe how the Kumeyaay used, managed, educated about, and spiritually connected to the land to convey the breadth and depth of their relationship with it. Like many other North American Indian tribes, the Kumeyaay had nothing like the European concepts of land boundaries or ownership. As Biologist Robert Wall Kimmerer, member of the Potawatomi

tribe, puts it, “In the settler mind, land was property, real estate, capital, or natural resources. But to our people, it was everything: identity, the connection to our ancestors, the home of our nonhuman kinfolk, our pharmacy, our library, the source of all that sustained us.”⁴ The Kumeyaay understood the land as a living being, epicenter of the divine, bedrock of personal and collective identity; they were themselves indivisible from the landscape. In the Kumeyaay dialects, the word for land and body are the same—*emutt*.⁵ As politics scholar Michael Hibbard writes, disregarding this intricate relationship with the land, “disempowers and marginalizes indigenous communities and interests, dismissing their cultural, religious, and other concerns.”⁶ Land is referred to as a source of paramount spiritual, agricultural, cultural, and personal significance to the Kumeyaay.

The arrival of the Kumeyaay on what is now California land is still a matter of scholarly debate and archaeological curiosity. They were certainly living within the territory of California by 1150 C.E.⁷ They settled on the banks of Lake Cahuilla, a transient freshwater lake that filled

⁴ Robin Kimmerer, *Braiding Sweetgrass: Indigenous Wisdom, Scientific Knowledge and the Teachings of Plants* (Minneapolis: Milkweed Editions, 2013), 17, ProQuest Ebook Central.

⁵ Louise Russell, “Still Here: Native American Portraits in Place 2, Native American Ideas About Land and Place,” *Kumeyaay.com*, Spring 2019, <https://www.kumeyaay.com/news/475-still-here-portraits-in-place-2-native-american%E2%80%99s-ideas-about-land-and-place.html>.

⁶ Michael Hibbard, Marcus B. Lane, and Kathleen Rasmussen, “The Split Personality of Planning: Indigenous Peoples and Planning for Land and Resource Management,” *Journal of Planning Literature* 23, no. 2 (November 2008): 147, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0885412208322922>.

⁷ Kumeyaay oral histories date their origin on the land to 10,000-12,000 years ago while archaeological estimates contend that the oldest arrival date is closer to 7000 B.C.E. There is scholarly consensus that by at least 1150 C.E. there were Kumeyaay living in the Southern California territory. This was reaffirmed after a 2017 archaeological dig done by archaeologist Lynn H. Gamble in Cuyamaca Rancho State Park. Ethnographer Steven Shackley concluded that the Kumeyaay entered California as a fragment of a prehistoric Arizona tribe, known as the Patayans, after splitting off from the larger tribe around 1000 A.D. See Pico, “The Kumeyaay Millennium.”; Ivano W. Aiello and Patricia M. Masters, “Glacial Evolution of Coastal Environments,” in *California Prehistory: Colonization, Culture, and Complexity*, eds. Terry L. Jones and Kathryn A. Klar (Blue Ridge Summit: AltaMira Press, 2007), 62, ProQuest Ebook

when the Colorado River overflowed and filled the stretch of the San Diego valley that sat below sea level.⁸ The lake teemed with fish, mollusks, aquatic birds, and shoreline vegetation that fed the burgeoning population.⁹ It was massive: roughly 100 miles long, 35 miles wide, and approximately 350 feet deep and took approximately sixty years to evaporate.¹⁰ Along the lake, there is evidence of some of the Kumeyaay's early land management practices, constructing small dams and ditches to divert water to drier areas.¹¹ These practices might have been immaterial to the Kumeyaay's survival, given their proximity to Lake Cahuilla's abundant resources. However, actively controlling and improving the amount of arable land would prove crucial to the Kumeyaay's survival in the more arid environments into which they moved later. These water management practices demonstrate how the Kumeyaay were, as historian and anthropologist Richard Carrico writes, "actively controlling and enhancing their environment and were not the passive foragers often portrayed."¹² Evidence that the Kumeyaay were designing methods to enhance their environment in early development in their new environment illustrates their deep connection to their surroundings.

As their numbers grew, the Kumeyaay expanded from the lake into the mountains, foothills, and valleys of Southern California, and the new environmental challenges they faced in

Central.; M. Steven Shackley, "Prehistory, Archaeology, and History of Research," in *The Early Ethnography of the Kumeyaay*, ed. M. Steven Shackley (Berkeley: Phoebe Hearst Museum of Anthropology, University of California, Berkeley, 2004), 12-36.

⁸ *First People – Kumeyaay*, directed by Nick Nordquist, aired May 20, 2014, on KPBS, <https://www.pbs.org/video/kpbs-presents-first-people/>.

⁹ Richard E. Hughes and Randall Milliken, "Prehistoric Material Conveyance," in *California Prehistory*, 370.

¹⁰ *First People*, Nick Nordquist, KPBS.

¹¹ Hughes and Milliken, "Prehistoric Material Conveyance," 376.

¹² Richard L. Carrico, "Before the Strangers: American Indians in San Diego at the Dawn of Contact," in *The Impact of European Exploration and Settlement on Local Native Americans* (San Diego: Cabrillo Historical Association, 1986), 9.

these spaces led to new forms of agricultural management, especially the practice of careful plant husbandry. The areas in which the Kumeyaay lived were plagued by sudden droughts, floods, and fires.¹³ The Kumeyaay's corresponding land management practices, as historian Kent Lightfoot and archaeologist Otis Parrish write, "enhanced an already diverse world of natural resources."¹⁴ The acorn is an excellent example of California's native ecological diversity. Twenty different species of oak in California produced acorns which formed the basis of the California Indian diet because the bitter nut could be stored in any conditions over long periods of time—making it ideal for times of shortage.¹⁵ Acorns were a staple food source, which the Kumeyaay supplemented with other food crops through plant transplantation, maximizing the quantity and geographic reach of the plant. Shipek explained that "crop variability allowed for more varieties to grow in more locations matching the microclimatic variability and erratic rainfall."¹⁶ By transplanting different plants the Kumeyaay's knowledge of characteristics of the land grew; through a process of trial-and-error they identified which species and plants complemented the environmental conditions of their territory. Transplantation also afforded the Kumeyaay the ability to propagate plants for medicinal purposes.¹⁷

¹³ Florence C. Shipek, "An Example of Intensive Plant Husbandry: the Kumeyaay of Southern California," in *Foraging and Farming: The Evolution of Plant Exploitation*, ed. David R. Harris and Gordon C. Hillman (United Kingdom: Taylor & Francis, 2014), 160, Google Books.

¹⁴ Kent Lightfoot and Otis Parrish, *California Indians and Their Environment: An Introduction* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2009), x.

¹⁵ Martin, A. Baumhoff, *Ecological Determinants of Aboriginal California Populations*, University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology, vol. 49, no. 2 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1963), 161-62.

¹⁶ Florence C. Shipek, "A Native American Adaptation to Drought: The Kumeyaay as Seen in the San Diego Mission Records 1770-1798," *Ethnohistory* 28, no. 4 (1981): 298, doi:10.2307/481135.

¹⁷ Richard L. Carrico, *Strangers in a Stolen Land: Indians of San Diego County from Prehistory to the New Deal*, (San Diego: Sunbelt Publications Inc., 2008), 13.

Transplantation alone could not sustain the Kumeyaay population in the more arid regions, so the Kumeyaay adopted terraced and field planting, using techniques learned through transplantation. New landscapes first seen around Lake Cahuilla demanded the adaptation of water management methods, in a practice akin to irrigation agriculture, in order for Kumeyaay people to survive.¹⁸ These evolved water management methods transformed trickling water into condensed springs and streams that could be tapped for complex plant-husbandry. In newly-flooded lands ethnographer Steven Shackley reports that Kumeyaay “planted maize, beans, and melons,”¹⁹ dining on an assortment of plants. The variety of the species of plants cultivated and consumed reflected both the harshness of the environment that forced the evolution of these practices and the Kumeyaay’s ever-widening knowledge and attention to the land. The combination of fields and water management was so successful and ubiquitous across Kumeyaay territory that the Spanish recorded that “little landscape existed...[they saw] areas with plants so even and regular that they looked planted.”²⁰

In addition to plants and water, a third element of Kumeyaay land management was fire. Numerous scholars, including the aforementioned Kent Lightfoot and Otis Parrish and ethnoecologist Kat Anderson, have argued that fire was fundamental to the Kumeyaay’s ability to thrive in an otherwise barren environment. The Kumeyaay followed a rotating schedule of burnings. Astrological calendars, soil health, and harvest cycles all influenced this schedule.²¹ These burnings encouraged plant growth, eradicated unwanted pests and plant diseases,

¹⁸ Jones and Klar, *California Prehistory*, 376.

¹⁹ M. Steven Shackley, “Prehistory, Archaeology, and History of Research,” in *The Early Ethnography of the Kumeyaay*, ed. M. Steven Shackley (Berkeley: Phoebe Hearst Museum of Anthropology, University of California, Berkeley, 2004), 29.

²⁰ Shipek, “Native Adaptation to Drought,” 298.

²¹ Michael Connolly Miskwish, *Kumeyaay: A History Textbook Precontact to 1893* (El Cajon: Sycuan Press, 2007), 1: 26.

increased the visibility around Kumeyaay settlements, and drove out animals for hunting. With all these uses, Anderson claims that “only widespread, careful, and effective fire management could have supplied the phenomenal quantities of food and raw materials to support the large numbers of people.”²² Fire was a technique used to maximize the productivity of the land—not to modify the landscape—so that large numbers of people could survive in a harsh environment.

The process of passing down this knowledge of various, complex land management practices through oral histories led to the land taking on a spiritual significance and becoming embedded in the Kumeyaay’s cultural roots and rituals. Linguist Margaret Field refers to these oral histories as “cultural property” that “serve as important cultural resources that retain and reinforce cultural values and group identity.”²³ She argues that these histories were a way of socializing children, guiding social practice, reinforcing cultural continuity, and transmitting values of behavior and knowledge.²⁴ “The Story of Chaup” and “The Twins from the Sea” are both examples of oral histories that include land management practices. Throughout “The Story of Chaup,” Earth-Mother recommends her two sons use fire to fulfill everyday tasks: boiling plants, driving out animals, and cooking meat.²⁵ This motif of fire may have been a way of educating people about its utility and applications while the image of a personified Earth-Mother presents the land as a living being. In “The Twins from the Sea,” a creation story, the animals

²² Kat M. Anderson, “The Use of Fire by Native Americans in California,” in *Fire in California’s Ecosystems*, ed. Neil G. Sugihara et al., (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006), 381.

²³ Field and Meza Cuero, “Kumeyaay Oral Tradition,” 321.

²⁴ Field and Meza Cuero, “Kumeyaay Oral Tradition,” 319-322.

²⁵ Mary Elizabeth Johnson, *Indian Legends of the Cuyamaca Mountains* (San Diego: Frye and Smith Printers, 1914), 218-25, Google Books.

that are created are described in terms of “bad animals” and “good things.”²⁶ The bad animals were labeled ones “that people don’t eat, for example crows and roadrunners, they made snakes and bears” and conversely the good ones “made rabbits cottontails and jackrabbits, they say... ‘go, hunt, eat,’ he said.”²⁷ This delineation between edible and non-edible animals may be a way to teach about which animals in Kumeyaay territory should be consumed. Both of these stories weave together knowledge of land management and representations of the living, sacred qualities of the land. These two stories demonstrate how oral histories conveyed both the practical and spiritual beliefs of the land.

The surrounding San Diego territory is a consistent theme across the Kumeyaay’s oral histories and is often used to reinforce cultural identity. An example of this is in the story “The Frog and the Rabbit” which Field defines as part of the “trickster tales” genre of Indian oral histories. Trickster tales are stories that communicate a moral for children.²⁸ In the story of “The Frog and the Rabbit,” the rabbit reluctantly offers his hospitality to a passing frog. The frog proceeds to take advantage of the rabbit’s hospitality, growing so fat on the food that the rabbit gives him that the rabbit is forced out of his burrow by the ungrateful frog.²⁹ Jon Meza Cuero, member of the Kumeyaay tribe and teacher of the Kumeyaay Wildcat singing tradition, says that the moral of the story is to be suspicious of strangers and discerning with those to whom one offers their hospitality.³⁰ With a backdrop of the natural world and a cast of animal characters, these stories teach Kumeyaay children how to behave and act. Nature is the lens through which

²⁶ Margaret Field, ed., *Footsteps Left in the Future: Kumeyaay Stories of Baja California*, by Aldama Cuero, Zeferina, et al., trans. Margaret Field, Ana Daniela Leyva, and Amy Miller (San Diego: San Diego State University Press, 2019), 29.

²⁷ Field, *Footsteps Left in the Future*, 29.

²⁸ Field and Meza Cuero, “Kumeyaay Oral Tradition,” 319.

²⁹ Field and Meza Cuero, “Kumeyaay Oral Tradition,” 325-327.

³⁰ Field and Meza Cuero, “Kumeyaay Oral Tradition,” 327.

young Kumeyaay learn about their world and the norms of their tribe. The natural aspect of oral histories brings together two important aspects of Kumeyaay life: culture and identity. The natural, surrounding environment is used in oral histories both to transmit knowledge and to establish behavioral norms and reinforce cultural identity; land is the criterion by which identity is decided.

Agricultural knowledge was also one of the criteria to hold a position of spiritual prominence. Spiritual plant specialists were the keepers of knowledge on how to increase food supply or where emergency food stores were kept. Spirituality, knowledge, and agriculture blended to produce the Kumeyaay belief in the land as a powerful, living entity.³¹ Their spiritual beliefs identified specific landmarks in Kumeyaay territory, such as a sacred mountain, as foci of this power.³² Doing so tied the Kumeyaay to their specific territory. Knowing just how deeply their spiritual beliefs were grounded in the land is uncertain. Since the Kumeyaay did not construct permanent ceremonial structures, their spiritual history is “archaeologically invisible.”³³ Their spiritual tradition forbids discussions of their spiritual beliefs with those who are not trained shamans, except in extreme circumstances. What limited research does exist, in the words of Shipek, provides only “the barest outlines of their religion.”³⁴ These bare outlines suggest that these beliefs depict the land as a source of spiritual power and ancestral connection, complementing land’s personification in oral histories.

³¹ Shipek, “Native Adaptation to Drought,” 298.

³² Florence C. Shipek, “KUUCHAMAA: The Kumeyaay Sacred Mountain,” *Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology* 7, no. 1 (1985): 67, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27825214>.

³³ Lynn H. Gamble and Michael Wilken-Robertson, “Kumeyaay Cultural Landscapes of Baja California's Tijuana River Watershed,” *Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology* 28, no. 2 (2008): 127, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27825888>.

³⁴ Shipek, “KUUCHAMAA,” 72.

One of the best-documented examples of imbuing landmarks with power and import is the sacred *Kuuchamaa*, also referred to as Tecate Peak. *Kuuchamaa* translates to “exalted one.”³⁵ Shipek, author of the article about *Kuuchamaa*, gained access to information about Kumeyaay spiritual beliefs, in spite of the policy of secrecy, because of extenuating circumstances. Leaders in the Kumeyaay community approached Shipek to write this article to prove the sanctity of the mountain, and her work would validate Kumeyaay claims to halt what was, at the time, a planned construction project on the mountain.³⁶ The Kumeyaay believed that the God Spirit, *Maayhaay*, created the mountain as a place to house the spirit of *Kuuchamaa*, his “prophet,” who later appeared in human form as a powerful shaman.³⁷ After *Kuuchamaa* died in his mortal form, Shipek writes that “in some mystical way the spirit of God and of *Kuuchamaa* remains inside the mountain calling to individuals with special innate abilities for healing and good.”³⁸ Despite the physical death of the human to which the mountain was tied, the mountain continued to be used as a place to seek healing, peace, and more generally be a power for good.³⁹ God had intentionally chosen to place the home of his prophet’s spirit in a mountain in Kumeyaay territory.

This belief that the land is a living home to a divine spirit had two important byproducts. First, presenting sacred beings as embedded in Kumeyaay territory reinforced Kumeyaay identity and sense of belonging to their particular territory. In the example of the story “the Frog and the Rabbit” Cuero reports that in the specific details of a story, the types of vegetation or species of animal mentioned, are ways to represent regional identity in the larger group. Cuero says “Many

³⁵ Shipek, “KUUCHAMAA,” 67.

³⁶ Shipek, “KUUCHAMAA,” 67-69.

³⁷ Shipek, “KUUCHAMAA,” 69-71.

³⁸ Shipek, “KUUCHAMAA,” 70.

³⁹ Shipek, “KUUCHAMAA,” 69.

times, the stories change, especially in different places. They change according to the way the people live in that place...It's the same rabbit, the same point of the story, but told in a different way, from where the storyteller lives. It's an indigenous tradition to be different. Each group has its tradition; you go to a different place, they have their tradition."⁴⁰ Field says these slight changes demonstrate the cultural significance of these stories since storytellers "inject their own community's idiom into them, marking them as symbols of local community identity and making them not only very different from each other but also clearly indexical of the local community."⁴¹ As a result, the Kumeyaay chose to remain close to the beings they revered and from which they received healing power. Environmental scholar Joy H. Greenberg posits that "the personification of the mountain Kuuchamaa thus demonstrates the Kumeyaay sense of autochthony—the spiritual experience of belonging to place...a culture's spiritual attachment to place is expressed in its mythology."⁴² The belief that the land was sacred may well have compelled the Kumeyaay to care for it. Greenberg reports that "studies have shown that belief in the sanctity of the land is linked to greater environmental awareness and concern...providing an expression of the sacredness of places with the goal of protecting them."⁴³ From this point of view, the Kumeyaay's complex land management practices may also be seen as an expression of spiritual devotion or fulfillment of spiritual duty.

The land was home to the souls of deceased ancestors as well. The Kumeyaay believed that the soul continued living after the death of the physical body. Anthropologist T.T. Waterman

⁴⁰ Field and Meza Cuero, "Kumeyaay Oral Tradition," 320-21.

⁴¹ Field and Meza Cuero, "Kumeyaay Oral Tradition," 322.

⁴² Joy H. Greenberg and Gregory Greenberg, "Native American Narratives as Ecoethical Discourse in Land-Use Consultations," *Wicazo Sa Review* 28, no. 2 (2013): 33, doi:10.5749/wicazosareview.28.2.0030.

⁴³ Greenberg and Greenberg, "Ecoethical Discourse," 30-31.

writes that “the spirit of the individual is supposed to linger about the localities and objects with which he was associated during life.”⁴⁴ The belief that ancestors lived in the territory reinforced Kumeyaay connections to their physical surroundings. The land was their home, the home of divine spirits, and the home of their ancestors. This meant that inhabiting and using the land, as anthropologist Tim Ingold noted, was “to carry out an act of remembrance, and remembering not so much a matter of calling up an internal image, stored in the mind, as of engaging with an environment that is itself pregnant with the past.”⁴⁵ By this logic, simply living on the land was a spiritual experience. The belief in ancestral habitation of the land reinforced the sense of identity Kumeyaay derived from the land. Their belonging to the land was, as described by historian and anthropologist Mircea Eliade, “the religious experience of autochthony; the feeling is that of belonging to a place, and it is a cosmically structured feeling that goes far beyond family.”⁴⁶

How this connection to specific locations could be maintained in an environment whose unpredictable climate necessitated frequent movement can be explained by tribal flexibility. Just as Kumeyaay land management practices evolved to meet the unpredictable and harsh circumstances of the environment, so too did their socio-political structures and cultural customs. The tribe was separated into territorial “bands” measuring about 10-30 miles and including a central village and a few homes on the outskirts of the village located beside water sources.⁴⁷

Roughly 5-15 familial lineages were represented in each of the 50-75 total bands recorded by the

⁴⁴ T. T. Waterman, *The Religious Practices of the Diegueño Indians*, vol. 8, no. 6 (Berkeley: The University Press, 1910), 278.

⁴⁵ Tim Ingold, “The Temporality of the Landscape,” *World Archaeology* 25, no. 2 (June 2010): 152-53, <https://doi.org/10.1080/00438243.1993.9980235>.

⁴⁶ Mircea Eliade, *The Sacred and the Profane: The Nature of Religion* (New York: Harper & Row, 1961), 140.

⁴⁷ Florence C. Shipek, “Kumeyaay Socio-Political Structure,” *Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology* 4, no. 2 (1982): 297, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27825128>.

Spanish at initial contact. Lineages were intentionally spread across bands to cross-cut the territorial groupings with familial relationships.⁴⁸ Each band was led by a male captain, known as a *Kwaaypaay*, whose primary roles included mediation of disputes between band members, managing inter-band relations, and coordinating with tribal shamans to determine harvest ceremonies and migratory patterns based on environment cues.⁴⁹ These bands were self-governing, autonomous political entities that were united via a network of courier systems that functioned on a network of trails.⁵⁰

This system allowed the Kumeyaay the flexibility to adapt to the unpredictable environment. Distribution of familial lineages across the whole band organization improved tribal cohesion across large numbers and distances and facilitated movement within the band, particularly in times of scarcity. Shipek writes that by grouping families as parts of the larger whole, there was “increased tribal or national level Kumeyaay integration”⁵¹ wherein, as ethnographer Steven Shackley put it, there was a “certain amount of affinity between widely separated lineages that facilitated the exogamous requirements of the group.”⁵² Anthropologists Lynn H. Gamble and Michael Wilken-Robertson note that the “flexible band organization allowed for fluctuations in group size, so that when resources were relatively scarce, groups could break into smaller units and spread out across the landscape.”⁵³ In other words, when the land on which a band lived could not support the whole band, the band would break apart based on family in a bid to maximize the amount of land occupied. Shipek supports this interpretation

⁴⁸ Anthony R. Pico, “The Kumeyaay Millennium,” *Kumeyaay.com*, n.d., <https://www.kumeyaay.com/the-kumeyaay-millennium.html>.

⁴⁹ Shipek, “Socio-Political Structure,” 298.

⁵⁰ Pico, “The Kumeyaay Millennium.”

⁵¹ Shipek, “Socio-Political Structure,” 302.

⁵² Shackley, “Prehistory, Archaeology, and History,” 33-34.

⁵³ Gamble and Wilken-Robertson, “Kumeyaay Cultural Landscapes,” 131.

writing that “the total dispersal of able-bodied persons...maximized the number of people who could survive a food shortage.”⁵⁴ Kwaaypaay did not inhibit the flexibility of familial movement either. The Kwaaypaays’ authority was understood as neither centralized nor absolute, and the observance of his orders was decided on an individual basis. Shipek claims a Kwaaypaay was followed “because of his greater knowledge and managerial abilities...because he knew more about food resource availability.”⁵⁵ Individual decision-making protected the individual’s independence and self-sufficiency, things that would be required in times of shortage, such as when bands split into self-sustained families. Movement among climates and landscapes was necessary to acquire food, so the socio-political structure evolved to support population shifts.

Another example of their flexibility is their use of harvesting ceremonies to achieve both an agricultural and cultural goal. Harvesting ceremonies that occurred in the fall gathered together multiple bands. Since many plants in the desert transitional have a small window of time in which they are edible, large numbers of people participating in the harvest ensured no food went to waste.⁵⁶ Some of the largest ceremonies were the annual acorn and pine nut harvests that would take place in October or November when the ripened nuts would fall from the trees. Ceremonies were typically an involved process of gathering, separation, storage, and shelling of the nuts.⁵⁷ Besides the agricultural benefit, the harvests also stimulated cultural exchange as cross-band alliances were strengthened, stories shared, and cultural customs reinforced. Kumeyaay tribe member Stanely Rodriguez in an interview for a 2014 PBS

⁵⁴ Shipek, “Native Adaptation to Drought,” 299.

⁵⁵ Shipek, “Socio-Political Structure,” 298.

⁵⁶ *First People*, Nordquist, KPBS.

⁵⁷ Leslie Spier, “Southern Diegueño Customs,” in *The Early Ethnography of the Kumeyaay*, ed. M. Steven Shackley (Berkeley: Phoebe Hearst Museum of Anthropology, University of California, Berkeley, 2004), 334.

documentary about the Kumeyaay described the harvest ceremonies as “bringing [Kumeyaay] people back together. It brings that communal spirit when we gather the agave, when we gather the acorns, when we gather chia, when we go and gather piñon, when we go into the ocean and gather the mussels. It reaffirms our territory; this is our land; this is our holy land; this is our promised land.”⁵⁸ The timing and location of these ceremonies varied based on each year’s weather. The ceremonies were neither a time bound nor location-specific medium to pass on knowledge, preserve culture, and reinforce national tribal cohesion.⁵⁹ The Kumeyaay could move at different times yet feel connected to the land; they could meet as a tribe at irregular intervals yet consider themselves parts of the larger whole; they could pass on knowledge and culture while simultaneously fulfilling agricultural needs.

The ceremonies, tribal hierarchy, and band system were all adapted to meet the variable conditions of the climate. To survive in a territory where food and water were unreliable, the Kumeyaay developed ways of cultivating the land to maximize food supply, to survive as a tribal unit, and to create the traditions that ensured their cultural survival. Shipek referred to the measures they developed to survive as “stress-induced cultural responses.”⁶⁰ Both the agricultural and cultural responses required an intimate connection to the land. The Kumeyaay learned which plants to grow, where. They used oral histories to pass on knowledge of how to cultivate the land. These histories were educational, spiritual, and cultural, so land became more than a source of survival. It became a source of tribal, personal, and spiritual identification. Oral histories encoded land culture as well as knowledge, so the land was personified in their spiritual beliefs. It was a power for good, a source of healing; inseparable from the individual.

⁵⁸ *First People*, Nordquist, 00:18:11, KPBS.

⁵⁹ Gamble and Wilken-Robertson, “Kumeyaay Cultural Landscapes,” 131.

⁶⁰ Shipek, “Native Adaptation to Drought,” 299.

Spirituality, oral histories, and agricultural management created what some refer to as a culture of place that, as Anderson eloquently put, is when land “not only fed the human spirit but also instructed people in right and wrong behavior and how they were obligated to nature.”⁶¹

Socio-political flexibility supported these agricultural needs and helped propagate this culture across the Kumeyaay’s vast territory and unpredictable environment. Bisecting the formal band tribal structure with familial lineages meant that the tribe could feel united via familial relationships; pre-existing and natural family loyalties did the work of ensuring tribal cohesion. The de-centralized authority of Kwaaypaay stimulated the individual contribution in agricultural work necessary to feed the larger tribe. By maintaining flexible locations of living, the Kumeyaay could migrate relatively painlessly to respond to any changes in the environment. The use of harvesting ceremonies provided a flexible venue for cultural exchange within the context of an agricultural event. Designing ceremonies based on the environment inherently made them adaptable since the environment itself was unpredictable. The Kumeyaay were equipped to move geographically, exchange culture in non-specific times or places, and, at their core, adapt.

This context of Kumeyaay connection to the land and adaptability are reflected in their actions, as the next chapter shows. When the Spanish permanently settled on Kumeyaay territory in 1769, their settlement cordoned off a section of Kumeyaay land, violating Kumeyaay understanding of land and disrupting their cultural space. Seizure of land took away not only possible resources but also space imbued with spiritual reverence and rooted in the Kumeyaay identity. Seemingly suspicious and angered, the Kumeyaay responded and adapted to the new

⁶¹ Kat Anderson, *Tending the Wild: Native American Knowledge and the Management of California's Natural Resources* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005), 56, ProQuest Ebook Central.

challenges of the Spanish presence, as they had responded and adapted to their environment for generations.

Chapter 2: The Spanish Arrival and Settlement

On July 16, 1769, in San Diego, California, a group of Spanish Franciscan missionaries and military soldiers along with some recently-baptized Indians, raised a cross that marked the establishment of the Mission San Diego.¹ It was the first mission and the closest Spanish outpost to Mexico, so it served as the link between the Spanish in Mexico and in California.² Although other Spaniards had traversed sections of California, including parts of San Diego, as early as the sixteenth century, the new mission heralded renewed efforts to convert Indians of the California coast to Catholicism and colonize Indigenous territory. Mission San Diego was founded in the territory of the Kumeyaay people. It is doubtful that the arriving Spanish knew the specifics of Kumeyaay culture or society, since their knowledge of California Indians was based on broad descriptions from early Spanish explorer logs.³

Still, the Spanish strode into San Diego, equipped with little prior knowledge of the people with whom they interacted. With the base understanding that chapter one provided for who the Kumeyaay were before the permanent settlement of the Spanish, the question arises of how the initial interactions between the Spanish and Kumeyaay impacted Kumeyaay life. More specifically, what effects did the Spanish have on Kumeyaay life between their arrival in 1769 and the relocation of Mission San Diego in 1774?

¹ Francisco Palóu, report on the five California missions, December 10, 1773, in *The Proto Mission: A Documentary History of San Diego de Alcalá*, comp. and ed. Francis J. Weber (Hong Kong: Libra Press Limited, 1980), 14.

² Steven W. Hackel, *Children of Coyote, Missionaries of Saint Francis: Indian-Spanish Relations in Colonial California, 1769-1850* (Chapel Hill: Published for the Omohundro Institute of Early American History and Culture, Williamsburg, Virginia, by the University of North Carolina Press 2005), 142, Apple Books.

³ Juan Rodriguez Cabrillo, diary entry, September 28, 1542 in Zephyrin Engelhardt, *San Diego Mission*, repr. ed. (1920; London: Forgotten Books, 2012), 3.

To answer these questions, it is important to understand the socio-political and religious motivations for Spanish activities in California. The Spanish, including the missionaries, royal officials, soldiers in California, and the government sending orders from Spain, had a shared goal of trying to turn the California Indians, in this case the Kumeyaay, into Spanish subjects. Historian Kent Lightfoot characterized their goal as to “create a reliable, subservient labor class that would imitate, to some degree, the cultural practices of the dominant order.”⁴ The missionaries’ primary goal was to baptize Kumeyaay into the Catholic faith; the soldiers’ was to turn the Kumeyaay into a labor force for the Crown. In theory, the two worked toward the shared goal of making subjects out of the Kumeyaay, but in practice, the two often came into conflict over questions of whose agenda took priority.⁵ What the two could agree on was that they travelled to San Diego with the intention of subjugating the Kumeyaay, not to learn or co-exist with them.

The Spanish Catholic Church, the primary authority of the missionaries, and the Spanish government, the primary authority of the soldiers and secular officials, shared a goal, but had different motivations. For the Spanish Catholic Church, California provided an opportunity to baptize California Indians into the Catholic faith. Baptism in Catholic doctrine was understood as a means of “saving” souls from the spiritual damnation that followed should one die without having been baptized in the Catholic church. Serra, head missionary of the California mission project, described in a letter to a friend that the Kumeyaay were “an abundant harvest of souls that can easily be gathered into the bosom of our Holy Mother the Church.”⁶ By baptizing

⁴ Kent G. Lightfoot, *Indians, Missionaries, and Merchants: The Legacy of Colonial Encounters on the California Frontiers* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005), 20.

⁵ Hackel, *Children of Coyote*, 684.

⁶ Junípero Serra to Juan Andrés, July 3, 1769, JSC 185, Junípero Serra Collection, Santa Barbara Mission Archive Library.

Kumeyaay people, the missionaries could fulfill the religious imperative of baptizing as many “souls” as possible.⁷

For the Crown, the purpose of baptizing Kumeyaay people was for economic gain.⁸ Before the Spanish arrived in San Diego in 1769 to settle permanently, other Spanish forces had spent three centuries baptizing Indigenous people and colonizing Indigenous land in Latin America. Their experience, beginning with the expeditions of Christopher Columbus in the 1490s, taught them the value of Indigenous labor. In the words of Columbus himself, “the Indians of Española were and are the greatest wealth of the island, because they are the ones who dig, and harvest, and collect the bread and other supplies, and gather the gold from the mines, and do all the work of men and beasts alike.”⁹ California had abundant, and potentially lucrative, natural resources, but the Spanish needed labor to extract them. A subjugated Indian population could serve as an inexpensive, dispensable labor force that would work the land at minimal cost, providing the resources to sustain Spanish colonies and profit the Spanish government.¹⁰

The Spanish would need to make California Indians subjects of the Crown so as to, in the words of Historian Kent Lightfoot, “create a reliable, subservient labor class that would imitate, to some degree, the cultural practices of the dominant order.”¹¹ The Spanish sought to remake the California Indians—culturally, linguistically, spiritually—in the image of the Spanish. Their mission project was undoubtedly economically motivated, but it hinged on cultural colonization.

⁷ Francisco Palóu, *Francisco Palou's Life and Apostolic Labors of the Venerable Father Junípero Serra, Founder of the Franciscan Missions of California*, trans. C. Scott Williams (Pasadena: G.W. James, 1913), 259, HathiTrust Digital Library.

⁸ Lightfoot, *Indians, Missionaries, and Merchants*, 53.

⁹ Christopher Columbus quoted in David Treuer, *The Heartbeat of Wounded Knee: Native America from 1890 to the Present* (New York: Riverhead Books, an imprint of Penguin Random House LLC, 2019), 50, Apple Books.

¹⁰ Columbus in Treuer, *Heartbeat of Wounded Knee*, 53.

¹¹ Lightfoot, *Indians, Missionaries, and Merchants*, 20.

Catholicism was an essential part of the identity of a Spanish subject, so if the Crown wanted to make the Indians “Spanish,” it would need them to be baptized Catholic.

In this chapter, I argue that the Spanish disrupted Kumeyaay life principally by settling and using natural resources on land in the Kumeyaay territory. Other ways in which the Spanish angered the Kumeyaay were by Spanish soldiers committing sexual abuse and through failed trade dealings. However, between 1769-1774, the only instances of violent Kumeyaay resistance occurred because of loss of sovereignty over land. A two-year-long drought coupled with the introduction of invasive species and destructive agricultural practices by the Spanish reduced the resources available to support the Kumeyaay. Loss of land threatened not just the survival of Kumeyaay individuals but also that of their entire culture because, as discussed in the last chapter, Kumeyaay culture and land were intertwined. The Kumeyaay fought the Spanish over land because it was essential to their physical *and* cultural survival.

Three Spanish ships left Mexico for San Diego, but only two arrived there in July 1769, with the ship carrying their supplies lost at sea. The surviving Spanish were in poor condition.¹² Serra wrote that “the situation was so dire that if they had not found the port right away, everyone would have died.”¹³ Only one hundred of the roughly two hundred men who had left for San Diego arrived alive, and of those still living, most were suffering from acute starvation and scurvy.¹⁴ At first, the Spanish tried to build a makeshift infirmary on the beach for the sick

¹² Engelhardt, *San Diego Mission*, 9-10.

¹³ Junípero Serra to Francisco Palóu, July 3, 1769, in Rose Marie Beebe and Robert M. Senkewicz, *Junípero Serra: California, Indians, and the Transformation of a Missionary*, Before Gold: California under Spain and Mexico, ed. Rose Marie Beebe and Robert M. Senkewicz, vol. 3 (Norman: The University of Oklahoma Press, 2015), 190, Google Books.

¹⁴ Thomas C. Patterson, *From Acorns to Warehouses: Historical Political Economy of Southern California's Inland Empire* (Walnut Creek: Left Coast Press, 2015), 54, Google Books.

men, but without supplies, those already severely ill were likely to die.¹⁵ Scurvy in particular meant a horrible death as it is described as “softening your bones, and your flesh dents like putty, and you spit out your teeth like stones.”¹⁶ On nineteenth century Spanish maps, the beach on which the ailing men were lying is named *Playa de Los Muertos*, which translates to Beach of the Dead.¹⁷

These initial scenes on the beach, particularly the grisly way in which the men were dying, were significant because they were the Kumeyaay peoples’ first prolonged exposure to the Spanish foreigners. Spanish explorers had crossed through Kumeyaay territory before but never stayed long enough to construct a permanent settlement.¹⁸ The images of men dying on the beach likely left the Kumeyaay suspicious of who the Spanish were and what they brought with them. These gothic scenes of dying men probably only validated the well-documented Kumeyaay cultural trait of suspicion towards outsiders described in chapter one. In an attempt to ingratiate themselves, Spaniards offered nearby Kumeyaay food, which they repeatedly refused, perhaps out of fear that the food was the cause for the Spaniards’ sickness. Kumeyaay individuals did, however, offer the Spanish sage soup in exchange for cloth and beads.¹⁹ Initial Kumeyaay reactions to Spanish arrival suggest that the Spanish made them uneasy, so Kumeyaay people

¹⁵ Gregory Orfalea, *Journey to the Sun: Junípero Serra's Dream and the Founding of California* (New York: Scribner, 2014), 512, Apple Books.

¹⁶ Ronald L. Ives, “The Lost Discovery of Corporal Antonio Luis: A Desert Cure for Scurvy,” *The Journal of Arizona History* 11, no. 2 (1970): 14, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41695553>.

¹⁷ Roger Newton, “A Monument to an Event that Never Happened,” *The Journal of San Diego History* 62, no. 3 and 4 (2016): 329, <https://sandiegohistory.org/journal/2016/july/a-monument-to-an-event-that-never-happened/>.

¹⁸ Anthony R. Pico, “The Kumeyaay Millennium,” *Kumeyaay.com*, n.d., <https://www.kumeyaay.com/the-kumeyaay-millennium.html>.

¹⁹ Orfalea, *Journey to the Sun*, 512.

kept interactions with Spaniards to a minimum and only interacted with them, at first, for a limited amount of trade.

Kumeyaay-Spanish interaction deteriorated less than a month after the Spaniards' arrival. Even though Kumeyaay culture did not include the concept of private property, foreign use of their territory without gifts or trade would have at least been considered rude and at most theft. Trade was common between the Kumeyaay and members of other California Indian tribes who passed through or hunted in Kumeyaay territory. Trade served as a sign of respect or a form of payment in exchange for using the land. The fact that the Spanish failed to compensate the Kumeyaay for settling and using resources on Kumeyaay land Hackel described as a "blunt rejection of basic rituals of diplomacy."²⁰

The construction of the mission, however rudimentary, could have signaled to the Kumeyaay that the Spanish intended to settle on the land, instead of just passing through it. Another party settling on Kumeyaay land was at least an imposition.²¹ Spanish permanent settlement meant the Kumeyaay could no longer live, plant, or harvest on that land, possibly disrupting their food supply or migration patterns.²² The cultural implications of Spanish permanent settlement were even more serious. As detailed in the last chapter, the Kumeyaay drew a spiritual, personal, and tribal sense of identity from the land, so yielding it was akin to losing some of their shared and individual identity.²³

²⁰ Hackel, *Children of Coyote*, 102.

²¹ Michelle Marie Lorimer, *Resurrecting the past: The California Mission Myth* (Pechanga: Great Oaks Press, 2016), 134.

²² Richard L. Carrico, *Strangers in a Stolen Land: Indians of San Diego County from Prehistory to the New Deal* (San Diego: Sunbelt Publications Inc., 2008), 27.

²³ Pico, "The Kumeyaay Millennium."

A series of skirmishes at the Spanish camp starting in mid-August of 1769 were the first instances of armed conflict between Kumeyaay individuals and the Spanish new arrivals.²⁴ On August 14, during a time when Spanish soldiers had left the Spanish settlement mostly unguarded, a small group of Kumeyaay entered the camp and stole cloth wherever they could find it—including out from under sick men.²⁵ Hackel argues that these first, non-violent raids were intended “not to kill but rather to plunder and humiliate.”²⁶ The raids angered the Spanish soldiers in particular, but Serra insisted that the Kumeyaay participating in the raid not be harmed, probably so as not to alienate further the people he aimed to baptize.²⁷ A day later a group of Kumeyaay returned again, presumably to seize more Spanish goods.²⁸ In response, Palóu recounts that Spanish soldiers yelled “to arms!” and proceeded to slip on their leather jackets and begin shooting at the Kumeyaay, who responded with a volley of arrows. Palóu puts it that “a regular battle ensued.”²⁹ Spanish eyewitness accounts estimate that three Kumeyaay to the Spanish’s one died.³⁰

These initial raids demonstrate the nearby Kumeyaay animosity towards the Spaniards and their permanent settlement. Anthropologist Anthony Kroeber described the Kumeyaay’s response as “quite different from the passiveness with which the other Californians received the new religion and life... passionately devoted to the customs of their fathers... In short, they

²⁴ Beebe and Senkewicz, *Junípero Serra*, 192.

²⁵ Engelhardt, *San Diego Mission*, 27.

²⁶ Steven W. Hackel, *Children of Coyote, Missionaries of Saint Francis: Indian-Spanish Relations in Colonial California, 1769-1850* (Chapel Hill: Published for the Omohundro Institute of Early American History and Culture, Williamsburg, Virginia, by the University of North Carolina Press 2005), 158, Apple Books.

²⁷ Engelhardt, *San Diego Mission*, 28.

²⁸ Engelhardt, *San Diego Mission*, 27.

²⁹ Francisco Palóu, *Historical Memoirs of New California*, ed. Herbert Eugene Bolton (1926; New York: Russell & Russell, 1966), 2: 253, HathiTrust Digital Library.

³⁰ Palóu, *Historical Memoirs*, 2: 253.

possessed their share of resoluteness.”³¹ The first raids in August could be seen as inquisitive or taunting, but the armed, group nature of the August 15 encounter shows that Kumeyaay’s anger was enough to merit a willingness to attack. Trade relations gone sour, potential competition for food resources, and even a broader cultural threat each possibly added to Kumeyaay bitterness towards the Spanish.

After the fight on August 15, the Kumeyaay moved inland, away from the Spanish camp.³² Why the Kumeyaay retreated is unclear. Letters from the missionaries at San Diego at this time attributed the Kumeyaay retreat to fear after witnessing the fatal power of Spanish firearms. Palóu reported afterwards that “the sad lesson they had learned in their last undertaking, induced the savages to treat us with respect and to conduct themselves in a manner far different from formerly.”³³ Perhaps the negative effects of permanent Spanish settlement on Kumeyaay land did not outweigh the possible consequences of a large-scale conflict. Another potential explanation was that the Spanish settled on a small area of land, certainly threatening Kumeyaay resource use and culture, but not to such a degree that it merited continued conflict. Regardless, Kumeyaay raids of the Spanish settlement stopped.

After the August raids, the Spanish focused their attention on finding water and food that would support the mission and revive the ailing men. These efforts were unsuccessful. Serra desperately wrote, “should we see that hope and supplies are vanishing, I shall remain here alone with Father Juan Crespi and hold out to the very last.”³⁴ It was the last-minute arrival of a supply

³¹ Kroeber, *Handbook of the Indians of California* (Washington: Government Print Off, 1925), 711, HathiTrust.

³² Palóu, *Historical Memoirs*, 2: 253.

³³ Palóu, *Historical Memoirs*, 2: 253.

³⁴ Junípero Serra to Francisco Palóu, February 10, 1770 in Engelhardt, *San Diego Mission*, 33.

ship in the spring of 1770 that saved the settlement from folding completely.³⁵ As will be discussed throughout the next chapter, at San Diego especially, difficulty creating a stable food supply constantly haunted the Spanish. In 1770, Palóu penned that a flood carried away all the crops, and the following year a drought withered any of their re-sown vegetation.³⁶ Agricultural efforts at the mission floundered in the face of San Diego's notoriously mercurial environment.

With the missionaries focused on their efforts to make San Diego agriculturally productive and the Kumeyaay sequestered inland, interaction between the two was minimal until 1774. During this interim period, the missionaries constructed a mission chapel out of wood posts and tulle and a complex of adobe private rooms for missionaries.³⁷ They succeeded in baptizing roughly 100 Kumeyaay by 1774.³⁸ The one exception to this rare interaction was soldier sexual assault of Kumeyaay women, a behavior the missionaries frequently rebuked. With a relatively small number of baptisms and news of soldiers misconduct second-hand through missionaries, it's hard to get a comprehensive picture of how Kumeyaay saw the Spanish.

What does emerge from the record available is that the relationship between the Kumeyaay and Spanish seems to have worsened. The primary reason for this was the soldiers' sexual abuse of Kumeyaay women. The construction of the presidio military fort adjacent to the mission in early 1770 brought Spanish soldiers into close contact with those Kumeyaay women who periodically visited the mission.³⁹ Soldiers would also routinely venture out on horseback

³⁵ Engelhardt, *San Diego Mission*, 36-37.

³⁶ Palóu, *Historical Memoirs*, 3: 227-232.

³⁷ Francisco Palóu to Viceroy, December 10, 1773 in Engelhardt, *San Diego Mission*, 50.

³⁸ Junípero Serra, report on the California missions, February 5, 1775, in Engelhardt, *San Diego Mission*, 58.

³⁹ Engelhardt, *San Diego Mission*, 32.

and ride far from the Spanish settlement to seek out Kumeyaay women.⁴⁰ Missionary Luis Jayme, head missionary at Mission San Diego as of 1772, reported multiple instances of Spanish soldiers raping or gang raping Kumeyaay women.⁴¹ Horrified, Jayme wrote that “what the Devil did not succeed in accomplishing among the pagans, is accomplished by the Christians.”⁴² Jayme brought these offenses to the attention of the Spanish-appointed governor of California, Pedro Fages, who punished the accused soldiers only at first. After the instances became more numerous, Fages no longer followed through on punishing, or even reprimanding, the accused men despite ongoing mistreatment of Kumeyaay women.⁴³ Fages’ nonchalance would have sent a message to both the soldiers and to the nearby Kumeyaay. To the soldiers, his inaction showed their illegal behavior would go unpunished. Spanish “law” on the frontier existed only insofar as those Spaniards in positions of authority were willing to enforce it. To the nearby Kumeyaay, his inaction inspired outrage. Jayme feared that “the gentiles therein many times have been on the point of coming here to kill us all.”⁴⁴ Jayme tended to agree with their outrage, saying that many of the soldiers “deserve to be hanged on account of the continuous outrages they are committing in seizing and raping women.”⁴⁵ The continued sexual assault of nearby Kumeyaay women

⁴⁰ Luis Jayme to Raphael Verger, October 17, 1772, in *Letter of Luis Jayme, O.F.M.: San Diego, October 17, 1772*, trans. and ed. Maynard J. Geiger (Los Angeles: Dawson's Book Shop for the San Diego Public Library, 1970), 39-40.

⁴¹ Luis Jayme to Raphael Verger, October 17, 1772, in *Letter of Luis Jayme*, 39-40, 45-47.

⁴² Engelhardt, *San Diego Mission*, 42.

⁴³ James A. Sandos, *Converting California: Indians and Franciscans in the Missions* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004), 56, ProQuest Ebook Central.; Luis Jayme to Raphael Verger, October 17, 1772, in *Letter of Luis Jayme*, 39.

⁴⁴ Luis Jayme to Raphael Verger, October 17, 1772, in *Letter of Luis Jayme*, 39.

⁴⁵ Luis Jayme to Raphael Verger, October 17, 1772, in *Letter of Luis Jayme*, 38.

would have bred deep resentment towards the Spanish, in particular the soldiers, but did not spark further armed altercations between the Spanish and Kumeyaay.⁴⁶

Another reason Spanish-Kumeyaay relations deteriorated was the growing effect of the Spanish settlement on native Kumeyaay land. The Spanish released animals on Kumeyaay land to graze on vegetation that would otherwise have been harvested to feed the Kumeyaay. Jayme blames the soldiers who “turned their animals into [Kumeyaay] fields and ate up their crops,”⁴⁷ depleting supplies of native grasses and seeds.⁴⁸ The Spanish also, unintentionally, introduced foreign plant species that would ultimately decimate local species. Hackel called this “ecological imperialism”⁴⁹ in which the Spanish livestock, weeds, and plant species spread like a disease, radiating out from the mission, pushing to extinction native species of plants and animals on which the Kumeyaay had relied for food. As Hackel sees it, these invasive species were Spain’s greatest weapon: “Spaniards came equipped with unwitting silent armies of pathogens, plants, and animals that rendered them and their institutions nearly invincible.”⁵⁰

Tensions between Spaniards and Kumeyaay were exacerbated as food supply was diminished further because of a drought in San Diego between 1771-1772.⁵¹ The Kumeyaay had adapted to life in a harsh, extremely variable environment. Everything about their culture—from their nomadic lifestyle to their clan structure—was a way to adapt to what their environment required. The tribe would typically have responded to a phenomenon as common as a drought in

⁴⁶ Mike Connolly, “Kumeyaay—Spanish Contact,” *Kumeyaay.com*, n.d., <https://www.kumeyaay.com/kumeyaay-spanish-contact.html>.

⁴⁷ Luís Jayme to Raphael Verger, October 17, 1772, in *Letter of Luís Jayme*, 40.

⁴⁸ Carrico, *Stangers in a Stolen Land*, 27.

⁴⁹ Hackel, *Children of Coyote*, 218.

⁵⁰ Hackel, *Children of Coyote*, 218.

⁵¹ Lester B. Rowntree, “Drought During California's Mission Period, 1769-1834,” *Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology* 7, no. 1 (1985): 14, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27825210>.

arid San Diego by changing migration patterns, planting schedules, or harvesting schedules. With food stores diminished because of the drought, the Kumeyaay living near the Spanish settlement and beyond, where disease had begun to transform the landscape, were likely to have felt more acutely the impacts of having less land.⁵² The Spanish now jeopardized the Kumeyaay's survival.

In sum, the effects that the Spanish permanent settlement had on Kumeyaay life could primarily be boiled down to a cultural and physical threat. At a granular level, sexual abuse of soldiers physically threatened Kumeyaay women. Spanish livestock grazing on Kumeyaay land and the spread of newly-introduced pathogens consumed food resources that could physically threaten the survival of the Kumeyaay. Beyond the land's utility, its place as a source of personal and collective identity for the Kumeyaay meant that others living on it permanently threatened the Kumeyaay culturally.

In the last months of 1774, Kumeyaay land would only be further encroached upon. Jayme appealed to a Spanish Viceroy in April 1773 to be allowed to move the mission inland, next to a Kumeyaay village. He argued in his letter that the move inland would ensure a reliable supply of water, facilitate the baptism of new Kumeyaay, and put a physical buffer between the presidio and mission that would keep Kumeyaay women safer from soldiers.⁵³ What the mission relocation would do was heighten tensions between the Spanish and Kumeyaay that would then explode into revolt less than a year later.

⁵² Florence C. Shipek, "A Native American Adaptation to Drought: The Kumeyaay as Seen in the San Diego Mission Records 1770-1798," *Ethnohistory* 28, no. 4 (1981): 295, doi:10.2307/481135.

⁵³ Luis Jayme to Junípero Serra, April 3, 1773, in Weber, *Proto Mission*, 17.

Chapter 3: The Revolt

Native American anthropologist David Truer began his book *The Heartbeat at Wounded Knee: Native America from 1890 to Present* with this quote: “There is a tendency to view the European settlement of North America, and the corresponding decimation of many tribes and cultures, as sudden and inevitable. It was neither.”¹ This is true of the 1775 revolt. For five years, those Kumeyaay who lived near the Spanish permanent settlement in San Diego largely avoided it. Avoidance became much harder in August of 1774 when Spanish missionaries relocated Mission San Diego next to the Kumeyaay village of Nipaguay.² This new proximity allowed the Spanish missionaries to observe Kumeyaay life at Nipaguay and to become more familiar with Kumeyaay culture. For the Kumeyaay at Nipaguay, watching daily missionary life made them even more concerned about, and suspicious of, the Spanish.

In the first six months after the mission’s move, baptisms continued at the same slow pace they had before the mission moved. Most of the 176 baptized Kumeyaay, as of February 1775, only visited the mission twice per month for mass, and otherwise lived in their villages practicing their culture and living a life in which baptism made them Catholic in name only.³ Normally, baptized California Indians lived in the missions, but Spanish missionaries could not house Indians they could not feed.⁴ Because the missionaries’ agricultural trouble continued at

¹ David Truer, *The Heartbeat of Wounded Knee: Native America from 1890 to the Present* (New York: Riverhead Books, an imprint of Penguin Random House LLC, 2019), 45, Apple Books.

² Junípero Serra, statistical report on the five California missions, February 5, 1775, in Zephyrin Engelhardt, *San Diego Mission*, repr. ed. (1920; London: Forgotten Books, 2012), 56.

³ Junípero Serra, statistical report on the five California missions, February 5, 1775, in Zephyrin Engelhardt, *San Diego Mission*, 58.

⁴ Luís Jayme to Raphael Verger, October 17, 1772, in *Letter of Luís Jayme, O.F.M.: San Diego, October 17, 1772*, trans. and ed. Maynard J. Geiger (Los Angeles: Dawson's Book Shop for the San Diego Public Library, 1970), 33.

the mission's new location, it could not support more than a few baptized Kumeyaay. Baptized Indians living at the missions was a key ingredient to the Spanish goal of cultural colonization.⁵ Historian Robert Archibald stressed that "Christianity insists on monogamy and stresses sedentary living."⁶ Life at the mission in theory allowed the Spanish to accomplish two things at once, prohibit the use of Indigenous culture and enforce the use of Spanish culture, neither of which the missionaries could do full-time at San Diego. While I could not find an exact figure, later statistics suggest that Mission San Diego could support roughly four percent of the total baptized Kumeyaay at one time.⁷ As a result, Kumeyaay, baptized or not, only spent a couple of days a month at the mission.

This rate of baptisms increased meaningfully through the summer and fall of 1775. The earlier figure of 176 total baptized Kumeyaay in the summer of 1774 increased almost threefold by the fall of 1775 for a total of 480 baptized Kumeyaay.⁸ By then, Jayme had become fluent in a Kumeyaay dialect, and as a consequence, he ventured farther into Kumeyaay territory, preaching in their native tongue and baptizing higher numbers of Kumeyaay.⁹ The expanding Spanish influence probably worried at least some of the Kumeyaay.

⁵ Steven W. Hackel, *Children of Coyote, Missionaries of Saint Francis: Indian-Spanish Relations in Colonial California, 1769-1850* (Chapel Hill: Published for the Omohundro Institute of Early American History and Culture, Williamsburg, Virginia, by the University of North Carolina Press 2005), 613, Apple Books.

⁶ Robert Archibald, "Indian Labor at the California Missions—Slavery or Salvation?," *The Journal of San Diego History* 24, no. 2 (Spring 1978), <https://sandiegohistory.org/journal/1978/april/labor/>.

⁷ Fages, report on the California missions, 1787, in Engelhardt, *San Diego Mission*, 121.

⁸ Richard L. Carrico, *Strangers in a Stolen Land: Indians of San Diego County from Prehistory to the New Deal*, (San Diego: Sunbelt Publications Inc., 2008), 32; James A. Sandos, *Converting California: Indians and Franciscans in the Missions* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004), 58, ProQuest Ebook Central.

⁹ Maynard J. Geiger, *Franciscan missionaries in Hispanic California. 1769-1848: A biographical dictionary* (San Marino: The Huntington Library, 1969), 129.

Three events that happened in the summer-to-fall period in 1775 revealed the potential cultural consequences for the Kumeyaay community as a whole. In short succession, these three events exposed the potential costs to Kumeyaay culture that came with the new spike in baptisms. Baptisms in and of themselves do not seem to have alarmed the Kumeyaay. The cultural and behavioral expectations that missionaries began to impose, did.

If missionaries and the baptisms they performed were the primary threat to Kumeyaay culture, then attacking the mission was one way to stop this threat. Destroying the physical structure of the mission would deal a formidable blow to the alarming missionary influence and power. Knifing tapestries and melting down silver chalices and crosses hindered the missionaries' ability to hold masses. Murdering Jayme erased the Spanish linguistic bridge to the Kumeyaay and restored a barrier that would keep their worlds separate culturally.

The relocation of the San Diego mission in 1774 brought the Kumeyaay at Nipaguay in contact with everyday life at the mission. It is impossible to know exactly what individual Kumeyaay at Nipaguay thought about their neighboring missionaries, but it surely would have been strange for the Kumeyaay to observe Spanish agricultural practices, such as herding livestock, which were so foreign.¹⁰ How the Spanish were able to tame and domesticate a herd of animals was likely puzzling for a people who captured only a few rabbits or fawns at a time.¹¹ The guns that the Spanish soldiers visiting the mission carried would have been shocking, shooting much farther than the bows and arrows the Kumeyaay used, and emitting sounds like thunder.¹² Shipek posits that the Kumeyaay understood these foreign objects and practices as

¹⁰ Florence C. Shipek, "California Indian Reactions to the Franciscans," *The Americas* 74, no. 2 (2017): 483-84, muse.jhu.edu/article/671736.

¹¹ Shipek, "Indian Reactions to Franciscans," 483.

¹² Shipek, "Indian Reactions to Franciscans," 483.

proof that the Spanish were powerful shamans, since only those who had acute spiritual powers would be able to manipulate technology and nature in such a way.¹³ Shamans in Kumeyaay communities were highly trained specialists who could wield their power for good or bad purposes. Rosalie Pinto Robertson, a Kumeyaay leader, said that when a shaman did not use their power for good, “you had better do something right quick or he would do something bad to you.”¹⁴ If the Kumeyaay viewed the Spanish as powerful shamans, they had the motive and the means to do harm.

Some Spanish missionary cultural practices likely also caused fear among the Kumeyaay at Nipaguay. For example, the missionaries used self-flagellation as a routine act to demonstrate religious piety. Clerical historian Francis Guest writes that self-flagellation was such an essential part of missionary life that it “was almost as much a part of their spiritual life as their rosary, or even their missal or breviary.”¹⁵ In contrast, in Kumeyaay culture, whippings were used for only those guilty of the most heinous crimes of murder or rape.¹⁶ They were the worst punishment one could receive, considered even worse than death. Kumeyaay who were whipped were exiled from their communities, and some felt so ashamed that they committed suicide.¹⁷ Given the frequency of missionaries’ self-flagellation and the Kumeyaay’s proximity to the mission, the Kumeyaay at Nipaguay almost certainly observed these practices. Taken in the context of

¹³ Shipek, “Indian Reactions to the Franciscans,” 484.

¹⁴ Delfina Cuero and Florence C. Shipek, *The Autobiography of Delfina Cuero, a Diegueño Indian*, ed. Sylvia Brakke Vane, trans. Rosalie Pinto Robertson (Banning: Malki Museum Press, 1970), 50.

¹⁵ Francis F. Guest, “Cultural Perspectives on California Mission Life,” *Southern California Quarterly* 65, no. 1 (1983): 15, doi:10.2307/41171019.

¹⁶ Shipek, “Indian Reactions to Franciscans,” 484.

¹⁷ Shipek, “Indian Reactions to Franciscans,” 484.

Kumeyaay culture, scenes of the missionaries regularly whipping themselves may have given the Kumeyaay the impression that the missionaries had committed grave wrongdoings.

Another point of contention was Spanish use of Kumeyaay natural resources intended for the benefit of those living in the village of Nipaguay. Shipek posits that Kumeyaay at Nipaguay viewed the Spanish as thieves for hunting on their land without permission and for releasing their cattle onto the Kumeyaay's fields, ruining their carefully cultivated crop.¹⁸ She further suggests that Spanish use and destruction of natural resources on which the Kumeyaay at Nipaguay relied caused starvation for the most food insecure, the ailing widows and orphans.¹⁹

From the Spanish perspective, use of Kumeyaay land was a necessary part of sustaining the missionaries amid continued agricultural problems. In practice, agricultural success eluded the missionaries. The annual December 1774 mission agricultural report recorded that San Diego reaped no bushels of either corn or beans while other California missions were reporting quantities of 150 and 240 bushels of each crop.²⁰ A missionary passing through San Diego wrote that he "found that the Fathers had tightened the cord around their waist,"²¹ looking gaunt after living off fractions of the standard rations.

Missionary accounts give conflicting messages about whether they felt that the baptized Kumeyaay living outside of the mission due to agricultural troubles, in fact, returned to practicing their Indigenous culture after leaving the mission. Father Rafael Verger, a missionary who served briefly at San Diego, proudly reported that "[the baptized] have been well-established in spirit of faith, to such a degree, that when none of the missionary priests are

¹⁸ Shipek, "Indian Reactions to Franciscans," 482.

¹⁹ Shipek, "Indian Reactions to Franciscans," 483.

²⁰ Junípero Serra, statistical report on the five California missions, December 31, 1774, JSC 491, Junípero Serra Collection, Santa Barbara Mission Archive Library.

²¹ Juan Crespí to Francisco Palóu, May 21, 1772, in Engelhardt, *San Diego Mission*, 43.

present, they do not in any way want to communicate with the non-converted.”²² On the other hand, Pedro Font complains that “under these conditions, the Christians were only such in name, and more or less like the pagans, weak in Christianity, free to live as they pleased.”²³ Most other missionary accounts echo Font’s sentiments that baptized Kumeyaay did not practice Christian behavior when they were allowed to live outside the mission.²⁴

Font’s opinion seems more plausible. It is unlikely that the baptized Kumeyaay understood that they were not supposed to continue participating in their culture away from the mission. With a language barrier between the Spanish and Kumeyaay until 1775, the Kumeyaay probably gauged Spanish expectations by their actions. Observation was a powerful communicator, and until late 1775, no Spanish actions the Kumeyaay would have observed would have indicated they had to relinquish their culture when they were baptized. There is also nothing to suggest that the Kumeyaay interpreted the Spanish culture as a more desirable alternative to their own. In fact, the opposite is true: Kumeyaay individuals at multiple turns resisted the changes the Spanish attempted to make to their Indigenous culture.

This raises the question of why the Kumeyaay would agree to be baptized in the first place. If the baptized Kumeyaay continued to practice their culture, what was the purpose or appeal of being Catholic, in the words of Font, “only such in name”? Why would some Kumeyaay choose baptism after years of distancing themselves from the Spanish permanent settlement? The answer is unclear. One possible explanation is that the Kumeyaay saw baptism

²² Rafael Verger to Lanz de Casafonda, October 27, 1771, JSC 274, Junípero Serra Collection, Santa Barbara Mission Archive Library, translation mine.

²³ Pedro Font, diary entry, January 11, 1776 in Engelhardt, *San Diego Mission*, 70.

²⁴ Fermín Francisco de Lasuén to José Gasol, June 16, 1802, in Zephyrin Engelhardt, *The Missions and Missionaries of California*, vol. 2 (San Francisco: The James H. Barry Company, 1912), 586-587.

as little more than a means to free themselves of the incessant Spanish evangelization. With the relocation of the mission, it is possible that especially for those living at Nipaguay the pleadings of the missionaries were constant. Baptism does not seem to have required any meaningful change in a Kumeyaay's life other than going to the mission twice a month on Sunday and for Catholic holidays, something that does not seem like it would have been an onerous commitment, especially for the Kumeyaay who lived in Nipaguay. Another possible reason is curiosity.²⁵ The religious iconography, sacramental objects, and church ceremony which the Kumeyaay at Nipaguay experienced perhaps inspired some to join in the ceremonies. Some Kumeyaay could genuinely have felt drawn to Catholicism. What individual baptized Kumeyaay people understood about Catholicism, given the language barrier and time spent away from the mission, is unknown, but it is still plausible that some individuals baptized for the spiritual attraction of Catholicism and genuinely participated in, not resisted, the Catholic ceremonies.

The number of Kumeyaay baptisms increased in the late summer of 1775, likely because of Jayme's efforts. Serra reported that, by this point, Jayme had gained fluency in a Kumeyaay dialect, and he had even authored a polyglot catechism.²⁶ This was a recent development. In a letter in 1772, Jayme spoke of needing a translator "either to learn the [Kumeyaay] language or to teach the Christians and gentiles."²⁷

Fluency afforded Jayme two principal advantages. He could now communicate with the Kumeyaay more effectively, preaching Catholic doctrine and understanding Kumeyaay responses to it. He could also probably travel more efficiently, without military escorts. Letters

²⁵ Mike Connolly, "Kumeyaay—Spanish Contact," *Kumeyaay.com*, n.d., <https://www.kumeyaay.com/kumeyaay-spanish-contact.html>.

²⁶ Geiger, *Franciscan Missionaries*, 129.

²⁷ Luís Jayme to Raphael Verger, October 17, 1772, in *Letter of Luís Jayme*, 33.

from one missionary at San Diego in the 1780s discuss how without linguistic fluency they had to travel with a military guard to provide protection and navigation.²⁸ This limited how fast and how far a missionary could travel, reducing the number of Kumeyaay a missionary could access and potentially baptize. Thanks to his fluency, Jayme could travel farther and faster into Kumeyaay territory.

Despite his language skills and lack of military escort, Jayme was not always welcome at new villages, which would imply that the thousands of Kumeyaay individuals living across hundreds of miles did not hold a singular opinion about the Spanish. How often Kumeyaay people interacted with the Spanish, how close they lived to their settlements, and how much contact they had with other Kumeyaay people living near the Spanish probably all influenced their opinions. Carrico projects that Kumeyaay exposure to the military branch of the Spanish was limited to “a narrow coastal strip no wider than thirty miles and about twenty miles east.”²⁹ Missionaries baptismal efforts took them distances of up to forty-five miles.³⁰

With linguistic fluency and without an armed escort, Jayme began pushing deeper into inland Kumeyaay villages.³¹ Based on Mission San Diego baptismal records analyzed by Sandos, from July to September of 1775, he baptized almost three hundred new Kumeyaay.³² This sharp

²⁸ Fermín Francisco de Lasuén, *Writings of Fermín Francisco de Lasuén*, trans. and ed. Finbar Kenneally (Washington: Academy of American Franciscan History, 1965), 2: 83.

²⁹ Richard L. Carrico, “Castigating the Insolent Ones: Native Resistance and the Spanish Military, The Pa’mu Incident,” *Journal of San Diego History* 63, no. 3/4 (Spring 2017). <https://sandiegohistory.org/journal/2018/july/castigating-the-insolent-ones-native-resistance-and-the-spanish-military-the-pamu-incident/>.

³⁰ Juan Figuer, entry in Mission San Diego Baptismal Register, August 30, 1784, in Engelhardt, *San Diego Mission*, 134-135.

³¹ Richard L. Carrico, “Sociopolitical Aspects of the 1775 Revolt at Mission San Diego de Alcalá: An Ethnohistorical Approach,” *Journal of San Diego History* 43, no. 3 (Summer 1997), <https://sandiegohistory.org/journal/1997/july/missionrevolt/>.

³² James A. Sandos, *Converting California: Indians and Franciscans in the Missions* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004), 68, ProQuest Ebook Central.

rise in baptisms was cause for Kumeyaay concern. Hackel supposes that “particularly galling was the Franciscans’ attempt to extend Spanish authority into the countryside and interfere with their own customary right.”³³ The geographic reach of the Spanish for years had been confined to the beach on which they first settled. Now a Spanish permanent settlement had moved adjacent to a Kumeyaay village and Spanish missionaries were venturing farther inland. It was harder for the Kumeyaay to retreat, as they had between 1769 and the mission relocation in 1774.

Just as the Kumeyaay at Nipaguay first regarded the actions of the missionaries with suspicion, then alarm, the rise in baptisms followed a similar pattern. As mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, there were three events that seem to have caused alarm to become revolt. These events were a Kumeyaay person witnessing another group of Kumeyaay laboring for the Spanish, a group of baptized Kumeyaay being flogged for having participated in a traditional Kumeyaay dance, and the missionaries’ threatening Nipaguay’s Kwaaypaay and his brother with punishment. Taken together, these events probably revealed for many Kumeyaay the implications of baptism as the Spanish saw them. The Spanish had intended for baptized Kumeyaay to reject their Indigenous culture, but it was not until the fall of 1775 that there were consequences for the Kumeyaay’s not doing so. The language barrier that existed between the Spanish and the Kumeyaay until the summer of 1775 would have made it difficult for the Kumeyaay to understand Spanish intentions, even if the Spanish had explicitly stated them.

The first event occurred in the summer of 1775. A Kumeyaay man, named Yguetin, along with a group of other Kumeyaay people, visited a nearby mission and saw other Kumeyaay people who lived north of Mission San Diego laboring for the Spanish.³⁴ Carrico writes that this

³³ Hackel, *Children of Coyote*, 614.

³⁴ Francisco Ortega, “Revolt of the Indians, Burning of the Mission, Death of the Missionary, November 30, 1775,” *Provincial State Papers*, Benicia, Military, 1:473 cited in Richard L.

scene that Yguetin witnessed “raised the Indians’ fears that they too would soon be subjected to the same work.”³⁵ Why else would the fiercely independent Kumeyaay work for the Spanish, toiling the very the land they had lived on and managed differently for generations? Spanish conscription of Kumeyaay people required Kumeyaay laborers to go against their culture of independence and semi-nomadism. This was an unwelcome change because of both the cultural loss and seemingly forced manual labor.³⁶ With what Yguetin witnessed, more Kumeyaay would have become aware of the implications of the Spanish presence, whose effect was on the rise thanks to Jayme’s success in baptisms. While this example did not clearly demonstrate a connection between baptism and a loss of culture, it did serve as a powerful indicator to some Kumeyaay of what cultural changes the Spanish could inflict.

A more explicit example of how baptized Kumeyaay were expected to change their culture came in October of 1775. Vicente Fuster, the other missionary serving at San Diego with Jayme, encountered a group of baptized Kumeyaay attending a traditional Kumeyaay dance. Dances were a common form of Kumeyaay spiritual and cultural expression.³⁷ Anthropologist T.T. Waterman writes that the Kumeyaay “ascribe great importance to religious dances...each [dance] appropriate to a particular ceremony.”³⁸ Nearly every occasion—from war to mourning and birth to adolescence—had a particular song and dance that accompanied it. Fuster interpreted their attendance as a violation of their cultural expectations of baptism, which required them to

Carrico, “Sociopolitical Aspects of the 1775 Revolt at Mission San Diego de Alcalá: An Ethnohistorical Approach,” *Journal of San Diego History* 43, no. 3 (Summer 1997), <https://sandiegohistory.org/journal/1997/july/missionrevolt/>.

³⁵ Carrico, “Sociopolitical Aspects.”

³⁶ Cuero and Shippek, *Delfina Cuero*, 53.

³⁷ T. T. Waterman, *The Religious Practices of the Diegueño Indians*, vol. 8, no. 6 (Berkeley: The University Press, 1910), 281-84.

³⁸ Waterman, *Religious Practices*, 281.

renounce their Indigenous culture. Sandos adds that by equating baptism with cultural renunciation, the missionaries “left themselves no alternative but to regard subsequent Indian behavior that violated Christian standards as sinful.”³⁹ He continues by saying that the missionaries took the Kumeyaay practice of their own culture even after baptism “not for what is was—a failure to adopt Christianity in the ways the priests intended—but for what is was not—evidence of Indian moral turpitude.”⁴⁰ The missionaries saw Kumeyaay participation in their Indigenous culture as a moral infraction that they took upon themselves to correct. Fuster ordered that the baptized Kumeyaay who had attended the dance be flogged at the mission, and he even threatened to burn down the village.⁴¹

Based on the research presented earlier in this chapter about the significance of whippings in the Kumeyaay culture, it is reasonable to conclude that the Kumeyaay people who were aware of the floggings were horrified, outraged, or both. A missionary had ordered this violent, shameful punishment for a group of Kumeyaay whose only recorded offense was participating in a cultural practice. To be whipped for participating in a common and important ritual would have made the punishment seem all the more severe in the eyes of the Kumeyaay. Since only the baptized Kumeyaay were punished, the negative consequences of baptism were probably now painfully apparent to more Kumeyaay.

For the Spanish, whipping did not hold the same cultural weight as it did for the Kumeyaay. Sandos points out that floggings were a mechanism “supposed to accomplish the

³⁹ James A. Sandos, *Converting California: Indians and Franciscans in the Missions* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004), xv, ProQuest Ebook Central.

⁴⁰ Sandos, *Converting California*, xv.

⁴¹ Maynard J. Geiger, *The Life and Times of Fray Junípero Serra, O.F.M.; or, the Man Who Never Turned Back, (1713-1784), a Biography* (Washington: Academy of American Franciscan History, 1959), 60, HathiTrust Digital Library.

Indians' conversion and pacification that Franciscans and Spanish authorities sought."⁴² Another significant detail about this flogging was that a missionary was the one who ordered it, though it is not likely that Fuster was the one who ultimately delivered it since the military more commonly were responsible for carrying out the punishment. Before this incident, the missionaries had not participated in any way in violence against the Kumeyaay. This was no longer the case.

The final, and most significant, example of missionary incursion on Kumeyaay life before the revolt also came in October of 1775. It started when two baptized Kumeyaay brothers named Chisli and Canuch⁴³ allegedly stole fish from a small group of elderly, unbaptized Kumeyaay women.⁴⁴ Hackel writes that the two brothers "believed they were entitled to the woman's catch."⁴⁵ This was probably because Chisli was the Kwaaypaay at Nipaguay, a title which could have allowed him to claim the resources of the other Kumeyaay living in the village.⁴⁶ The affronted women complained to the missionaries. In response, the missionaries sought punishment for the two brothers who subsequently fled, along with five other Kumeyaay, to avoid punishment.⁴⁷

It is revealing that non-baptized Kumeyaay women sought help from the missionaries for a conflict among Kumeyaay people. Their actions suggest that certain Kumeyaay viewed the Spanish, specifically the missionaries, as a policing force on Kumeyaay life. Hackel posits that

⁴² Sandos, *Converting California*, 10.

⁴³ Commonly referred to in Spanish material and other scholarship by their Spanish names Carlos and Francisco.

⁴⁴ Gregory Orfalea, *Journey to the Sun: Junípero Serra's Dream and the Founding of California* (New York: Scribner, 2014), 711, Apple Books.

⁴⁵ Hackel, *Children of Coyote*, 738.

⁴⁶ Carrico, *Strangers in a Stolen Land*, 36.

⁴⁷ Hackel, *Children of Coyote*, 738-740.

the motivation for them to go to the missionaries could have been their way to challenge Kumeyaay authority, pursuing retribution for a high-ranking Kwaaypaay in an effort to “confront a hierarchy that left [them] at the bottom.”⁴⁸ Even in this interpretation of their actions, the Spanish are a viable counter-authority to Kumeyaay leadership. Despite the fact that only a minority of Kumeyaay had been baptized and those that were baptized spent the majority of their time away from the mission, missionary influence in Kumeyaay life was significant enough that unbaptized Kumeyaay women could take their grievance with a leader of their tribe to a Spanish missionary.

Spanish soldiers pursued the brothers and the five other Kumeyaay people but were unsuccessful in bringing them back.⁴⁹ Scholars have argued the Spanish pursuit of the brothers galvanized the desire of some Kumeyaay people to retaliate. Historian Stephen Hyslop notes that “chiefs led largely by example and relied more on persuasion than compulsion...unwittingly, the friars strengthened [Chisli] as a rebel leader by sending troops after him.”⁵⁰ To the brothers, the Spanish military pursuit probably reinforced the feeling that an outsider had made them outlaws. A Kumeyaay leader fleeing under threat of punishment and another group of Kumeyaay actually receiving punishment from the missionaries drove home the consequences of the growing missionary presence.

The two brothers and five other Kumeyaay travelled to rural Kumeyaay villages beyond the mission, calling for other Kumeyaay people to join them in their armed resistance against the

⁴⁸ Hackel, *Children of Coyote*, 738.

⁴⁹ Hackel, *Children of Coyote*, 738.

⁵⁰ Stephen G. Hyslop, *Contest for California: From Spanish Colonization to the American Conquest*, Before Gold: California Under Spain and Mexico Series, ed. Rose Marie Beebe and Robert M. Senkewicz, vol. 2 (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2019), 70.

Spanish.⁵¹ Historian George Hardwood Phillips surmises that the group of runaway Kumeyaay “had come to the conclusion that Christianity was detrimental to Indian interests and sought to rid the region of its propagators.”⁵² Their campaign to rise up against the Spanish was not unanimously supported, however. Carrico comments that “the autonomous structure of the Kumeyaay villages made large-scale collective resistance difficult—but not impossible.”⁵³ The same socio-political flexibility that afforded the Kumeyaay independence and made them well-adapted to live in the harsh San Diego environment also meant that it was nearly impossible to ensure the participation of all Kumeyaay bands, since each experienced and interpreted the threat of the Spanish differently. Carrico reiterates that the bands “each maintained their own alliances exclusive of each other and that even in a time of mutual danger, they operated independently.”⁵⁴ At least fourteen villages agreed to participate in the revolt. The pattern of which villages chose to participate followed along the lines of military affiliations and familial lineages of Chisli and Canuch.⁵⁵

Interestingly, Kumeyaay baptisms surged in the month of October. Over 100 Kumeyaay were baptized in October 1775 alone, tallying to a total of 480 baptisms by November.⁵⁶ Most scholars seem to agree that this was not a coincidence. Baptism was a tactic used to infiltrate the mission by those Kumeyaay who planned to revolt. Sandos writes that inundating the mission with new Kumeyaay was a tactical plan with two intended effects. First, the number of

⁵¹ Elias Castillo, *A Cross of Thorns: the Enslavement of California's Indians by the Spanish Missions* (Fresno: Craven Street Books, 2015), 372, Apple Books.

⁵² George Hardwood Phillips, *Chiefs and Challengers: Indian Resistance and Cooperation in Southern California* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1975), 30-31.

⁵³ Carrico, *Strangers in a Stolen Land*, 32.

⁵⁴ Carrico, *Strangers in a Stolen Land*, 36-37.

⁵⁵ Carrico, *Strangers in a Stolen Land*, 36.

⁵⁶ Sandos, *Converting California*, 58.

Kumeyaay would “disorient” the Spanish as they scrambled to teach, feed, or possibly find a solution to house the influx of people.⁵⁷ Second, baptized Kumeyaay visiting the mission could act as informants to feed information to the revolt leaders.⁵⁸ For the baptized Kumeyaay to communicate with the readying forces beyond the mission, “runners,” carried messages to-and-from the mission an intricate network of trails and people.⁵⁹

Just before the revolt, some Kumeyaay people warned Jayme that they had heard rumors that other Kumeyaay intended to kill missionaries and soldiers. Jayme not only brushed aside these reports, but was so confident in their falsity that he threatened to whip the interpreters relaying these warnings if they bothered him with such rumors again.⁶⁰ Font writes that “[Jayme] thought it to be impossible that his Indians should do such a thing to him, since he loved them very much and was as good to them as he could be.”⁶¹ Ultimately, Jayme’s confidence in his positive relationship with all Kumeyaay would prove to be misplaced.⁶²

A group of an estimated 600-1,000 Kumeyaay sat poised to strike the mission under the light of the full moon on November 4, 1775. The plan was for the attacking Kumeyaay to split into two groups. One group would begin by lighting the presidio on fire while a second group at the mission would wait until they saw flames at the presidio to set the mission ablaze.⁶³ The

⁵⁷ James A. Sandos, “Between Crucifix and Lance: Indian-White Relations in California, 1769-1848,” *California History* 76, no. 2/3 (1997): 209, doi:10.2307/25161667.

⁵⁸ Sandos, *Converting California*, 58.

⁵⁹ Carrico, *Strangers in a Stolen Land*, 33; Hubert Howe Bancroft, *History of California: 1542-1800* (San Francisco: A.L. Bancroft & Company, 1884), 1: 254-255, HathiTrust Digital Library.

⁶⁰ Geiger, *Life and Times*, 60.

⁶¹ Pedro Font, *With Anza to California, 1775-1776: The Journal of Pedro Font, O.F.M.*, trans. and ed. Alan K. Brown (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2011), 191.

⁶² Vicente Fuster to Junípero Serra, November 28, 1775, JSC 583, Junípero Serra Collection, Santa Barbara Mission Archive Library, translation mine.

⁶³ Fuster to Serra, November 28, 1775, Junípero Serra Collection, translation mine.; Font, *With Anza to California*, 190.

presidio and mission were lightly guarded at this time. A few days prior, the Lieutenant at San Diego's presidio, José Ortega, had taken a group of the soldiers at San Diego farther north to found the new Mission San Juan Capistrano, leaving both the mission and presidio vulnerable. His relocation of the guards provided the perfect opportunity for the Kumeyaay to strike.⁶⁴

At around one o'clock in the morning, a group of Kumeyaay crept onto the mission settlement. Before the group at the presidio had the chance to light the first fire, the second group of Kumeyaay at the mission, likely by accident, set fire to the mission. Having lost the element of surprise, the group at the presidio abandoned their plan to burn the presidio, instead joining the ranks at the mission.⁶⁵ The Kumeyaay's ill will towards the missionaries, after the whippings, threatened punishments, and conversions of the past few months, seems to have played out in the way they attacked the mission. They did not just burn the structure of the mission, they targeted Catholic ceremonial objects: smashing stone chests holding vestments, carrying away images of revered figures, and melting pounds of silver into a pool of metal.⁶⁶

After ransacking the church, the Kumeyaay used firebrands to set the tulle thatch roofs of the mission ablaze.⁶⁷ Two soldiers in the mission's guardhouse, awakened by the fire, took to arms. The Kumeyaay assailants wounded, but did not kill, the two guards, who, still half-asleep, left the guardhouse without leather armor.⁶⁸ Roused by the sound of gunshots coming from outside, Fuster awoke. Taken entirely by surprise, Fuster writes "I came running, and I asked the soldiers: What is this? And I had barely uttered it, when I saw around my body so many arrows, that it is not possible to guess, that I had no other action than to take my cloak with, and join up

⁶⁴ Orfalea, *Journey to the Sun*, 711.

⁶⁵ Font, *With Anza to California*, 190.

⁶⁶ Font, *With Anza to California*, 191.

⁶⁷ Font, *With Anza to California*, 191.

⁶⁸ Font, *With Anza to California*, 192.

on the same wall as the guards.”⁶⁹ The soldiers and Fuster hid in an adobe building to shield themselves from a “horde of burning firebrands raining down.”⁷⁰ Inside the building, Fuster used his cloak to keep the barrels of gunpowder from igniting while the soldiers took cover and fired at the Kumeyaay forces. The Kumeyaay siege continued for hours. As the Spanish anxiously awaited the protection of daylight, Fuster writes that “there were so many arrows, stones, and pieces of adobe and coals that they threw at us that it seemed they were trying to bury us...they shot us with arrows so many arrows that the sky appeared cloudy.”⁷¹ Fuster’s words illustrate the fervor of the Kumeyaay to destroy the mission building.

By morning, with casualties on both sides, the Kumeyaay retreated. Nearly all of the mission compound had burned, and only walls of adobe buildings survived the blaze. The Kumeyaay attackers had killed a Spanish carpenter, blacksmith, and soldier while the Spanish had killed a handful of Kumeyaay soldiers.⁷² Notably missing from the band of besieged Spanish survivors was Jayme. Fuster raced around looking for him. A group of converted Kumeyaay living at the mission and loyal to the Spanish found him alongside the river. Fuster described the moment he found him in his account of the revolt:

when his figure registered in my eyes, I saw him completely disfigured, and I knew his death had been utterly cruel...I saw him fully naked even from his plain dress, his chest and body pierced like a sieve by the fierce jabs that they gave him, and his face all crushed by the hard blow of clubs and stones: finally, I can only recognize that it was Padre Luis when my eyes registered the whiteness of his body and the fringes of his hair on his head.⁷³

⁶⁹ Vicente Fuster to Junípero Serra, November 28, 1775, JSC 583, Junípero Serra Collection, Santa Barbara Mission Archive Library, translation mine.

⁷⁰ Font, *With Anza to California*, 192.

⁷¹ Fuster to Serra, November 28, 1775, Junípero Serra Collection, translation mine.

⁷² Font, *With Anza to California*, 192.

⁷³ Fuster to Serra, November 28, 1775, Junípero Serra Collection, translation mine.

Jayme had been so brutally beaten to death that his face was beyond recognition. Eighteen arrows skewered his body.⁷⁴ The other Spanish who died did not suffer the same beating. When analyzed together with the destruction of mission books and ceremonial objects, it seems that Jayme's uniquely brutal murder was intentional. Because he was the one most equipped to baptize new Kumeyaay people and expand the missionary presence, as the only missionary fluent in both Spanish and Kumeyaay, the Kumeyaay killed him. Killing Jayme destroyed one of the greatest Spanish tools to attract and retain converts—communication. Without Jayme, the language barrier was restored.

Once the attacking Kumeyaay were gone, Fuster catalogued the destruction. Font recounts that “the Fathers were entirely destitute, their books, manuscripts, etc., having all been destroyed in the fire. The censer, the chalice used at the holy Mass, and pieces of coin used in ceremonies of marriage, had been melted a solid mass. The missionaries retired to the presidio, where they huddled together bereft of every comfort.”⁷⁵ If the attacking Kumeyaay's intention in destroying ceremonial church objects was to curb the Spanish's ability to hold religious ceremonies, it had worked.⁷⁶ Fuster implored Spanish officials to resume the celebration of masses, writing that “for now I beg Your Reverence to help me with some precious ornaments to celebrate...to help this poor, scorched mission with what is necessary for the church.”⁷⁷ To emphasize the urgency of his need, Fuster wrote that “I'll send you the incense burner so that you can appreciate the tremendous damage caused by the voraciousness of the fire: the

⁷⁴ Bancroft, *History of California*, 1: 252.

⁷⁵ Pedro Font, diary entry, January 11, 1776 in Engelhardt, *San Diego Mission Engelhardt, San Diego Mission*, 71.

⁷⁶ Hackel, *Children of Coyote*, 434.

⁷⁷ Vicente Fuster to Junípero Serra, November 28, 1775, JSC 583, Junípero Serra Collection, Santa Barbara Mission Archive Library, translation mine.

remaining silver of the pyx, chalice, altar cruets, lectern, urns, and decorative braids of the ornaments...there is nothing left but the bells.”⁷⁸ Along with the ornaments, Serra notes as well that all books of the church burned.⁷⁹

The comprehensive destruction of ceremonial objects can be interpreted a number of ways. It could be seen as an act of retribution. The Kumeyaay probably felt after the October whippings that the missionaries had injured members of their community and attempted to punish and prohibit their cultural practices. The Kumeyaay responded in kind by destroying what the missionaries cherished—religious ornaments that were used regularly. Another way of interpreting it is that the Kumeyaay looked to eliminate the means for the Spanish to educate them and attract them to the mission. It seems that many Spaniards believed large gold and silver objects drew the Indians to the mission.⁸⁰ If the Kumeyaay also believed this to be true, then the destruction of these objects would result in fewer baptisms, curtailing the influence the Spanish had on Kumeyaay life. The destruction of the catechism, used to educate the Kumeyaay in Christian principles, served the same purpose.

In the immediate aftermath of the revolt, as Fuster and the soldiers hurried to send news of the destruction of San Diego to other missions, they deflected blame for the revolt from themselves. The conclusion that many Spanish accounts drew was that the increase in baptisms in the summer of 1775 provoked the devil to work through the Kumeyaay. Palóu, who arrived at San Diego only a few weeks after the revolt, wrote:

undoubtedly, the jealous archenemy realized that in this territory paganism was doomed: that the missionaries by their whole-souled energy and apostolic zeal were weakening his stronghold little by little banishing heathenism from the vicinity of the port of San

⁷⁸ Fuster to Serra, November 28, 1775, Junípero Serra Collection, translation mine.

⁷⁹ Junípero Serra to Antonio María Bucareli, December 15, 1775, JSC 589, Junípero Serra Collection, Santa Barbara Mission Archive Library, translation mine.

⁸⁰ Galvéz cited in Palóu, *Historical Memoirs*, 1: 57.

Diego...Satan to revenge himself upon those who had snatched so many souls from his infernal clutches. Malice, of course, led Satan to incite a few new Christians, not yet as grounded in the faith, to rise and Rebellion for the purpose of putting an end to the mission... They wanted to kill the missionaries because they intended to abolish paganism by converting all to Christianity.⁸¹

Baptisms were a manifestation of a larger problem of missionary involvement and alteration of Kumeyaay life.

On December 13, soldiers at San Diego personally handed to Commander Fernando Rivera y Moncada a letter containing news of the destruction at San Diego. He tore it open, and upon reading it, decidedly to travel directly to Serra to tell him the news. Bursting into Serra's room located at another mission in California, Rivera y Moncada proudly stated, according to Font, "the Indians have rebelled, burned the mission, and killed Father Fray Luis. But one thing pleases me greatly and that is that they did not kill a single soldier, thanks be to God."⁸² Serra, taking a decidedly different stance from Rivera y Moncada, exclaimed "Thanks be to God; now that the terrain has been watered by blood, the conversion of the San Diego Indians will take place."⁸³

⁸¹ Palóu, *Historical Memoirs*, 4: 118-131.

⁸² Geiger, *Life and Times*, 68.

⁸³ Geiger, *Life and Times*, 68.

Chapter 4: The Investigation

A day after the revolt, the handful of soldiers, the one remaining missionary, and some Spanish personnel from the mission sheltered together in the presidio. Fuster wrote letters to Spanish missionaries and military officials informing them of the destruction at the mission and begging them for help. News of the attack first reached Lieutenant José Ortega on November 8, just three days after the revolt.¹ Ortega had left the San Diego presidio temporarily to help found the new Mission San Juan Capistrano to the north, but after receiving word of the revolt, he rushed back to San Diego with a number of other soldiers. His primary concern was securing the presidio by whatever means possible.² At this time, the presidio housed only twenty soldiers.³ Should a group of Kumeyaay similar in size to the one that had attacked the mission strike the presidio, the Spanish would be greatly outnumbered.

To prevent another attack, Ortega began an investigation to find and punish the revolt leaders, Chisli and Canuch. Ortega sent small groups of armed soldiers into Kumeyaay territory beyond the presidio to capture any Kumeyaay people believed to have participated in the revolt, bring them back to the presidio, and force them to testify about the events and the location of Chisli and Canuch.⁴ He seems to have thought that apprehending and punishing the leaders was the key to securing the presidio because, it would address the Kumeyaay with proven desire and

¹ Maynard J. Geiger, *The Life and Times of Fray Junípero Serra, O.F.M.; or, the Man Who Never Turned Back, (1713-1784), a Biography* (Washington: Academy of American Franciscan History, 1959), 2: 62, HathiTrust Digital Library.

² Richard L. Carrico, *Strangers in a Stolen Land: Indians of San Diego County from Prehistory to the New Deal* (San Diego: Sun Belt Publications, 2008), 34.

³ Claudio Saunt, “‘My Medicine Is Punishment’: A Case of Torture in Early California, 1775-1776,” *Ethnohistory* 57, no. 4 (Fall 2010): 688, doi:10.1215/00141801-2010-041.

⁴ Saunt, “Medicine Is Punishment,” 682-683.

ability to rally Kumeyaay forces against the Spanish while deterring other Kumeyaay from taking their place.⁵

The investigation was not quickly resolved. It dragged on from November 1775 until August of 1776. In January 1776, new military commanders and soldiers arrived in San Diego to provide additional protection and to assume leadership of the investigation.⁶ A mix of fear and frustration caused Spanish military officials to become increasingly violent towards the Kumeyaay over the course of the investigation. Despite their ongoing efforts, Spanish forces were unable to find Chisli, and they faced continuous threats of another Kumeyaay attack on the presidio. Becoming more desperate to prevent another revolt, the Spanish made floggings a routine part of their investigative proceedings. Ortega first instituted floggings of Kumeyaay captives in late November 1775. By January, when military commander Fernando Rivera y Moncada took over the proceedings, he initiated what Font referred to as a policy of “welcome floggings.”⁷ Any Kumeyaay soldiers captured would be “welcomed” to the presidio with a series of fifty lashes from the whip, even before testifying.

Evidence from the period of investigation after the revolt suggests that those Kumeyaay captured at the presidio still looked to achieve their own goals, but they began to do so *within* the Spanish colonial rules and hierarchy as opposed to outside them. As punishment became common practice, the Kumeyaay found new ways of resisting. Beaten and imprisoned, the Kumeyaay's options were greatly limited. Some Kumeyaay chose to receive baptism to avoid

⁵ Richard L. Carrico, “Castigating the Insolent Ones: Native Resistance and the Spanish Military, The Pa’mu Incident,” *Journal of San Diego History* 63, no. 3/4 (Spring 2017). <https://sandiegohistory.org/journal/2018/july/castigating-the-insolent-ones-native-resistance-and-the-spanish-military-the-pamu-incident/>.

⁶ Pedro Font, *With Anza to California, 1775-1776: The Journal of Pedro Font, O.F.M.*, trans. and ed. Alan K. Brown (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2011), 191.

⁷ Font, *With Anza to California*, 195.

suffering further punishment. Chisli, when he turned himself in, took shelter in a church, betting that the missionaries would treat him better than would the military at the presidio. When examined in the context of the two choices given to the captive Kumeyaay—risking further punishment if they remained unbaptized or securing some protection if they chose baptism—the baptisms made at the end of the investigation can be seen as a means to an end. Baptism was the ticket out of prison and out from under the whip.

This constant threat and use of force complicate how to interpret the Kumeyaay testimonies that the Spanish recorded. Kumeyaay captives would relay their testimonies to a Kumeyaay translator, who would convey them to either Ortega or Rivera y Moncada, who would finally put them in writing. This process means the testimonies as they appear in the diaries of Ortega or Rivera y Moncada are almost certain not to reflect either the totality or the essence of what the Kumeyaay captives said. Even if the records capture the Kumeyaay captives' testimony verbatim, the threat of punishment would have influenced what the captives said. It is impossible to know whether the captives told the truth or said what was necessary to avoid punishment.⁸ With so little certainty about the accuracy of or motivation for these testimonies, it is difficult to understand individual, and especially collective, Kumeyaay perspectives during the post-revolt investigation.

There are approaches to discern degrees of certainty, or lack thereof, in these testimonies. Analyzing these testimonies in the context of Kumeyaay culture and their prior interactions with the Spanish is one way to measure how likely it is that the information offered in the testimony is true. Another way is to find patterns among the testimonies. When something is repeated across

⁸ Saunt, "Medicine Is Punishment," 680.

testimonies given by different Kumeyaay people at different times, it suggests a shared circumstance, shared belief, or shared understanding.

The first Kumeyaay people Ortega interrogated were his two personal interpreters, who Ortega identifies by their Spanish-given names Diego and José María, and five other Kumeyaay.⁹ I do not know the circumstances of how these testimonies were delivered—whether the seven Kumeyaay were imprisoned together or separately, in what order they testified, or whether they were beaten before or not. These details could help explain their reported testimony. What we do know is that these interrogations were the first of the investigation, and they began on November 12. Ortega claimed that the testimonies were “absolutely true, taken in the style of a soldier since [he] lacked that of a jurist.”¹⁰ Ortega’s admission that he carried out the investigation in the “style of a soldier” underscores the ambiguity inherent in all aspects of the investigation—how it was carried out, what Kumeyaay people said, and why they said it.

These first testimonies agree in almost all respects. Diego and José María stated that they both attempted to warn Jayme about the revolt. They stopped warning him after Jayme threatened to flog them, though they admitted to spreading word of the revolt. Diego and José María agreed that Chisli and Canuch were entirely responsible for the revolt. Diego says that Chisli feared the Spanish would capture him, so, in Diego’s words, Chisli “persuaded everyone to kill the Father and soldiers.”¹¹ Notable in these two testimonies is the prominent role that fear of Spanish capture and punishment plays in motivating Kumeyaay action. Diego and José María both cite Jayme’s threat to whip them as the cause for their silence. They also cite the possibility

⁹ Saunt, “Medicine Is Punishment,” 687.

¹⁰ José Francisco de Ortega, *Diligencias de José Francisco de Ortega*, 1 February 1776, in Saunt, “Medicine Is Punishment,” 687.

¹¹ Ortega, *Diligencias de Ortega*, in Saunt, “Medicine Is Punishment,” 688.

of capture, and likely punishment, as the motivation for Chisli to flee and to convince others to participate in the revolt. From the very first testimonies there is evidence that punishment, as historian Claudio Saunt put it, “loomed large in the minds of the Kumeyaay.”¹²

When asked why Diego and José María spread word of the revolt if they claimed to have been loyal to Jayme, Ortega writes that “fear of the heathens led them to spread the word [of the revolt.]”¹³ They needed to communicate plans for the revolt to other Kumeyaay because they feared what their Kumeyaay counterparts would do to them if they failed to spread the word. This claim is dubious because, if it were true, it would contradict what Shipek and other modern scholars understand about the Kumeyaay socio-political structure. Independence of the individual, and of communities within the larger whole, was central to their structure. Kumeyaay people had the autonomy to choose the ceremonies or conflicts in which they participated, where they wanted to move and when, and which Kumeyaay leaders’ mandates that they would follow.¹⁴ Diego and José María’s claim that Chisli and Canuch alone convinced at least fourteen Kumeyaay villages to participate in the revolt conflicts with this independence. Villages participated in the revolt voluntarily, so they did so either out of loyalty to Chisli and Canuch or because they shared their grievances with the Spanish. Perhaps, then, Diego and José María’s claims were motivated by self-preservation. Blaming two individuals who were not present exonerated the two of them. Four days after their testimonies, on November 16, Ortega’s men freed Diego and José María.¹⁵

¹² Saunt, “Medicine Is Punishment,” 687.

¹³ Ortega, *Diligencias de Ortega* cited in Saunt, “Medicine Is Punishment,” 688.

¹⁴ Florence C. Shipek, “Kumeyaay Socio-Political Structure,” *Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology* 4, no. 2 (1982): 298, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27825128>.

¹⁵ Saunt, “Medicine Is Punishment,” 688.

A few weeks later, Ortega saw smoke billowing from the mountains. He feared that the Kumeyaay were communicating with one another, perhaps gearing up for revolt. Since Chisli and Cauch still had not been apprehended, Ortega decided to institute a night patrol tasked with finding and capturing more Kumeyaay who would then be interrogated at the presidio. Ortega cautioned the men on the first patrol not to “proceed with vengeance, in cold blood, killing them unjustly, without the force of rigor and right of law.”¹⁶ The first patrol captured two Kumeyaay women and three children whose testimonies all confirmed Ortega’s fear that another revolt was imminent. A few days later, a Kumeyaay man also claimed that the Kumeyaay were planning another revolt. Ortega, believing their claims, reversed his earlier mandate. In late November he began sending out patrols with orders to kill all potential Kumeyaay attackers they encountered and whip any others who the patrolling soldiers deemed capable of carrying arms. In the record, Ortega begins to call the Indians “accomplices,” and justifies his new use of force as a means to “break their commitment” to the uprising.¹⁷ Ortega’s sudden change of heart was likely out of fear; unnerved and outmanned, he resorted to violence to deter further Kumeyaay revolt.

Some scholars suggest that warnings of a forthcoming revolt, which happened frequently throughout California during the Mission Era, was a way for California Indians to sow chaos and confusion among the Spanish. Hackel explains that “rumors of Indian plots to kill Franciscans and destroy the missions and presidios proved frequent and intimidating.”¹⁸ Head missionary in California, Junípero Serra, wrote to a Spanish Viceroy of the “danger of a new [Kumeyaay]

¹⁶ Ortega, *Diligencias de Ortega* quoted in Saunt, “Medicine Is Punishment,” 688.

¹⁷ Ortega, *Diligencias de Ortega* quoted in Saunt, “Medicine Is Punishment,” 688-689.

¹⁸ Steven W. Hackel, *Children of Coyote, Missionaries of Saint Francis: Indian-Spanish Relations in Colonial California, 1769-1850* (Chapel Hill: Published for the Omohundro Institute of Early American History and Culture, Williamsburg, Virginia, by the University of North Carolina Press 2005), 617, Apple Books.

uprising”¹⁹ while Fuster, the only surviving San Diego missionary who was present during the revolt, claimed that at San Diego, “we wait from one night to the next for another similar assault, or greater than the past.”²⁰ These accounts support Hackel’s claim that the possibility of another revolt intimidated many Spanish, and specifically the missionaries at San Diego. The revolt never happened. The limited quotes available from Kumeyaay testimonies make it impossible to know whether a revolt was actually planned or the stories of it were fabricated. What is clear is that these threats caused disarray at the presidio.

Why the Kumeyaay did not strike again at the presidio is unknown. Multiple scholars have noted that the Kumeyaay had the Spanish in San Diego on the ropes.²¹ The situation mirrored what happened in August 1769 when the Kumeyaay clashed with the newly-arrived Spanish, then receded inland. Perhaps the Kumeyaay did not attack because, as in 1769, they did not want to risk Spanish military retaliation. Even though Kumeyaay outnumbered the Spanish, as has already been discussed, their geographic dispersion made it hard for them to organize. It could also be that the Kumeyaay felt that their destruction of the mission fulfilled their purpose and it was not necessary to return to destroy the presidio.

While the potential for Kumeyaay attacks receded, Ortega’s punishment policies advanced. On November 30, he ordered that the most recently captured Kumeyaay individual, someone Ortega claimed had participated in the revolt, be flogged. Just a few weeks earlier, at

¹⁹ Rose Marie Beebe and Robert M. Senkewicz, *Junípero Serra: California, Indians, and the Transformation of a Missionary*, Before Gold: California under Spain and Mexico, ed. Rose Marie Beebe and Robert M. Senkewicz, vol. 3 (Norman: The University of Oklahoma Press, 2015), 324-25, Google Books.

²⁰ Vicente Fuster to Junípero Serra, November 28, 1775, JSC 583, Junípero Serra Collection, Santa Barbara Mission Archive Library, translation mine.

²¹ David J Weber, *The Spanish Frontier in North America: The Brief Edition* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), 182, ProQuest Ebook Central.

the beginning of the investigation, Ortega did not punish captured Kumeyaay charged with participating in the revolt. His order at the end of November stipulated that the five Kumeyaay captives who had recently been apprehended receive 25 lashes each, every day over a nine-day period.²² Font recounts the physical toll this took on the bodies of the Kumeyaay: “I saw the poor state an Indian, who was among the captives and had been whipped, had been left by the lashes...it is as if though they were rotten, which perhaps results from infected blood and the dampness...the sores of the Indian I saw were black and horrifying.”²³ Historian Claudio Saunt judges from these descriptions that the instrument used to whip the Kumeyaay was either a chain or a long, thick leather rope. Either of these, when used with frequency and force, could slice through flesh and reach the bone. This was likely the case for one prisoner who, on December 5, succumbed to the wounds he sustained during his series of floggings.²⁴ By December, Ortega’s use of force had become commonplace in the investigation proceedings.

A question that arises at this juncture is the role of the missionaries. How did religious figures reconcile the flogging of Kumeyaay prisoners with their religious gospel? Fuster had ordered a group of Kumeyaay flogged in October 1775 but Ortega’s were more severe and frequent. From a doctrinal perspective, flogging of Indians was not against religious law or precedent. Missionaries believed that they had a paternalistic relationship with the California Indians that justified their use of force on the surrounding Indian populations. Serra muses “that spiritual fathers should punish their sons, the Indians, with blows appears to be as old as the

²² Saunt, “Medicine Is Punishment,” 689.

²³ Font, *With Anza to California*, 200.

²⁴ Saunt, “Medicine Is Punishment,” 690.

conquest of these kingdoms [the Americans].”²⁵ Another missionary put it more bluntly, saying that “[Indians] must be treated like schoolchildren who are governed by showing bread in one hand and whips in the other.”²⁶ If missionaries saw themselves as parents to California Indians, then punishment was a natural extension of their disciplinary duty. The missionaries did not participate in punishing the Kumeyaay during the investigations. However, other missionaries complained of Fuster’s quick temper and deteriorating patience and his unwillingness to defend captive Kumeyaay.

Serra did defend them after the death of the Kumeyaay captive on December 5. On December 15, Serra wrote a letter to the Spanish Viceroy, begging clemency for the Kumeyaay leaders of the revolt, should they be found guilty during the course of the investigation. Serra’s plea represents the nuanced role that the missionaries played throughout this investigation—condoning punishment of Kumeyaay people in some areas and not in others. In his December 15 letter he argues that the religious justification for the missionaries’ California enterprise rested on teaching forgiveness, confession, and salvation. To kill the Kumeyaay revolt leaders was to undermine the spiritual argument for Spanish evangelization and colonization. He writes,

allow the murderer to live so that he can be saved. This is the one purpose of our coming here and the title which justifies our presence here...it should be conceived to the murderer, after some moderate punishment, that he is forgiven and thus we shall fulfill our [Catholic] law which commands us to forgive injuries and not to seek the [sinner’s] death, but his eternal salvation.²⁷

²⁵ Junípero Serra to Felipe de Neve, January 7, 1780, in *Writings of Junípero Serra*, trans. and ed. Antonine Tibesar (Washington: Academy of American Franciscan History, 1955-1966), 3: 413, HathiTrust Digital Library.

²⁶ Luis de Sales, *Noticias de la provincia de Californias en tres cartas* (Valencia, 1794), 94 quoted in Saunt, “Medicine Is Punishment,” 685.

²⁷ Junípero Serra to Antonio Bucareli, December 15, 1775 in Maynard J. Geiger, *The Life and Times of Fray Junípero Serra, O.F.M.; or, the Man Who Never Turned Back, (1713-1784), a Biography* (Washington: Academy of American Franciscan History, 1959), 2: 70-71, HathiTrust Digital Library.

In early January, military reinforcements arrived at San Diego. Among the thirty soldiers and one missionary was Rivera y Moncada and commander Juan Bautista de Anza. Font recalls that “extraordinary was the joy in the presidio at Commander Rivera and Commander Anza’s arrival with the soldiers.”²⁸ The missionaries were likely less enthusiastic about their arrival. Rivera y Moncada was known for his clashes with the missionaries. One missionary described his conflicts with the missionaries as “continuous little quarrels that have occurred between Don Fernando and the Padres since the beginning.”²⁹ As his first act in San Diego, Rivera y Moncada pardoned the four soldiers on guard at the presidio on the night of the revolt who had failed to come to the mission’s aid. The soldiers claimed that they thought the light from the fire was “that of the moon,” and Rivera y Moncada believed them.³⁰ The missionaries protested that the “light of the moon” was an excuse to cover up the fact that they had been asleep, which led to Jayme’s death and the destruction of the mission. Reflecting on Rivera y Moncada’s pardon, Font remarked “let this serve as guidance to show what the missionaries have to suffer from gentlemen commanding in remote countries who have no one over them.”³¹

Rivera y Moncada lead through fear; his punishment of the Kumeyaay was more severe than Ortega’s. He created a new rule that all captured Kumeyaay would receive “fifty lashes apiece as a welcome”³² when they entered the presidio. Throughout January and February, his lieutenants brought him scores of Kumeyaay from different surrounding villages. Rivera y Moncada would beat them, then interrogate them, and sometimes beat them again. In a diary

²⁸ Font, *With Anza to California*, 188.

²⁹ Pablo de Mugártegui to Francisco Pangua, June 6, 1776, JSC 643, Junípero Serra Collection, Santa Barbara Mission Archive Library, translation mine.

³⁰ Font, *With Anza to California*, 193.

³¹ Font, *With Anza to California*, 192.

³² Font, *With Anza to California*, 195.

entry Rivera y Moncada wrote “I must know everything; that I have a medicine to make them tell the truth; that it is not nor am I like their Indian witchdoctors who peddle so many lies; that my medicine is punishment and the great pain will force them [to testify the truth].”³³

I did not have access to Rivera y Moncada’s record of the testimonies he extracted from Kumeyaay captives. I do, however, have his conclusion from what he heard. It was difficult to “put two and two together,”³⁴ he wrote. The frequency or intensity of punishments does not seem to have resulted in greater accuracy of the testimonies. If anything, punishment was the primary reason for their confusing and contradictory content. According to Saunt, one Kumeyaay captive actually implied in his testimony that punishment caused false evidence. Saunt’s analysis is that “because Rivera [y Moncada] relied on testimony obtained by intimidation and torture...the governor knew nothing.”³⁵

It is likely that at this point, with one Kumeyaay dead from floggings and others having been beaten at least once during their time at the presidio, the Kumeyaay in the surrounding area understood the punishment they risked should they be brought to the presidio. Perhaps this is why Chisli decided to turn himself in. On the night of March 27 1775, Chisli sneaked into the presidio’s makeshift chapel. The chapel was a temporary space for masses that had formerly been a warehouse.³⁶ Rivera y Moncada described the chapel as being so shabby, with chickens running in-and-out, that he mistook it for a chicken coop.³⁷ On morning of the 28, Fuster entered the chapel, startled to find Chisli there. Fuster immediately approached Rivera y Moncada and

³³ Rivera quoted in Saunt, “Medicine Is Punishment,” 693.

³⁴ Rivera quoted in Saunt, “Medicine Is Punishment,” 694.

³⁵ Saunt, “Medicine Is Punishment,” 695.

³⁶ Font, *With Anza to California*, 351.

³⁷ Alijandra Mogilner, “Betrayal,” (paper presentation, 38th Annual California Missions and Presidios Conference, February 13, 2021).

stated, “Señor let us handle things in peace and quietude. I am notifying you that Carlos [Chisli] has taken refuge in the church.”³⁸ The “refuge” to which Fuster was referring was an old canonical law that provided asylum to any person, criminals included, who sought shelter in a sanctified church. The law stated that the person seeking shelter could not be removed without authorization from the presiding religious official. When authorization was granted, it usually included an agreement with the religious official that the criminal would not be harmed or killed.³⁹ It is unlikely that Chisli was aware of this law because there is no record of it being invoked at San Diego prior to this instance. Chisli probably observed that he was likely to receive better treatment from the missionaries than from the military.

Rivera y Moncada was stunned. After considering for a few hours his response to Fuster, Rivera y Moncada sent an ultimatum. Fuster would hand Chisli over before sundown or Rivera y Moncada would take him. His note included four points supporting his right to remove Chisli despite the rule of asylum.⁴⁰ Fuster responded, warning that, should Rivera y Moncada violate the asylum rule, he would be excommunicated. Fuster’s note ended with the line “No matter how much you protest, I do not have the power to hand him over to you.”⁴¹ Rivera y Moncada disregarded the letter, ordered his soldiers to surround the chapel where Chisli sat in hiding, entered, seized Chisli, and had him placed in stocks outside. Fuster, true to his word, shouted in protest throughout the ordeal that all those involved in Chisli’s removal were hereby excommunicated.⁴² In the church, excommunication is the most severe punishment. Those that

³⁸ Fuster quoted in Geiger, *Life and Times*, 2: 88.

³⁹ Victor M. Uribe-Uran, “‘Iglesia Me Llamo’: Church Asylum and the Law in Spain and Colonial Spanish America,” *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 49, no. 2 (April 2007): 449, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27563643>.

⁴⁰ Geiger, *Life and Times*, 2: 89.

⁴¹ Fuster quoted in Geiger, *Life and Times*, 2: 90.

⁴² Geiger, *Life and Times*, 90-91.

received it were banned from attending mass and religious ceremonies, publicly shamed, socially ostracized, and incurred spiritual damnation. The following Sunday, Fuster publicly reiterated his excommunication of Rivera y Moncada and the soldiers involved in removing Chisli. Before starting mass, he said, “for the benefit of the faithful and not the excommunicated is Mass said in this temple, church, or sacred place.” Most excommunicated soldiers present sullenly left the church.⁴³ Rivera y Moncada, now aware that the excommunication was not an empty threat, left San Diego for Monterey to plead to Serra to have his excommunication revoked.⁴⁴

Although Chisli endured a month and a half in prison after Rivera y Moncada seized him from the church, he was released to the missionaries in mid-May as a result of the protest of the missionaries.⁴⁵ Chisli’s actions reflect how he used existing Spanish tensions and law to ensure his security. It is hard to imagine that word of the atrocities at the presidio had not reached Chisli. Learning of the punishments, perhaps he turned himself in to halt the punishment of other Kumeyaay while the Spanish pursued him. Another possibility was that he saw his capture as inevitable, and instead of living a life as a fugitive of the Spanish, he decided to take matters into his own hands, placing himself under the protection of the missionaries. One could argue that his choice to return to the presidio after months of successfully evading capture demonstrates defeat or surrender, but this argument would ignore his choice to find shelter in the chapel. He navigated the Spanish system, electing to hide out in the chapel, not the presidio, to get him to what he wanted, relative protection.

In August, a number of fellow captured Kumeyaay chose to become baptized in order to win their freedom. Though patrols and beating continued from May until August, I had limited

⁴³ Fuster quoted in Geiger, *Life and Times*, 92.

⁴⁴ Geiger, *Life and Times*, 92.

⁴⁵ Geiger, *Life and Times*, 92.

access to the investigation proceedings. The few pieces of evidence I did have were difficult to interpret on their own. The next big event that is widely covered in Spanish records is the arrival of Serra in San Diego in August of 1776. Serra's primary concern was renewing the baptismal efforts that had been overshadowed by the destruction of the mission and subsequent investigation. He expedited the reconstruction of the mission and said that the objective at San Diego should be "that the gentiles in the area will come into the mission after seeing that they are treated amiably and well."⁴⁶

To prove his point, he offered the remaining imprisoned Kumeyaay captives freedom in exchange for their baptism. Palóu writes that Serra went into the jail cells of those captives and was "given full vent in continuous exhortations and friendly conversation."⁴⁷ All but one of the prisoners agreed to be baptized. The most meaningful outcome of his effort was baptizing Chisli and Canuch who he later said were "now such models of loyalty that they are the main support of the padres and have now been confirmed."⁴⁸ Serra proudly claimed that his baptisms were an act of "going after the lost sheep and bringing them back into the fold of the Good Shepard."⁴⁹ Serra seems to interpret the baptisms of the former rebel ringleaders as a triumph of Catholicism. This interpretation of the baptisms did not consider the Kumeyaay's agency, that is their choice in their decision to be baptized. In the same way that Chisli likely chose to hide in the chapel for his

⁴⁶ Junípero Serra to Fernando Rivera y Moncada, October 5, 1776, in Beebe and Senkewicz, *Junípero Serra*, 324.

⁴⁷ Francisco Palóu, *Palóu's Life of Fray Junípero Serra*, ed. Maynard J. Geiger (Washington: Academy of American Franciscan History, 1955), 79, Google Books.

⁴⁸ Junípero Serra to Antonio Bucareli, October 4, 1778, quoted in James A. Sandos, *Converting California: Indians and Franciscans in the Missions* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004), 68, ProQuest Ebook Central.

⁴⁹ Junípero Serra to Father Guardian and the Discretorium, August 13, 1778 in *Writings of Junípero Serra*, 3: 217.

safety, the jailed Kumeyaay probably saw baptism as their way to end their incarceration and punishment.

That each Kumeyaay had agency is perhaps most apparent in the case of the one Kumeyaay, Naguasajo, who refused baptism. Spanish soldiers encountered him on a patrol to a nearby village in mid-August. They tied him up and began interrogating him, suspicious of his participation in the revolt. When he claimed that he was only in the village in search of fish, the sergeant on the patrol did not believe him and said, “either I keep you tied up and whip you unconscious, or you tell me the truth.”⁵⁰ Naguasajo began pouring out a story about plans for another revolt and was taken to the presidio for further questioning. Rivera y Moncada recorded Naguasajo’s testimony on August 13, and Palóu writes that Serra visited him in jail on the 14 to plead with Naguasajo and the other prisoners to be baptized.⁵¹ While the others agreed to baptism, Naguasajo sat quietly, neither acknowledging nor responding to Serra. The next morning Naguasajo was found in his cell having apparently hanged himself with a rope.⁵² What Naguasajo’s suicide illustrates is that the Kumeyaay captured during the investigation had the power to choose, even if among the limited options the Spanish left them.

⁵⁰ Carillo quoted in Saunt, “Medicine Is Punishment,” 695.

⁵¹ Palóu, *Life of Serra*, 78; Saunt, “Medicine Is Punishment,” 695-696.

⁵² Palóu, *Life of Serra*, 79; Saunt, “Medicine Is Punishment,” 696.

Chapter 5: The Sound of Silence

When the investigation proceedings concluded in 1777, Spanish military punishment of the Kumeyaay persisted, although it was not as frequent. In March 1778, the Spanish learned of the threat of another Kumeyaay revolt, this time from a populous Kumeyaay village named Pa'mu located thirty miles from the mission.¹ In 1775, Jayme had ignored a baptized Kumeyaay who warned of a coming attack, and this cost the Spanish the mission. This time, the military forces at the presidio did not wait for the Kumeyaay in Pa'mu to act. A group of Spanish soldiers under the command of Lieutenant Mariano Carillo made the two-day journey to Pa'mu, and their orders were to neutralize the threat of violence.² They killed two people, burned some alive, cut off others' ears, and took four alleged leaders of the attack back to the presidio.³

The brutality was intended not only to prevent another revolt but also to beat the Kumeyaay into submission. Lieutenant José Ortega, military commander at the San Diego presidio during the Pa'mu incident, claimed that the actions of the Spanish soldier were to “serve [to] them as incentive to behave well.”⁴ It seems that these actions did discourage further Kumeyaay attacks on the mission and presidio. Having either born witness to or been victims of physical Spanish punishments, the Kumeyaay were less willing to mount armed resistance against the Spanish. However, the Kumeyaay continued to resist Spanish attempts to assimilate

¹ Richard L. Carrico, “Castigating the Insolent Ones: Native Resistance and the Spanish Military, The Pa'mu Incident,” *Journal of San Diego History* 63, no. 3/4 (Spring 2017), <https://sandiegohistory.org/journal/2018/july/castigating-the-insolent-ones-native-resistance-and-the-spanish-military-the-pamu-incident/>.

² Carrico, “Castigating the Insolent Ones.”

³ Richard L. Carrico, “Native Peoples and Crime and Punishment at the Presidio de San Diego” (paper presentation, 38th Annual California Missions and Presidios Conference, February 13, 2021).

⁴ Ortega quoted in Carrico, “Castigating the Insolent Ones.”

them. The question then becomes, how did Kumeyaay continue to resist the Spanish after the revolt and investigations, in the period of 1777-1785?

The rate of baptisms, which I've used in other chapter to gauge the Kumeyaay relationship with the Spanish, remained consistent during this period.⁵ Many scholars cite Mission San Diego's baptismal books that show that between 1769-1775, there were roughly 480 baptisms, and by December 5, 1785, there were a total of 1,169.⁶ As was the case before the revolt, most Kumeyaay did not live at the mission due to a lack of food.⁷ Annual missionary reports drawn up from this period reflect that missionaries at San Diego continued to have yo-yoing agricultural success.⁸ Since neither the rate nor the requirements for baptism changed for the Kumeyaay during this period, I do not discuss baptism in this chapter.

What did change, however, was the way in which the Kumeyaay expressed their resistance: through language. It appears that the Kumeyaay chose not to speak Spanish, and at the same time, refused to teach the Spanish any of their multiple native languages. I refer to this behavior as "linguistic resistance." With no language in common, the Spanish could not teach Kumeyaay Spanish culture, much less learn that of the Kumeyaay. This erected a formidable barrier, insulating Kumeyaay culture from the Spanish. Their motivation was probably to protect their culture, which continued to be at risk from the Spanish colonization goals and was

⁵ Francis F. Guest, *Fermín Francisco de Lasuén (1736-1803); a biography* (Washington: Academy of American Franciscan History, 1973), 114.

⁶ James A. Sandos, *Converting California: Indians and Franciscans in the Missions* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004), 69, ProQuest Ebook Central; Zephyrin Engelhardt, *The Missions and Missionaries of California*, vol. 2 (San Francisco: The James H. Barry Company, 1912), 120.

⁷ Guest, *Lasuén*, 171.

⁸ Fermín Francisco de Lasuén, inventory of San Diego Mission the house, May 4, 1783, in *Writings of Fermín Francisco de Lasuén*, trans. and ed. Finbar Kenneally (Washington: Academy of American Franciscan History, 1965), 2: 93.

increasingly threatened by Spanish-introduced diseases that were particularly devastating to a culture with an oral tradition. By keeping the Spanish from learning their language, Kumeyaay could safeguard their culture in one of the limited ways available to them.

In 1778, Spanish secular officials passed legislation that offered California Indian leaders the chance to assume positions of modest power within the Spanish hierarchy and, as part of their duties, serve as interpreters.⁹ There is evidence that even Kumeyaay leaders in these positions continued to resist translating or teaching Kumeyaay languages to the Spanish. Their motivation was to protect their culture, a culture that was at continual risk of erosion from Spanish colonial efforts and newly-introduced diseases that proved particularly devastating to a culture with an oral tradition. By keeping the Spanish from learning their language, Kumeyaay safeguarded their culture in one of the limited ways available to them.

The reason the Spanish needed to learn Kumeyaay languages was that since Luis Jayme was killed in the revolt and the polyglot catechism he authored burned, the language barrier between the Spanish and Kumeyaay was restored. No other Spanish person is recorded to have spoken a Kumeyaay language. Language was the cornerstone of Catholic evangelization. Serra wrote that “in countries like these, where it is impossible to get hold of an interpreter, or anybody who can act as an instructor...that some time should be required [before the Indians’ conversion.]”¹⁰ Language, as Serra enumerates, wasn’t just the linchpin for securing new baptisms but an adoption of Spanish culture that followed too: “If, at the present time, they are not yet all Christians, it is, in my judgement, only for want of a knowledge of their language.”¹¹ After the mission was reconstructed and missionaries Fermín Francisco de Lasuén and Juan

⁹ Hackel, *Children of Coyote*, 682-83

¹⁰ Junípero Serra to Palóu, August 18, 1772 in Hackel, *Children of Coyote*, 402.

¹¹ Junípero Serra to Miguel de Petra, August 4, 1773, in Hackel, *Children of Coyote*, 402.

Figuer were assigned to serve at San Diego, they desperately needed translators to communicate with the Kumeyaay they intended to convert.

Translation was one of the primary responsibilities of the role of an *alcalde*. Alcalde was a position for Indian leaders, written into law in 1778 by governor of California Felipe de Neve. He reasoned that these new positions would give California Indians living near missions a chance to develop their skills of self-governance, making them, in his words, “useful vassals for our [Spanish] religion and state.”¹² The law created three possible positions for Indians—the role of *alcalde*, *registrador*, or *fiscal*.¹³ For the purposes of this chapter, I will focus exclusively on the position of the *alcalde* since the evidence relevant to 1777-1785 discusses the actions of the Kumeyaay *alcaldes* almost exclusively.

Alcaldes had a range of responsibilities: enforcing Spanish punishments, administering sacraments, and acting as translators, among others.¹⁴ That translation was one of the responsibilities would suggest that many Kumeyaay were not speaking in Spanish. From what I gather, this was somewhat intentional. In other words, there were some Kumeyaay whose resistance to speak Spanish came not from their lack of proficiency but choice to not communicate to the Spanish in the Spanish language, in spite of the fact some knew it. While there is no specific evidence for this, there are a few examples that could support this. In 1770 when King Charles III in Spain passed a law prohibiting the use of any indigenous language in a Spanish colony, he wrote that Indians did not misunderstand the Spanish language but rather that they “did not wish to speak it.”¹⁵ The Pa’mu incident is an example of Kumeyaay people

¹² Felipe de Neve to Junípero Serra, January 7, 1780, in Hackel, *Children of Coyote*, 568.

¹³ Hackel, *Children of Coyote*, 673-682.

¹⁴ Hackel, *Children of Coyote*, 699-703.

¹⁵ King Charles III quoted in Virginia Marie Bouvier, *Women and the Conquest of California, 1542-1840: Codes of Silence* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2001), 157.

selectively speaking in Spanish. How the Spanish knew of the possible attack was from a Kumeyaay informant named Jamacuain Culip who personally warned Lasuén. Clearly, if Jamacuain Culip could speak to Lasuén, who was not proficient in any Kumeyaay dialect, without a translator, then Jamacuain Culip was able to speak Spanish.¹⁶ A larger pattern of Kumeyaay living near the mission not speaking Spanish was a decision on the part of the Kumeyaay, not entirely their lack of proficiency.

The alcaldes in their roles were uncooperative, including as translators. In 1779, according to the Spanish, the acting alcalde did not warn the Spanish before a Kumeyaay attack on a nearby village.¹⁷ By failing to translate to the Spanish the information they likely knew, the alcaldes were being selective in their role as translators. There are other mentions of insubordination of Kumeyaay alcaldes, but they are not specific. Serra described in 1779 in a letter to Neve that San Diego “had put up with a great deal from their alcaldes,” so much so that for the missionaries, “fortunately the presidio is near. May God help them.”¹⁸ As Hackel points out, the role of alcaldes “provided Indians with the means and the personnel to retain control over certain aspects of their communities.”¹⁹ For the Kumeyaay alcaldes, it appears that safeguarding their native language and passing on information selectively were aspects of control.

In the same letter in which Lasuén references the unhelpful Kumeyaay interpreters, he also mentions his inability to learn Kumeyaay languages, which keeps him from being able to

¹⁶ Carrico, “Castigating the Insolent Ones.”

¹⁷ Hackel, *Children of Coyote*, 702.

¹⁸ Junípero Serra to Fermin Francisco de Lasuén, January 12, 1780, in *Writings of Junípero Serra*, trans. and ed. Antonine Tibesar, 4 vols. (Washington: Academy of American Franciscan History, 1955-1966), 419, HathiTrust Digital Library.

¹⁹ Hackel, *Children of Coyote*, 672.

evangelize to and understand the Kumeyaay. In 1782, he lamented “I am much perturbed that I am having difficulty learning the inflections of the dialect, for I cannot grasp its syllables, although I have been here a long time.”²⁰ Lasuén also could not get Kumeyaay to speak Spanish and could not get reliable translators. After five years serving at San Diego, he was still incapable of speaking the language. What Lasuén’s letter suggests is that Kumeyaay people prevented the Spanish from learning their language.

One could question whether Lasuén’s difficulties with Kumeyaay languages is more a reflection of his natural shortcomings picking up languages than they are evidence of Kumeyaay action. However, he says in his letter that his inability to learn Kumeyaay languages is inconsistent with his success elsewhere: “This is an experience I did not have at the other missions. It may be that there are circumstances peculiar to this mission which are responsible for this difference which is so notable and obvious.”²¹ Having served at other missions prior to San Diego, Lasuén notes that he has never before had this much difficulty learning Indigenous languages. It wasn’t Lasuén’s difficulty with languages that kept him from learning Kumeyaay: it was the Kumeyaay keeping the Spanish from learning their languages.

This raises the question of why the Kumeyaay began to use linguistic resistance at this time and did not so prior to the revolt. A possible explanation of why they did not use it earlier is that they did not realize the risk in teaching the Spanish Kumeyaay languages. It was only clear after the Kumeyaay saw how Jayme’s fluency in their languages facilitated his ability to baptize larger numbers of Kumeyaay and to police Kumeyaay cultural practices. Another major reason

²⁰ Fermín Francisco de Lasuén to Francisco Pangua, December 6, 1780, in *Writings of Fermín Francisco de Lasuén*, 78.

²¹ Fermín Francisco de Lasuén to Francisco Pangua, December 6, 1780, in *Writings of Fermín Francisco de Lasuén*, 78.

Kumeyaay began linguistic resistance post-revolt is the worsening threat to Kumeyaay culture posed by newly-introduced diseases. After the investigation, missionary accounts are littered with mentions of Kumeyaay falling prey to disease.

Spanish-introduced diseases were particularly fatal to California Indian populations, primarily because California Indians had no immunity to foreign pathogens such as smallpox, influenza, and measles. The high California Indian death rate from these newly-introduced diseases has been referred to as an example of “demographic collapse.” This collapse was not isolated to human hosts but plant and animal species as well, on which the Kumeyaay relied for food, as discussed in chapter two. Kumeyaay land management practices were complex but did not account for foreign diseases. In 1779 in a letter to Lasuén, Serra sends his condolences because of the “death among gentiles caused by starvation.”²² In an insidious cycle, those Kumeyaay who did not contract Spanish-introduced diseases were malnourished, which then made them more likely to contract and die from new diseases.²³

Disease took a human and cultural toll on the Kumeyaay. Shipek describes disease as having triggered “massive knowledge loss, as well as, socio-political disorganization accompanied by depopulation as specialists died without having fully trained their successors in their specialties.”²⁴ The spoken Kumeyaay languages were the vehicle for transmission of all

²² Junípero Serra to Fermín Francisco de Lasuén, March 29, 1779, in *Writings of Junípero Serra*, 299.

²³ Robert H. 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, 1995), 45.

²⁴ Florence C. Shipek, “The Impact of Europeans Upon Kumeyaay Settlement,” in *The Impact of European Exploration and Settlement on Local Native Americans* (San Diego: Cabrillo Historical Association, 1986), 20.

cultural, historical, mythical, musical, and moral information.²⁵ The spoken word doesn't appear to have been just one avenue for the Spanish to participate in Kumeyaay culture; it was *the* avenue that opened up a gateway to generations of Kumeyaay knowledge.

Newly-introduced diseases were a problem for California Indian populations before the Spanish established permanent settlements, but in San Diego, mentions of disease affecting the Kumeyaay became frequent from 1777 onwards.²⁶ Figuer and Lasuén's accounts describe them arriving in Kumeyaay villages to find "a multitude of sick people"²⁷ and ministering to "the large number who are sick."²⁸ Lasuén specifically reported that "we have some [epidemics]...and persons from Lower California tell us that we have reason to fear an outbreak of smallpox."²⁹ This suggests that disease had a greater effect on the lives of the Kumeyaay in the time period after the revolt. As impacts of disease increased, it's likely that this made it more important for the Kumeyaay to protect their culture.

Whether this effort was successful from the Kumeyaay point of view cannot be determined definitively. However, there is evidence that even the Kumeyaay who interacted with the missionaries still practiced their culture. In 1782, when speaking of the Kumeyaay Lasuén wrote that "most of them are content with a loincloth which barely covers their nakedness...none would submit to the slightest discipline if he were denied access to his hunting or fishing; to his

²⁵ Margaret C. Field and Jon Meza Cuero, "Kumeyaay Oral Tradition, Cultural Identity, and Language Revitalization," *Oral Tradition* 27, no. 2 (2012): 319-320, doi:10.1353/ort.2012.0013.

²⁶ William Preston, "Serpent in Eden: Dispersal of Foreign Diseases into Pre-Mission California," *Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology* 18, no. 1 (1996): 3, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27825595>.

²⁷ Figuer,

²⁸ Fermín Francisco de Lasuén to Francisco Pangua, June 17, 1780, in *Writings of Fermín Francisco de Lasuén*, 86.

²⁹ Fermín Francisco de Lasuén to Junípero Serra, January 9, 1782, in *Writings of Fermín Francisco de Lasuén*, 80.

mice, snakes, vipers, and insects.”³⁰ Contrary to the missionaries’ desire, the Kumeyaay continued to dress in traditional ways, eat traditional foods, and gather food in a traditional manner. Even under the threat of punishment from the Spanish, the Kumeyaay Lasuén observed maintained their culture and their ability to practice it. With a language barrier in place, Lasuén did not know how to communicate that he disapproved or how to change their behavior. Of the adoption of Spanish culture, Lasuén remarked in a 1780 letter that “on the part of the Indians, there is no love whatever for anything resembling civilization or rational culture.”³¹

The period after the revolt shows that the Kumeyaay continued to find new ways to maintain their culture in the face of potential Spanish assimilation. This became especially urgent as newly-introduced diseases decimated the Kumeyaay. While violent Spanish punishment in the wake of the revolt deterred them from attacking the Spanish directly, the Kumeyaay remained adamant about finding ways to preserve their culture and cultural practices. The Kumeyaay—leaders, translators, or simply Kumeyaay visiting the mission—achieved this by refusing to speak Spanish and to teach other Spanish people their native languages. The language barrier served as a cultural barrier.

³⁰ Fermín Francisco de Lasuén to Junípero Serra, January 9, 1782, in *Writings of Fermín Francisco de Lasuén*, 81.

³¹ Fermín Francisco de Lasuén to Francisco Pangua, December 6, 1780, in *Writings of Fermín Francisco de Lasuén*, 78.

Conclusion

In late March of this year, 2021, councilman Joe La Cava, who represents the north coastal areas of San Diego, proposed changing the city's 107-year-old seal. The seal features an image of a Spanish caravel ship used during the first Spanish explorations into California and a mission bell tower just above the ship that pays homage to the Spanish missions and missionaries. Noticeably absent from the seal are any Kumeyaay symbols. It was perhaps inferred that symbols of the mission sufficiently represented the Kumeyaay, as it did the Spanish. La Cava pushed in his proposal to change the seal to explicitly include symbols that represent the Kumeyaay, not just in their proximity to colonist history. The omission of Kumeyaay symbols, La Cava argued, "erases the history of the indigenous peoples who occupied this land long before us and glorifies those who stole it." In his view, "History will always be preserved in our books and academia, but this is about learning from our history and recognizing the symbol does not reflect who we are. If these symbols no longer reflect our values, it is incumbent on us to change them."¹

This thesis attempted to represent a story in history frequently written about from a predominantly Spanish perspective and tried to analyze the same events from a Kumeyaay perspective—using analyses and extrapolation to tease out what the Kumeyaay might have thought of the Spanish rather than the reverse. It used circumstances and action to discern motive in lieu of written documents spelling out the rationale or opinion behind Kumeyaay actions. It delved into the pre-contact culture of the Kumeyaay and how their metaphysical connection to

¹ David Garrick, "Councilman criticizes San Diego city seal for glorifying missionaries, wants new version," *The San Diego Union Tribune*, March 25, 2021, <https://www.sandiegouniontribune.com/news/politics/story/2021-03-25/councilman-criticizes-san-diego-city-seal-for-glorifying-missionaries-wants-new-version>.

the land as well as complex land management practices inclined them to resist Spanish permanent settlement on their land. The physical surroundings of the Kumeyaay were inextricable from their understandings of personal and collective identity, giving them cause and urgency to treat Spanish permanent settlement on their land, with at first trepidation and then hostility. Kumeyaay resistance was motivated by a desire to hold sovereignty over their land which was inherently a desire to maintain and protect their culture that was indivisible from the land.

When the Spanish mission relocated deeper into Kumeyaay territory, adjacent to a Kumeyaay village, six years after the first Spanish permanent settlement, tensions that had simmered for years between the Spanish and certain Kumeyaay became more immediate and inflamed. In close proximity with one another, they clashed on a more frequent and violent basis than they had before. When Spanish missionaries stepped in to discipline a handful of Kumeyaay people and then a Kumeyaay leader, the rising tensions exploded into revolt.

The revolt and the investigation that followed above all revealed that discussion of “Spanish” and “Kumeyaay” was a discussion not of opposing groups each unified under the same opinion, acting in a uniform manner, but of individuals acting to further their ends. The question of how to proceed at San Diego after such a setback bitterly divided the Spanish across primarily religious and secular lines. The revolt divided the Kumeyaay as well. Probably the most extreme example of these divisions can be found in looking at the actions of the baptized Kumeyaay when fighting broke out: some baptized Kumeyaay turned on the Spanish and helped burn the mission down while other baptized Kumeyaay chose not to fight, aligning themselves with the Spanish and mourning the loss of the mission alongside the missionaries. Those Kumeyaay who did revolt did so in all likelihood to further their ends of cultural preservation

and land sovereignty via an overt offensive. During the investigation, this shifted, and the primary way it seems captured Kumeyaay acted to achieve their goals was not working outside the Spanish colonial system but within it. Weighing the limited choices they had, some Kumeyaay prisoners chose baptism to avoid punishment. Chisli, the revolt leader, shrewdly used the missionary and military tension to lessen his punishment for his role in the revolt, and Naguasajo, another captured Kumeyaay, chose neither baptism nor to leverage existing tensions and instead took his own life.

In the years that followed the contentious investigation, some aspects changed at San Diego and others persisted. Basic Spanish struggles to make the mission agriculturally self-sufficient failed while threats of another Kumeyaay revolt, and forceful military reactions that accompanied them, were common. Different manifestations of Kumeyaay resistance were new to this period. The Indian leaders who held the title of *alcalde* allowed more opportunity for certain Kumeyaay leaders to use a Spanish-sanctioned role to lead double lives that would benefit their Indigenous communities under the guise of submission. For those that entered the mission, persistent reports of missionaries' difficulty learning a Kumeyaay language and the Kumeyaay's refusal to speak Spanish insulated the Kumeyaay culture from either Spanish control or policing.

What a study of the revolt reveals is that the Kumeyaay adapted in order to resist the Spanish, and a firm connection to their culture steeled that resolve. Writer David Truer, member of the Ojibwe tribe and author of the historical non-fiction book *The Heartbeat at Wounded Knee*, articulated this idea well when he wrote "The [Spanish] colonists came for money and they stayed for money. Indigenous peoples, for their part, resisted, helped, hindered, played, and

constantly negotiated the changes brought by colonization and dispossession.”² The Spanish came with the intention to Christianize and Hispanicize the Kumeyaay to eventually profit off their labor, and many Kumeyaay people took steps to hamper parts of this Spanish agenda that did not suit their individual or collective goals. The Kumeyaay were, and are, unvanquished.

Joe La Cava’s proposal to change the San Diego seal to represent the Kumeyaay apart from their Spanish past serves as a powerful reminder that the central questions and conflicts with which this thesis wrestles are alive and well today. You do not have to go as far back as 1775 to find debates over how Kumeyaay culture is interpreted, remembered, and represented. You do not even have to look exclusively at Kumeyaay relations with the Spanish to find conflict: disputes about land sovereignty and cultural preservation are characteristic of the tribe’s relationship with the United States.³

When historians analyze the many examples of Kumeyaay perseverance, they begin to recognize that the Kumeyaay had a rich pre-contact history, a culture and society that people fought to maintain. The invading powers were not ultimately successful in destroying or suppressing these societies; rather, they persisted and remain a vibrant community in the modern world.

² David Treuer, *The Heartbeat of Wounded Knee: Native America from 1890 to the Present* (New York: Riverhead Books, an imprint of Penguin Random House LLC, 2019), 47, Apple Books.

³ Teo Armus, “‘You Don’t Control the Border’: Indigenous groups protesting wall construction clash with federal agents,” *Washington Post*, September 23, 2020, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/nation/2020/09/23/border-wall-construction-protests/>; Kristina Davis, “Judge denies Kumeyaay band request to halt border wall construction,” *The San Diego Union Tribune*, August 27, 2020, <https://www.sandiegouniontribune.com/news/courts/story/2020-08-27/kumeyaay-band-border-wall-construction>.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

- Anza, Juan Bautista de. *The Juan Bautista de Anza--Fernando de Rivera y Moncada letters of 1775-1776: personalities in conflict*. Compiled by Donald T. Garate. San Diego: Los Californianos, 2006.
- Beebe, Rose Marie, and Robert M. Senkewicz. *Lands of Promise and Despair: Chronicles of Early California, 1535-1846*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2015.
- Field, Margaret, ed. *Footsteps Left in the Future: Kumeyaay Stories of Baja California*. By Zeferina Aldama Cuero, Jovita Aldama Machado, Aurora Meza Calles, Emilia Meza Calles, and Jon Meza Cuero. Translated by Margaret Field, Ana Daniela Leyva, and Amy Miller. San Diego: San Diego State University Press, 2019.
- Font, Pedro. *With Anza to California, 1775 -1776: The Journal of Pedro Font, O.F.M.* Translated and edited by Alan K. Brown. 1913. Reprint, Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2011.
- Jayme, Luís. *Letter of Luís Jayme, O.F.M: San Diego, October 17, 1772*. Translated and edited by Maynard J. Geiger. Los Angeles: Dawson's Book Shop for the San Diego Public Library, 1970.
- Lasuén, Fermín. Francisco de. *Writings of Fermín Francisco de Lasuén*. Vol. 2. Translated and edited by Finbar Kenneally. Washington: Academy of American Franciscan History, 1965.
- Palóu, Francisco. *Francisco Palou's Life and Apostolic Labors of the Venerable Father Junípero Serra, Founder of the Franciscan Missions of California*. Pasadena: G.W. James, 1913. Translated by C. Scott Williams. HathiTrust Digital Library.
- . *Historical Memoirs of New California*. Vol. 1. Edited by Herbert Eugene Bolton. 1926. Reprint, New York: Russell & Russell, 1966. HathiTrust Digital Library.
- Serra, Junípero. *Writings of Junípero Serra*. Translated and edited by Antonine Tibesar. 4 vols. Washington: Academy of American Franciscan History, 1955-1966. HathiTrust Digital Library.
- The Junípero Serra Collection. Santa Barbara Mission Archive Library, Santa Barbara.

Secondary Sources

- Anderson, Kat. *Tending the Wild: Native American Knowledge and the Management of California's Natural Resources*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005. ProQuest Ebook Central.

- . “The Use of Fire by Native Americans in California.” In *Fire in California’s Ecosystems*, edited by Sugihara, Neil G., Jan W. van Wagtendonk, Kevin E. Shaffer, Jo Ann Fites-Kaufman, and Andrea E. Thode, 417-430. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006.
- Archibald, Robert. “Indian Labor at the California Missions—Slavery or Salvation?.” *The Journal of San Diego History* 24, no. 2 (Spring 1978).
<https://sandieghistory.org/journal/1978/april/labor/>.
- Armus, Teo. “‘You Don’t Control the Border’: Indigenous groups protesting wall construction clash with federal agents.” *Washington Post*, September 23, 2020,
<https://www.washingtonpost.com/nation/2020/09/23/border-wall-construction-protests/>.
- Bancroft, Hubert Howe. *History of California: vol. I, 1542-1800*. San Francisco: A.L. Bancroft & Company, 1884. HathiTrust Digital Library.
- Baumhoff, Martin, A. *Ecological Determinants of Aboriginal California Populations*. University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology, edited by R.F. Heizer, W.R. Bascom, and E.A. Hammel, vol. 49, no. 2. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1963.
- Beebe, Rose Marie, and Robert M. Senkewicz. *Junípero Serra: California, Indians, and the Transformation of a Missionary*. Before Gold: California under Spain and Mexico, edited by Rose Marie Beebe and Robert M. Senkewicz, vol. 3. Norman: The University of Oklahoma Press, 2015. Google Books.
- Bouvier, Virginia Marie. *Women and the Conquest of California, 1542-1840: Codes of Silence*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2001.
- Carrico, Richard L. “Before the Strangers: American Indians in San Diego at the Dawn of Contact.” In *The Impact of European Exploration and Settlement on Local Native Americans*, 5-12. San Diego: Cabrillo Historical Association, 1986.
- . “Castigating the Insolent Ones: Native Resistance and the Spanish Military, The Pa’mu Incident.” *Journal of San Diego History* 63, no. 3/4 (Spring 2017).
- . “Sociopolitical Aspects of the 1775 Revolt at Mission San Diego de Alcalá: An Ethnohistorical Approach.” *Journal of San Diego History* 43, no. 3 (Summer 1997): 142-57. <https://sandieghistory.org/journal/1997/july/missionrevolt/>.
- . *Strangers in a Stolen Land: Indians of San Diego County from Prehistory to the New Deal*. San Diego: Sunbelt Publications Inc., 2008.
- Castillo, Elias. *A Cross of Thorns: the Enslavement of California's Indians by the Spanish Missions*. Fresno: Craven Street Books, 2015. Apple Books.

- Clendinnen, Inga. *Ambivalent conquests: Maya and Spaniard in Yucatan, 1517-1570*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511800528.
- Connolly, Mike. "Kumeyaay—Spanish Contact." *Kumeyaay.com*, n.d. <https://www.kumeyaay.com/kumeyaay-spanish-contact.html>.
- Cuero, Delfina and Florence C. Shipek. *The Autobiography of Delfina Cuero, a Diegueño Indian*. Edited by Sylvia Brakke Vane. Translated by Rosalie Pinto Robertson. Banning: Malki Museum Press, 1970.
- Davis, Kristina. "Judge denies Kumeyaay band request to halt border wall construction." *The San Diego Union Tribune*, August 27, 2020. <https://www.sandiegouniontribune.com/news/courts/story/2020-08-27/kumeyaay-band-border-wall-construction>.
- Eliade, Mircea. *The Sacred and the Profane: The Nature of Religion*. New York: Harper & Row, 1961.
- Engelhardt, Zephyrin. *San Diego Mission*. 1920. Reprint, London: Forgotten Books, 2012.
- . *The Missions and Missionaries of California*. Volume 2. San Francisco: The James H. Barry Company, 1912.
- Field, Margaret, and Jon Meza Cuero. "Kumeyaay Oral Tradition, Cultural Identity, and Language Revitalization." *Oral Tradition* 27, no. 2 (2012): 319-332. doi:10.1353/ort.2012.0013.
- Field, Les W. "Who Is This Really About Anyway? Ishi, Kroeber, and the Intertwining of California Indian and Anthropological Histories." *Journal of Anthropological Research* 61, no. 1 (2005): 81-93. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3631298>.
- Gamble, Lynn H., and Michael Wilken-Robertson. "Kumeyaay Cultural Landscapes of Baja California's Tijuana River Watershed." *Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology* 28, no. 2 (2008): 127-52. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27825888>.
- Garrick, David. "Councilman criticizes San Diego city seal for glorifying missionaries, wants new version." *The San Diego Union Tribune*, March 25, 2021. <https://www.sandiegouniontribune.com/news/politics/story/2021-03-25/councilman-criticizes-san-diego-city-seal-for-glorifying-missionaries-wants-new-version>.
- Geiger, Maynard J. *Franciscan missionaries in Hispanic California. 1769-1848: A biographical dictionary*. San Marino: The Huntington Library, 1969.

- . *The Life and Times of Fray Junípero Serra, O.F.M.; or, the Man Who Never Turned Back, (1713-1784), a Biography*, vol. 2. Washington: Academy of American Franciscan History, 1959. HathiTrust Digital Library.
- Greenberg, Joy H., and Gregory Greenberg. “Native American Narratives as Ecoethical Discourse in Land-Use Consultations.” *Wicazo Sa Review* 28, no. 2 (2013): 30-59. doi:10.5749/wicazosareview.28.2.0030.
- Guest, Francis F. “Cultural Perspectives on California Mission Life.” *Southern California Quarterly* 65, no. 1 (1983): 1-65. doi:10.2307/41171019.
- . *Fermín Francisco de Lasuén (1736-1803); a biography*. Washington: Academy of American Franciscan History, 1973.
- Hackel, Steven W. *Children of Coyote, Missionaries of Saint Francis: Indian-Spanish Relations in Colonial California, 1769-1850*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press for the Omohundro Institute of Early American History and Culture, 2005. Apple Books.
- Hardwood Phillips, George. *Chiefs and Challengers: Indian Resistance and Cooperation in Southern California*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1975.
- Hibbard, Michael, Marcus B. Lane, and Kathleen Rasmussen. “The Split Personality of Planning: Indigenous Peoples and Planning for Land and Resource Management.” *Journal of Planning Literature* 23, no. 2 (November 2008): 136–51. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0885412208322922>.
- Hyslop, Stephen G. *Contest for California: From Spanish Colonization to the American Conquest*. Before Gold: California Under Spain and Mexico Series, edited by Rose Marie Beebe and Robert M. Senkewicz, vol. 2. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2019.
- Ingold, Tim. “The Temporality of the Landscape.” *World Archaeology* 25, no. 2 (June 2010): 152-74. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00438243.1993.9980235>.
- Ives, Ronald L. “The Lost Discovery of Corporal Antonio Luis: A Desert Cure for Scurvy.” *The Journal of Arizona History* 11, no. 2 (1970): 101-14. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41695553>.
- Jackson, Robert H., and Edward D. Castillo. *Indians, Franciscans, and Spanish Colonization: The Impact of the Mission System on California Indians*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1995.
- Johnson, Mary Elizabeth. *Indian Legends of the Cuyamaca Mountains*. San Diego: Frye and Smith Printers, 1914. Google Books.
- Jones, Terry L. and Kathryn A. Klar, eds. *California Prehistory: Colonization, Culture, and Complexity*. Blue Ridge Summit: AltaMira Press, 2007. ProQuest Ebook Central.

- Kimmerer, Robin. *Braiding Sweetgrass: Indigenous Wisdom, Scientific Knowledge and the Teachings of Plants*. Minneapolis: Milkweed Editions, 2013. ProQuest Ebook Central.
- Kroeber, A.L. *Handbook of the Indians of California*. Washington: Government Print Off, 1925. HathiTrust.
- Lightfoot, Kent G. *Indians, Missionaries, and Merchants: The Legacy of Colonial Encounters on the California Frontiers*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005.
- Lightfoot, Kent, and Otis Parrish. *California Indians and Their Environment: An Introduction*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2009.
- Lorimer, Michelle Marie. *Resurrecting the past: The California Mission Myth*. Pechanga: Great Oaks Press, 2016.
- Milliken, Randall. *A Time of Little Choice: the Disintegration of Tribal Culture in the San Francisco Bay Area, 1769-1810*. Menlo Park: Malki Museum, 2009.
- Miskwish, Michael Connolly. *Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology* 28, no. 2 (2008): 195-96. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27825895>.
- . *Kumeyaay: A History Textbook Precontact to 1893*, vol. 1. El Cajon: Sycuan Press, 2007.
- Newton, Roger. "A Monument to an Event that Never Happened." *The Journal of San Diego History* 62, no. 3 and 4 (2016): 323-330. <https://sandiegohistory.org/journal/2016/july/a-monument-to-an-event-that-never-happened/>.
- Nordquist, Nick, dir. *First People - Kumeyaay*. Aired November 24, 2015, on KPBS. May 20, 2014, on KPBS, <https://www.pbs.org/video/kpbs-presents-first-people/>.
- Orfalea, Gregory. *Journey to the Sun: Junípero Serra's Dream and the Founding of California*. New York: Scribner, 2014. Apple Books.
- Patterson, Thomas C. *From Acorns to Warehouses: Historical Political Economy of Southern California's Inland Empire*. Walnut Creek: Left Coast Press, 2015. Google Books.
- Pico, Anthony R. "The Kumeyaay Millennium," *Kumeyaay.com*, n.d., <https://www.kumeyaay.com/the-kumeyaay-millennium.html>.
- Preston, William. "Serpent in Eden: Dispersal of Foreign Diseases Into Pre-Mission California." *Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology* 18, no. 1 (1996): 2-37. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27825595>.

- Rowntree, Lester B. "Drought During California's Mission Period, 1769-1834." *Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology* 7, no. 1 (1985): 7-20. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27825210>.
- Russell, Louise. "Still Here: Native American Portraits in Place 2, Native American Ideas About Land and Place." *Kumeyaay.com*, Spring 2019. <https://www.kumeyaay.com/news/475-still-here-portraits-in-place-2-native-american%E2%80%99s-ideas-about-land-and-place.html>.
- Sandos, James A. "Between Crucifix and Lance: Indian-White Relations in California, 1769-1848." *California History* 76, no. 2/3 (1997): 196-229. doi:10.2307/25161667.
- . *Converting California: Indians and Franciscans in the Missions*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004. ProQuest Ebook Central.
- Saunt, Claudio. "'My Medicine Is Punishment': A Case of Torture in Early California, 1775-1776." *Ethnohistory* 57, no. 4 (Fall 2010): 679-708. doi:10.1215/00141801-2010-041.
- Shackley, M. Steven. "Prehistory, Archaeology, and History of Research." In *The Early Ethnography of the Kumeyaay*, edited by M. Steven Shackley, 36-57. Berkeley: Phoebe Hearst Museum of Anthropology, University of California, Berkeley, 2004.
- Shipek, Florence C. "California Indian Reactions to the Franciscans." *The Americas* 74, no. 2 (2017): 480-492. muse.jhu.edu/article/671736.
- . "An Example of Intensive Plant Husbandry: the Kumeyaay of southern California." In *Foraging and Farming: The Evolution of Plant Exploitation*, edited by David R. Harris and Gordon C. Hillman. United Kingdom: Taylor & Francis, 2014. Google Books.
- . "The Impact of Europeans Upon Kumeyaay Culture." In *The Impact of European Exploration and Settlement on Local Native Americans*, 13-26. San Diego: Cabrillo Historical Association, 1986.
- . "Kumeyaay Socio-Political Structure." *Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology* 4, no. 2 (1982): 296-303. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27825128>.
- . "KUUCHAMAA: The Kumeyaay Sacred Mountain." *Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology* 7, no. 1 (1985): 67-74. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27825214>.
- . "A Native American Adaptation to Drought: The Kumeyaay as Seen in the San Diego Mission Records 1770-1798." *Ethnohistory* 28, no. 4 (1981): 295-312. doi:10.2307/481135.
- Spier, Leslie. "Southern Diegueño Customs." In *The Early Ethnography of the Kumeyaay*, edited by M. Steven Shackley, 151-217. Berkeley: Phoebe Hearst Museum of Anthropology, University of California, Berkeley, 2004.

Treuer, David. *The Heartbeat of Wounded Knee: Native America from 1890 to the Present*. New York: Riverhead Books, an imprint of Penguin Random House LLC, 2019. Apple Books.

Uribe-Uran, Victor M. “‘Iglesia Me Llamo’: Church Asylum and the Law in Spain and Colonial Spanish America.” *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 49, no. 2 (April 2007): 446-472. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27563643>.

Waterman, T. T. *The Religious Practices of the Diegueño Indians*. Vol. 8, no. 6., Berkeley: The University Press, 1910.

Weber, David J. *The Spanish Frontier in North America: The Brief Edition*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009. ProQuest Ebook Central.