



**RECOGNITION,
SOVEREIGNTY
STRUGGLES,
& INDIGENOUS
RIGHTS IN
THE
UNITED STATES**

A SOURCEBOOK

Edited by Amy. E. Den Ouden & Jean M. O'Brien

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA PRESS CHAPEL HILL

67. Brian Klopotek, *Recognition Odysseys: Indigeneity, Race, and Federal Tribal Recognition Policy in Three Louisiana Indian Communities* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2011).

68. Miller, *Forgotten Tribes*.

69. Klopotek, *Recognition Odysseys*, 264

70. *Ibid.*, esp. introduction, ch. 10.

71. Disney, interview.

72. For Washington state recognition, see Trafzer, *Chinook*, 100, 105. For the longhouse project, see Angela Sanders, "Chinook Nation," *Portland Magazine*, Winter 2005.

73. Disney, interview; www.chinooknation.org.

74. Edward Stratton, "Clarks Make Good on Stolen Canoe," *Daily Astorian*, September 26, 2011.

Mapping Erasure

The Power of Nominative Cartography in the Past and Present of the Muwekma Ohlones of the San Francisco Bay Area

LES W. FIELD with Alan Leventhal and Rosemary Cambra

In the twentieth century, the erasure of the Ohlones, the indigenous people of the San Francisco Bay area, was constructed around the unilateral and arbitrary termination of their relationship with the federal government in 1927, on the one hand, and an "extinction sentence" inscribed by Alfred Kroeber in his authoritative tome, *Handbook of the Indians of California* (1925), on the other.¹ But the processes by which the presence of Ohlone peoples in their aboriginal territories was decisively obscured and disestablished had been ongoing since the initiation of the Spanish colonial regime in the late eighteenth century. These processes involved transformation of geography and place-names that not only erased the Ohlones and their long history but filled that absence with colonial presence. This chapter closely interrogates "nominative cartography," the power to erase and also implant, to disappear but also to substantiate, and to displace and replace in the service of colonial projects, tracing the changing map of Ohlone home territories in Central California as they were transformed by and during Spanish, Mexican, and U.S. colonial regimes. The Ohlones did not disappear, and their persistence is reflected in contemporary strategies to gain federal recognition and reestablish their presence in the landscape.

In June 2002, the Branch of Acknowledgment and Research (BAR, now renamed the Office of Federal Acknowledgment) of the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) notified the Muwekma Ohlone tribe of its intention to find negatively on their federal recognition petition. The Muwekma Ohlone tribe is the contemporary tribal organization of the indigenous Ohlone peoples of the San Francisco Bay area (predominantly East and South Bay lineages) that has struggled to obtain federal recognition since the mid-1980s.² In 1996, the BAR conceded that the federal government had

previously unambiguously recognized the Muwekmas' ancestors as the Verona Band of Alameda County as late as 1927. This finding meant that the Muwekmas had only to prove a continuous historical relationship between themselves and the Verona band since 1927. The Ohlones rejoiced, since they had already assembled materials that demonstrated that all of their members were direct descendants of the Verona band and could therefore demonstrate they had maintained a kin-structured social organization over the years. "Kin-structured social organization" refers to the quotidian relationships of mutual aid between intermarried Ohlone families, reflected in ongoing participation in the rituals of baptism, marriage, and funerals and reaffirmed by the informal leadership of specific individuals who organized the families to continuously enroll with the BIA in 1933, 1955, and 1970 and to participate in the California Claims Act of 1955. The Ohlones were asking for a reaffirmation of their previously recognized status, which seemed to them far less fraught than having to prove who they were from scratch. Nevertheless, the BAR had ruled negatively in their case.

Unrecognized or unacknowledged status can be thought of as a lack or absence of recognition. Such status is not merely a denial or repression of recognition, nor are the barriers to achieving recognition constructed of incomplete or distorted information. Nonrecognition and the maintenance of nonrecognized status are therefore not the consequence of an oversight or a lapse in administrative efficiency that can be straightforwardly rectified via sustained effort. Following Foucault's by-now well-trod path, we identify nonrecognition itself as a powerful discourse that produces knowledge and is sustained by entrenched discursive practices built into the cultural, ideological, political, ecological, and spatial/geographical environments.³ Consequently, gaining recognition is not and has never been simply a matter of providing the BAR with the appropriate materials and information. The power of the discourse of nonrecognition discards and discounts such information and the material documentation of it as part of its regularized procedures.⁴ The spatial/geographical character of colonialism as it shaped the unrecognized status of contemporary Ohlone people is intrinsic, but this chapter focuses on what we will call "nominative cartography"—that is, the power to erase and also implant, to disappear but also to substantiate, and to displace and replace in the service of colonial projects. Our focus on place-names stems from recent experiences watching and listening to the ways that a people's presence can be obscured and eliminated through the renaming of places in Palestine.⁵

Our emphasis on space and cartography is inspired by Neil Smith's theoretical work on the geography of uneven development in capitalist societies. Smith's summation that "uneven development is social inequality blazoned into the geographical landscape, and it is simultaneously the exploitation of that geographical unevenness for certain socially determined ends" provokes me to wonder how to apply such a profound insight to colonial projects that remake, restructure, and rename landscapes.⁶ Rashid Khalidi offers one suggestion for how to apply a spatial, cartographic perspective to colonialism: "This process of naming [places] is an attempt to privilege one dimension of a complex reality at the expense of others, with the ultimate aim of blotting out or decisively subordinating them."⁷ This chapter, then, hinges on the quite literal transformation of the map of the San Francisco Bay area under successive colonial regimes as a central underpinning of the unacknowledged status of the Ohlone people.

The Ohlone case has been especially illuminated by a "comparable" case: what Meron Benvenisti has called "the Israelification of Palestinian geography."⁸ Benvenisti's work draws attention to particular colonial practices and outcomes that substantively erase and replace constitutive features of social and cultural landscapes when indigenous peoples lose control not only over their homelands but also over documenting historical memory of how their homelands looked and functioned before the onset of a colonial regime.⁹ This chapter begins with a discussion of the Hispanification of Ohlone geography during the Spanish colonial era (1770–1821). After a somewhat speculative discussion of changes transforming the Ohlone map during the period of the Mexican republic in California (1821–48), we argue that the Spanish colonial project made possible the categorical erasure of the Ohlone presence that occurred after U.S. statehood (1850). In coastal California, then, the sequence of two distinct colonial regimes shaped a particular fate for peoples such as the Ohlones. Better said, the ways in which the former shaped the possibilities of the latter, rather than the singular impact of either of these regimes, gave rise to the form geographical erasure took in Ohlone country. In these historical discussions, it is clear that in the California case, the erasure of the Ohlones from the map is the consequence not just of the conjugation of Spanish and American colonialisms but also of the specific forms of Spanish and American colonialism in their distinct time periods. That is, Spanish colonialism's transformation of coastal California came very late in the history of that empire and was marked by the primary impact of the use of Franciscan

missions, while the subsequent U.S. colonial regime was distinct in the role played by resource extraction and massive sudden waves of immigration that gave California immense national importance since its admission to the United States. These specificities further complicate and embroider the conjugation of two colonialisms that shaped the nonrecognized status of the Ohlone peoples in the San Francisco Bay area.

In conclusion, we will describe the Muwekma Ohlone tribe's efforts to directly confront their erasure from the map of the Bay Area through deliberate, self-reflexive efforts to reimplant their history and contemporary presence into the landscape of places using the power of nominative cartography. These efforts have proceeded notwithstanding the BAR's negative ruling in 2002, as the Muwekmas continue their struggle for recognition by other means.¹⁰

The Hispanification of Native Geography: The Ohlone Case

At first blush, the question of the Hispanification of native geography in California seems self-evident. Looking at any map of the state, one can immediately see that there are a preponderance of Hispanic place-names, particularly (and unsurprisingly) in the zone where missionization took place between the current Mexico-California boundary in the south to the northernmost extent of mission activity in what is now Sonoma County. By contrast, there are very few native place-names in this region, and the few that exist—Malibu, Lompoc, and Port Hueneme in the south, Petaluma in the north, for example—are not understood by the vast majority of people in California as native in origin or linked to the contemporary presence and activities of native peoples.¹¹ But if the results are self-evident to any map reader, how did this process of Hispanification take place? And what happened to indigenous place-names and to the indigenous places themselves?

One way to begin a discussion of the transformation of place would entail discussing precontact social structure and how native places were made and named before the arrival of the Spaniards. The anthropological literature about precontact California Indian society and social structure has developed contradictory approaches to those issues. On the one hand, the iconic work of Alfred Kroeber, embodied in his still-authoritative tome, *The Handbook of the Indians of California*, employed the term "tribelet" to describe what were supposed to be small, autochthonous sociopolitical

units that he considered the dominant structure in precontact California.¹² On the other hand, in Lowell Bean and Thomas Blackburn's pathbreaking edited volume, *Native Californians: A Theoretical Retrospective*, numerous authors write about large-scale social, political, and ritual integration of native societies across relatively great distances via relations of trade, kinship, and ceremonial interaction.¹³ It is indeed quite difficult to describe precisely the nature of precontact place and social structure, given what Randall Milliken has called "a vast discrepancy between the two cultures [native and Spanish]; there was a disparity in technology and an incongruity in world views." Thus, because the Spaniards were the first to report on precontact societies¹⁴ in coastal California, the picture that emerges is necessarily distorted and contentious. Steven W. Hackel argues that the Franciscans and other Spaniards were utterly uninterested in California Indian culture and believed that the native peoples in the missionized areas were primitives who had attained only the most rudimentary social, cultural, and religious levels.¹⁵

Milliken, however, provides a rigorous framework for discussing the transformation of place and social structure in the Ohlone region.¹⁶ While he does not theoretically commit himself to the older Kroeberian framework, his analysis takes for granted that villages and village social structure comprised the basis for precontact native society, a view that is also accepted by the later theorists from Bean and Blackburn onward. According to Milliken, Mission Santa Clara, one of the five missions in the aboriginal territory of Ohlone peoples, "lay at the northeastern edge of the Tamien tribal district. . . . Three large villages of over 120 inhabitants each lay within a four mile radius of the Santa Clara Mission site; the native names of those villages are not now known," but their Spanish designations—San Francisco Solano, Santa Ysabel, and San Joseph Cupertino—have survived.¹⁷ Santa Clara was established in 1777, whereas Mission Dolores in what is now urban San Francisco was built in 1776. Santa Cruz, site of the current city of the same name, was established in 1791. Mission San Jose, in what is now the East Bay city of Fremont was founded in 1797. Earliest of all, Mission San Carlos, in what is now Monterey, south of the Bay Area but still within the aboriginal territory of Ohlone peoples, was established in 1770.

Robert H. Jackson and Edward Castillo argue that the Spaniards' use of Franciscan missions to colonize California in the last quarter of the eighteenth century was "a warmed over version of the 16th century policy of congregación and reducción, modified by two hundred years of practical experience in missions" all over Spanish America and designed "to

transform native society into sedentary populations that could provide labor and pay taxes according to the model [the Spaniards had] developed in central Mexico."¹⁸ Writing about Mission San Jose, Jackson also concludes that the mission project, at least with regard to its organization of agricultural production and ranching and the architectural design of the mission itself, specifically aimed to resettle "dispersed [native] populations into large communities modeled on the corporate indigenous communities of central Mexico," and in this way the colonization of California hinged upon the success of the missions.¹⁹ Thus, we should understand Spanish mission colonialism in the late eighteenth century, accompanied by the establishment of military presidios designed to protect the missions and act as their enforcers, as itself the product of almost three hundred years of Spanish colonialism in the Americas. As Kent Lightfoot has noted, Spain sought geopolitically to compete with Britain and Russia in laying claim to the Pacific littoral of North America, which for Europeans at the time was one of the planet's most remote regions.²⁰ Spain's efforts in this regard also accelerated following U.S. independence as Americans began encroaching on Spanish territories and claims in Florida, and in the immense territories interior to the St. Louis/middle Mississippi River Valley region. The expeditions of Lewis and Clark, who reached the Pacific coast on November 7, 1805, underscored the ever-expanding reach of Anglo-American territorial ambitions in North America.²¹

The collapse of native places and geographies in the face of missionization was a complex and never quite complete process. Lightfoot comments that in California, "the founding of new European colonies often involved the removal of native peoples from their ancestral lands and their resettlement in newly created colonial places, including missions, plantations, mines and barrios"; in the Ohlone region specifically, "the ultimate consequence of placing missionary colonies in the coastal zone was the structural collapse of local native societies."²² Milliken explains that collapse as a complex historical process that lasted decades. He explains that "in contrast with the Spanish missionaries, many local people initially respected the new forms of worship practiced by the foreigners" but that Ohlone people soon made calculated alliances with what seemed to them powerful newcomers as increasingly damaging changes began taking their toll on native society.²³ Their emotional ambivalence, Milliken argues, was transformed by the Spaniards' "stunning technology and complex social organization," which challenged native social and economic values as epidemiological and ecological catastrophes ensued.²⁴

This process snowballed, and the Franciscans and other Spaniards may not have realized exactly how their actions would unfold. Hackel and Milliken agree that local native peoples were lured to the missions through Franciscans' gifts of food.²⁵ Very soon after the arrival of the Spaniards, epidemic diseases began decimating native populations, a process that accelerated, Hackel argues, as natives came to the missions hoping that the power of the priests could protect them from the wave of death. David Weber writes that the "Franciscans did not succeed unless Indians cooperated and Indians cooperated only when they believed they had something to gain from the new religion and the material benefits that accompanied it, or had too much to lose from resisting it."²⁶ The Franciscans interned neophytes (recently baptized Indians) in sex-segregated, filthy barracks-type quarters that contributed to the spread of diseases. Neophytes who attempted to escape were forcibly recaptured by soldiers from nearby presidios and flogged by the priests, enduring an almost complete loss of personal autonomy. Lightfoot contends that the missions resembled a penal system.²⁷ The livestock that the Spaniards brought with them almost immediately began damaging the native vegetation on which the Ohlones and other coastal native peoples had depended. The Franciscans suppressed controlled burns, an especially important technique of native food resource management.²⁸ Environmental degradation, demographic implosion, and the deterioration of the psychological and cultural environment caused by the systematic mistreatment of neophytes ultimately led the native social structure to erode. Ritual practices and respect for elders and cultural experts deteriorated as natives realized that their old ways provided no protection against disease and mistreatment and had apparently become irrelevant. All of these effects irrevocably transformed both interior landscapes (the intellectual and behavioral bases for indigenous cultural systems) and exterior landscapes (the reconfirmation of cultural understandings through a named geography with which individuals and groups interacted on a daily and highly practical basis).

If the Spaniards did not initially understand all the effects of their activities, they certainly came to that understanding over time and, according to Milliken, mounted an increasingly aggressive campaign against native ways of life. He strongly implies that as Christianity and its worldview spread among the neophytes and more widely, it fed a sense of powerlessness, unworthiness, and apathy in the Ohlone region. Christianity also seemed to access new realms of power. The old villages were abandoned, their place-names forgotten and replaced by Hispanic designations, as

were the personal names of individual natives who underwent baptism.²⁹ Hackel contends that “native identity often was obscured not just by given Spanish names but by the terms Spanish officials and missionaries used to classify people and establish their place within the colonial order.”³⁰ As the old place, polity, and personal names fragmented and then evaporated, Lightfoot describes the development of a new kind of Indian identity, constructed in the missions around the intermarriage between individuals from many different villages who spoke different Ohlone languages or languages from other adjacent regions.³¹ As Hackel argues, the missions became the central, essential places around which native identity recongealed.³² But the fate of those identities and the places associated with them was not a foregone conclusion. Before the Americans came to occupy and define what is now the state of California, this geography and particularly the coastal missionized region was part of the Mexican Republic. Had Mexico prevailed, the future might have turned out somewhat differently for the indigenous peoples and places of California.

Ohlone Places and Identities in Mexican California (1821–1848)

By 1822, the successful conclusion of the Mexican independence struggle against Spain brought a new administration to the region that would later become the state of California.³³ The chaotic struggles within the Mexican state no doubt affected the political structure in the territories of Alta California. But Mexican independence’s main effect on the native peoples of the coast, including the San Francisco Bay area, was the Mexican Republic’s secularization of the Franciscan missions, which occurred in 1832.

Soon after the arrival of the new Mexican bureaucracy, officials convened with both the Franciscans and the secular-military authorities in the Spanish presidios; among the key topics discussed was the fate of the missions’ neophytes. According to James A. Sandos, Mexican authorities initially concluded that the neophytes could not function on their own and “should remain subject to missionaries.”³⁴ Some Indians, judged useful to the local economy, were permitted to move out of the mission compounds. The status quo was unstable, and in 1827, growing anti-Spanish sentiment in the Mexican government led to demands that the Franciscans swear allegiance to the new republic. The resulting conflict with the Spanish Franciscans was matched by Mexican officials’ worries that were the missions to simply close, they would cease producing the food that supported the

entire Hispanic population (both those born in California, the Californios, and more recent immigrants from Mexico) in Alta California.³⁵ Therefore, Sandos explains, the Mexican authorities turned control over the missions from Sonoma to Carmel—the aboriginal homeland of Ohlone peoples—to a Mexican Franciscan order from Zacatecas.³⁶ This change later led to the complete secularization of the missions, their transformation into regular church parishes, and the emancipation of the neophytes, who were recognized as adult citizens of the republic. Whereas in 1800 the mission population stood at more than eighteen thousand, by 1839, the neophyte population had dwindled to less than one thousand.³⁷

But given that the missions had become the central—indeed, essential—places, for native peoples such as the Ohlones, what did emancipation mean for the neophytes and associated missionized populations in coastal areas like the Ohlone homelands? According to Milliken, writing in collaboration with the Muwekma Ohlones,

Under Spanish law, Mission lands were to be held in trust for the Indians until the government felt that they had become enough like Europeans to be considered “people of reason.” The Mexican government came under strong pressure during the 1820s to ignore Indian land rights and open up mission lands to settlement by the families of ex-soldiers and by new settlers from Mexico. The government of Mexico finally gave in to these new pressures. . . . [O]n paper these acts protected Indian land rights. Administrators were to divide mission properties among the Indians, with the left over lands to be allocated to Mexican immigrants through petition. A veritable landrush began among local Mexican families from San Jose. . . . Within a two year period an instant feudal aristocracy was formed complete with a population of Indian serfs. These new land owners continued to live in [the town] of San Jose, while former Mission San Jose Indians did all the labor on various ranchos.³⁸

The Mexican land grants in the southern end of the Bay Area, around Mission Santa Clara, included at least four grants to neophytes, two of which are important in light of this discussion. Rancho Ulistac, granted by the Mexican governor in 1845 to several Ohlone men, is a place-name that may mean “place of the basket” in several Ohlone languages and that has remained associated with the same location.³⁹ Although the ranch went through a complete depopulation of its indigenous inhabitants and many

significant ecological changes from orchard to golf course to neglect, it remained the last forty acres of open space in the city of Santa Clara and was officially designated the Ulistac Natural Area in 1997. How closely the current residents of Santa Clara associate the name “Ulistac” with Ohlone history and, more importantly, with contemporary Ohlone people is an open question. In a second case, an Ohlone village name was given to another land grant, the Rancho Posolmi, also awarded in 1844 to an Ohlone connected to Mission Santa Clara. The indigenous name and history were subsequently buried (literally and metaphorically) by the historical events that transformed the original ranch lands into a military area by the early 1930s, and by 1953 into Moffett Field, the site of major aerospace industries. The example of these two ranchos underscores the incomplete nature of cartographic transformations.

Sandos elaborates that following secularization, many Indians groups that had for up to two generations lived in or around the missions returned to old village sites.⁴⁰ This was true in the case of Ohlones who had been associated particularly with Mission San Jose and to a lesser extent with Mission Santa Clara. By the early 1840s, Ohlones began returning to an old village site in the Livermore Valley located on the Rancho El Valle de San Jose (later known as the Bernal Ranch), granted to three Hispanic California families in 1839, where they reestablished a small settlement that came to be known by the Spanish name “Alisal” (the alder grove).⁴¹ Alisal was the home of the Verona band, the most significant early twentieth-century Ohlone community in the Bay Area. Alisal and a number of other smaller post mission communities were not antiquarian revivals of pristine pre-contact culture, society, and place. Sandos points out that postmission native communities in the Ohlone region were composed of multilingual postneophytes who spoke Spanish as their common language as well as one among many mutually unintelligible Ohlone languages or languages from the Yokutsan, Miwokan, or other families.⁴² Lightfoot refers to “pan-mission identities” formed out of the intermarriages that took place in the missions.⁴³ Jackson and Castillo describe the emerging economy of Mexican California as based on cattle ranching, dominated by a small landed elite in which Indians—from Alisal in the case of the Ohlone territories—performed the multiple and essential menial labor as vaqueros.⁴⁴ In this situation, cattle and horse rustling was linked to outright rebellion against the authorities, and the history of one such rebel, Estanislao, a Yokuts-speaker from Mission San Jose who led a band of Miwok and Ohlone speakers, saw his defeat by the Mexican Army’s Lieutenant Mariano Guadalupe Vallejo.⁴⁵

Under Mexican rule, California was headed for a regime of labor, social stratification, and cultural diversity that is familiar to scholars of Latin American history and society. In such societies, there is no question about the need for a large pool of subaltern laborers who are marked ethnically as indigenous and whose non-Hispanic practices are tolerated even though to a great extent indigenous religious, sociopolitical, and kinship practices are in Latin America already always transformed by long-term impacts from and interactions with Catholicism and Hispanic notions of gender, social status, and hierarchy. The social order thereby constructed featured patron-client relationships between Hispanic landowners and Indian laborers structured by ritual godparenthood, or *compadrazgo*.⁴⁶ The postmission Ohlones and other natives of the coastal region were certainly still recognizable as Indians to the Hispanic Californios and immigrant Mexicans, and as in the rest of Latin America, indigenous settlements in California such as Alisal were part of a Hispanified cartography in which Spanish names were not incompatible with indigenous places.⁴⁷ Following this line of thinking, had the Mexican regime in California endured, the question would not be whether indigenous identities and places existed—as became the case under the U.S. regime—but rather what rights such identities and places could claim under a highly stratified and unequal political, social, and economic system.

The “Disappearance” of Ohlone Places and Identities in American California

According to Jackson and Castillo, “The discovery of gold in 1848 following the American conquest of California led to the rapid populating of California and statehood in 1850, and conflicts between Mexican and Anglo-American settlers over land. Indians in the coastal area where missions previously operated were increasingly marginalized and identified by Anglo-Americans as part of an unwanted and despised Mexican underclass.”⁴⁸ These authors describe an Anglo-American vision of California built out of frontierism, the individual ethic of self-reliance and a racially profiled egalitarianism in which only Anglo-American farmers, prospectors, and merchants would have the right to belong and be treated as equals. In such a society, the coastal, formerly missionized Indians evaporated because they did not fit the Anglo-American expectation of how Indians should look and act, while their looks and behaviors characterized them as Mexicans, the racially and linguistically marked underclass under the new regime. In these

circumstances, an indigenous map of places and indigenous identities was subsumed and ultimately erased by their Hispanification.

For all native peoples in California, two main thrusts determined the unfolding of the American colonial project: on the one hand, the overwhelmingly unstoppable drive toward resource extraction, epitomized by the Gold Rush that accompanied—indeed, propelled—statehood; and on the other hand, what Tomás Almaguer has described as the institutionalization of white supremacy as “the central organizing principle” during and since the formation of the state of California.⁴⁹ On January 7, 1851, in Governor Peter Burnett’s first address to the new state’s legislature, he declared that “a war of extermination will continue to be waged between the races, until the Indian race becomes extinct.”⁵⁰ The native peoples of the Sierra Nevada and North Coast, whose aboriginal territories lay exactly within the Gold Rush zone (and later the most important zones of timber extraction) experienced the drive toward resource extraction as genocide, which has been well documented for peoples such as the Sierra Miwok, the Maidu, and the Hupa.⁵¹ The resource extraction bonanzas had less direct effects on the coastal native peoples in the missionized zone. For the Ohlone peoples, the accelerating urbanization of what became the San Francisco Bay Area meant sudden and decisive demographic changes that made native peoples even smaller minorities in a population of Euro-American migrants eager to shape an unfamiliar environment into a comfortable one and in this way to fulfill utopian desires.⁵² Thus, the effects of demographic changes converged with the project of establishing white supremacy, leading to a horizon of erasure for native peoples in the coastal region.

We can underscore the nature of geographical-cartographic erasure for the Ohlones by contrasting their experience with native groups in California that did not undergo missionization, were officially recognized by the United States on a continuous basis since California statehood, and did receive a land base on which to maintain their cultural identity. That contrast is provided by a recent book about the Central Valley Yokuts and their struggles for cultural identity and tribal sovereignty on the Tule River reservation.⁵³ Before statehood, Yokuts peoples had emerged relatively unscathed by the Spanish and Mexican regimes. Under the U.S. regime, these Yokuts peoples coalesced as the Tule River Tribe, composed of multiple “closely related but politically and dialectically distinct Southern Valley and Foothill Yokuts tribes” that had “occupied villages of varying sizes along the rivers, creeks, springs and lakes throughout California’s vast Central Valley and foothill regions.” Their federally recognized status includes a

reservation land base of 55,396 acres—very large by California standards.⁵⁴ The reservation was established by executive order of Ulysses S. Grant in 1873 and was one of only four reservations in California that the federal government created in that era. One might expect that under such conditions and with such an outcome, the Central Valley Yokuts should have maintained a certain degree of cartographic integrity—in other words, some of the native places of the past would still exist with their native names intact.

But nothing of the sort occurred. Under the American regime, the Yokuts peoples were moved from the Tejon Reservation in the 1850s to the first Tule River Reservation, created in 1864, and then forcibly removed to the second (current) Tule River Reservation by 1873. All along, old village sites were abandoned and destroyed; new ones were only temporarily occupied before being destroyed; and subsistence enterprises, including both foraging for wild foods and agriculture, were continuously and repeatedly disrupted and rendered unproductive.⁵⁵ During the late nineteenth century, the federal government was disentangling itself from the older policies and views that had mandated the designation of greatly reduced portions of aboriginal lands as Indian Territory, where native peoples could nevertheless live apart from the larger Euro-American society. In its place came a new conception of reservations as much smaller and divorced from aboriginal territorial rights and where Indians were to be “civilized.”⁵⁶ Indeed, by the 1850s, the state and federal governments had decided that the Land Commission Act of 1851 had effectively abolished aboriginal claims to land in the state of California. As Gelya Frank and Carole Goldberg show, the Tule River reservation was established through other means, and its sovereign status was only maintained through continuous struggle.⁵⁷ Cartographic integrity has consequently not been a feature of Yokuts identity and sovereignty in the lands controlled by this tribe.

With this case—perhaps the best-case scenario in California—in mind, how did Ohlone relationships with place and place-names fare, given that they bore an additional burden of Spanish colonialism that led Anglo-Americans to discredit or simply not see Ohlones and other formerly missionized native peoples as Indians? The highly ambivalent case of Ulistac in Santa Clara notwithstanding, the connections between Ohlone identity and place, between indigenous existence and a piece of land, were most clearly maintained after statehood and into the twentieth century among the largest group of Ohlones located at Alisal and several other smaller nearby settlements in the East Bay. These connections occurred, in contrast with the Yokuts case, in the absence of any kind of official recognition or sanction.

In the late nineteenth century, the rancho estates of the Californios, like the Bernal Ranch where Alisal was located, passed out of the hands of the old Hispanic elite because new American laws made it very difficult to validate Californios' titles. An extreme drought destroyed agricultural production and obliged the old owners to sell to the wealthy Anglo-Americans settling in the San Francisco Bay area. No better example of this transition could be found than the acquisition of the Bernal Ranch by U.S. Senator George Hearst and his wife, Phoebe Apperson Hearst, parents of publishing magnate William Randolph Hearst. The Hearsts permitted the native community at Alisal, which had by then become known as the Verona band because the Verona railroad station had been built adjacent to their homes, to continue to occupy this terrain. This informal relationship sustained a revitalized cultural syncretism in which multiple Ohlone, Miwok, and Yokuts languages were spoken and ceremonial life was reinvigorated. Ohlones from Alisal participated in the Ghost Dance revitalization movement that in California fused with much older traditions such as the Kuksu ceremonial dance and religious complex. Numerous anthropologists documented these linguistic, ritual, and sociocultural phenomena at Alisal during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.⁵⁸

The informal relationship between the Verona band and the land where Alisal was located could not withstand the continued wave of demographic and economic change engulfing the Bay Area. The increasingly large number of Anglo-American immigrants and the tendency of new Anglo landowners to discontinue the use of Indian labor in favor of the droves of young men of European descent who seldom had families to support dried up the slender economic base on which the Verona band had depended. Assimilationist pressures were even stronger because the Ohlones, like other formerly missionized coastal peoples, were invisible as Indians under the American regime. As individuals from the Verona band drifted away from Alisal to live in other parts of the Bay Area, their invisibility became formalized when the federal government disassociated itself from the Verona band in 1927. Les W. Field and the Muwekma tribe elaborated the Verona band's listing on the California Indian census conducted in 1905–6, and the appearance of the Verona band on the "Indian Map of California" produced by Indian Service Bureau special agent C. E. Kelsey. He identified the Verona band as among twenty-four Indian bands for which land should be purchased, as reported to the Indian Service Bureau (of the BIA) by special agent C. H. Asbury from the Reno agency in 1914.⁵⁹ The Verona band appeared again as a landless tribe in the BIA's Reno agency 1923 annual report. But this

historic relationship, which formed the basis for the BAR's 1996 admission that the Verona band had previously been unambiguously recognized, was in effect unilaterally terminated in 1927 when the BIA's Sacramento superintendent, L. A. Dorrington, wrote in a report to Congress, "It does not appear at the present time that there is need for the purchase of land for the establishment of their [the Verona band's] homes."⁶⁰ The end of the Ohlones' relationship with the federal government, through the idiosyncratic decisions of one Indian agent, was matched by the declaration by the one of anthropology's patriarchs, Kroeber, who wrote that the "Costanoans" were "for all practical purposes" extinct.⁶¹

The Verona band ceased to exist as a residential group at Alisal because as a landless band, the community could not economically sustain itself, particularly after it was denied the formal land base federal recognition would have afforded. As Muwekma tribal scholarship has shown, without land—a place of their own—the family lineages of the Verona band continued to function as a cohesive social and cultural group; continued to enroll as individuals in BIA censuses from 1929 to 1932, from 1950 to 1957, and from 1968 to 1970; and even remained within a relatively small geographical area.⁶² The name "Alisal," not an indigenous one even if it was an indigenous place, was covered over by time and Bay Area real estate development. In the end, the coercive economic and political forces of American statehood, with which anthropology perhaps unwittingly cooperated, coming on the heels of Spanish missionization, denied the Ohlones their cultural existence and erased their cartographic presence. But although the places where they had lived as a community went into a decisive occultation behind Hispanic and Anglo place-names, neither the places nor the people went extinct, refusing to disappear.

Concluding Thoughts: Reinserting Ohlone Places and People in the Twenty-First Century

The descendants of the Verona band reorganized in 1965–71 to save their historic cemetery at Mission San Jose from destruction. In 1984 they solidified their reorganization as the Muwekma Ohlone Tribe, pursuing federal recognition and utilizing multiple professional, intellectual, political, and cultural tools to reassert their identity and reinsert their presence in their old homelands. From archaeological excavation to language revitalization, from leadership training workshops to abalone feasts, and from overnight camping and hiking trips in the Alisal area to participating in Bay Area

political alliances, the Muwekmas have emerged from erasure as an increasingly visible tribal organization of the indigenous people of the Bay Area. Notwithstanding BAR's negative finding in 2002, the tribe continues to struggle toward federal recognition.

Reinserting their presence in their aboriginal territory implies the redefinition of places and the renaming of those places. Muwekma leaders have made no secret of their desire, once they receive federal recognition, to secure property in and around the old Alisal community site. The successful reestablishment of an Ohlone presence at Alisal may result in multiple renamings, but so far, naming has emerged as a practice primarily in association with archaeological excavation and interpretation undertaken by the Muwekma Ohlone tribe's cultural resources management firm, Ohlone Families Consulting Services. These practices were recently detailed in a report for the City of San Jose's Department of Public Works, written in collaboration with San Jose State archaeologist Alan Leventhal and other professional archaeologists. Their report included a highly elaborated ethnohistory chapter that interpreted the findings at the CA-SCL-869 excavation site:

Towards the completion in August 2008 of the archaeological and burial recovery program at [CA-SCL-869], it became apparent that the most significant aspect of this site was the recovery of four elderly ancestral Ohlone Indian women. A decision was made by the Muwekma Ohlone Tribal leadership and the Tribe's Language Committee . . . to honor their deceased ancestors by renaming the site with a new name in the Tribe's aboriginal Ohlone Chocheño language.

This practice follows Tribal tradition which has over the past decades renamed some of their ancestral village and cemetery sites. . . . As mentioned above, because of the discovery of four elderly women who were buried near each other and had died very close in time to each other, the Muwekma Tribal Language Committee decided upon the name *Katwás' Ketneyma Waréptak*, which literally means "The Four Elderly Women" or the "Four Matriarchs" as the alternative native name for this site.⁶³

The significance of these renaming practices may primarily benefit the tribal members who appreciate the meaning of these names. But the effects may not always be so limited. In another resonant case, the construction of a railroad station in San Jose in the late 1980s and early 1990s on the

site where an enormous fruit cannery had once stood uncovered a major archaeological site with eighty-one burials. The California Department of Transportation constructed "a permanent exhibit structure within the heavy rail station which describes the story of the archaeological recovery." The rail station was named Tamien Station, after the local Ohlone village, and included "artifacts not associated with the burials" in the exhibit display.⁶⁴ The department intended that "the large number of commuters using this station [would be exposed] to the prehistory and rich cultural heritage of the Santa Clara Valley."⁶⁵ A brass plaque at the Tamien Station states, "Tamien Caltrain Station Grand Opening, June 27, 1992, 'Dedicated to the Muwekma Tribe of the Ohlone Indian Community who lived on this site for centuries.'"⁶⁶ This marker, placed with the collaboration of the Ohlone Families Consulting Services and the Muwekma tribe, seeks to inform a broad public about the contemporary existence of Ohlone people by reemplacing them in the world of daily life and work.

All such efforts to reemplace the Muwekmas within their aboriginal homelands through nominative cartography offer illuminating ethnographic perspectives on Patrick Wolfe's recent efforts to tease apart the relationships between settler colonialism and the elimination of native peoples through genocide.⁶⁷ In the United States, as Wolfe notes, settler colonialism was not necessarily isomorphic with genocide; in California, in specific instances, the war against native people was indeed tied up with genocidal campaigns.⁶⁸ In the Muwekma Ohlone case, erasure—a synonym for elimination—played out in the anthropology of California Indians as well. Resisting their erasure, the Muwekma Ohlones seek to literally put themselves back on the map in the highly urbanized San Francisco Bay Area, just one nodal point of an increasingly urbanized planet. Perhaps the urban battlegrounds, rather than the remote, rural locations where indigenous peoples were supposed by anthropologists to always have the best chances of survival, are the places where the power of renaming as well as the defense of indigenous places will matter most in this century, even as the technologies of settler colonialism develop ever more rapidly.

Notes

1. Alfred Kroeber, *Handbook of the Indians of California* (New York: Dover, 1925).
2. Throughout most of the twentieth century, anthropologists referred to Ohlone peoples as "Costanoan," derivative of the Spanish for "coastal people," *costeños*. Apparently misheard and mispronounced by early English-speaking

settlers as “costanos,” anthropologists transformed a misnomer into the even more absurd “Costanoan,” perhaps believing it sounded more “scientific.” The ethnonym “Ohlone” is a self-identifying term with a reasonably long history. The ancestors of these peoples spoke related, although mutually unintelligible languages, but were affiliated with one another through intermarriage, trade, and annual ceremonial cycles. In the East and South Bay, the term “Ohlone” has been used among the descendant families for at least a century. See Alan Leventhal, Les W. Field, Hank Alvarez, and Rosemary Cambra, “Back from Extinction: A Brief Overview of the Historic Disenfranchisement of the Ohlone Indian Peoples,” in *The Ohlone Past and Present: Native Americans of the San Francisco Bay Region*, ed. Lowell John Bean (Menlo Park, Calif.: Ballena, 1994), 297–337; Alan Leventhal, Diana Di Giuseppe, Melynda Atwood, David Grant, Rosemary Cambra, Charlene Nijmeh, Monica V. Arellano, Susanne Rodriguez, Sheila Guzman Schmidt, Gloria E. Gomez, Norma Sanchez, and Stella D’Oro, “Final Report on the Burial and Archaeological Data Recovery Program Conducted on a Portion of a Middle Period Ohlone Indian Cemetery, Katwás̄ Ketneyma Waréptak (Four Matriarchs) CA-SCL-869, Located at 5912 Cahalan Avenue, Fire Station #12 San Jose, Santa Clara County, California” (Prepared for the City of San Jose Department of Public Works by the Muwekma Ohlone Tribe and Ohlone Families Consulting Services, 2009). The term “Muwekma” (“the People” in Chocheño and Tamien, the East and South Bay Ohlone language) was also used into the 1930s (Leventhal et al., “Back from Extinction”).

3. Michel Foucault, *The History of Sexuality* (New York: Vintage, 1990).

4. See Les W. Field and the Muwekma Tribe, “Unacknowledged Tribes, Dangerous Knowledge: The Muwekma Ohlone and How Indian Identities Are ‘Known,’” *Wicazo Sa Review* 18 (2003): 79–94. As with our other collaboratively produced work, the tribe has edited, revised, and critiqued this article in an extensive fashion. Other scholars have described aspects of the historical construction of unacknowledged status for the Muwekma Ohlones and other coastal California indigenous peoples. See especially Randall Milliken, *A Time of Little Choice: The Disintegration of Tribal Culture in the San Francisco Bay Area, 1769–1810* (Menlo Park, Calif.: Ballena, 1995); Randall Milliken, *Native Americans of Mission San Jose* (Banning, Calif.: Malki-Ballena, 2008); Steven W. Hackel, *Children of Coyote, Missionaries of Saint Francis: Indian-Spanish Relations in Colonial California, 1769–1850* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003); Robert H. Jackson, “The Development of San Jose Mission,” in *Ohlone Past and Present*, ed. Bean, 229–49; Robert H. Jackson and Edward Castillo, *Indians, Franciscans, and Spanish Colonization: The Impact of the Mission System on California Indians* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1995); James A. Sandos, *Converting California: Indians*

and Franciscans in the Missions (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008); Kent Lightfoot, *Indians, Missionaries, and Merchants: The Legacy of Colonial Encounters on the California Frontiers* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003).

5. In May 2011, I co-organized and led an ethnographic field school in Palestine with Alex Lubin, the chair of the American Studies Department at the University of New Mexico. With seventeen undergraduate and graduate students, we visited and witnessed areas of the West Bank and East Jerusalem currently undergoing ethnic cleansing and colonial transformation; the effects of the 420-mile-long “separation barrier” on West Bank villages, some of which are enclosed on four sides by the wall; Arab villages within the pre-1967 boundaries that had been destroyed and erased; Israeli national parks built atop massacre sites; and many other locations, all in an effort to decolonize the study of Palestine.

6. Neil Smith, *Uneven Development: Nature, Capital, and the Production of Space* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2008), 206.

7. Rashid Khalidi, *Palestinian Identity: The Construction of Modern National Consciousness* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2010), 15.

8. Meron Benvenisti, *Sacred Landscape: The Buried History of the Holy Land since 1948* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002), 70.

9. For the Palestine case, see also Chiara De Cesari, “Creative Heritage: Palestinian Heritage NGOs and Defiant Arts of Government,” *American Anthropologist* 112 (2010): 625–37; Rochelle Davis, *Palestinian Village Histories: Geographies of the Displaced* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2011). I do not consider the case of Israel’s domination of Palestinian geography through, on the one hand, the power of nominative cartography, and, on the other, a distinct form of the discourse of nonrecognition with respect to the Palestinian people living within Israel’s 1948 “Green Line” boundaries, more brutal, onerous, or terrible than colonial practices utilized in other settler-colonial projects, including in the United States, Canada, Australia, or elsewhere. The Israel/Palestine case is simply much more recent and, thanks to excellent scholarship by both Palestinian and Israeli academics, quite well documented and dissected.

10. Since 2002, the Muwekma Ohlone tribe has pursued federal recognition largely through a court-based judicial strategy that entails obliging the Department of the Interior (where the BIA and the BAR are housed) to act in good faith, according to its own rules and regulations. This strategy is slowly bearing fruit (for news about their ongoing recognition struggle, see www.muwekma.org).

11. The missionized zone of coastal California has a number of important place-names of indigenous origin, although because of the general invisibility of native peoples in the state, I am not sure that the majority of denizens in those towns and cities are aware of this fact. Malibu, Lompoc, and Port Hueneme are place-names

from Chumash languages; Petaluma was the Coast Miwok name for a precontact village. In the case of one indigenous place-name outside of the missionized zone, Ukiah (from a Pomoan language), I found that many nonnative people were in fact aware of the indigenous origin of their city's name. Knowledge about and relations to place-names thus varies considerably around the state.

12. Kroeber, *Handbook*.

13. Lowell John Bean and Thomas C. Blackburn, *Native Californians: A Theoretical Retrospective* (Menlo Park, Calif.: Ballena, 1976).

14. Milliken, *Time of Little Choice*, 58.

15. Hackel, *Children of Coyote*.

16. Milliken, *Time of Little Choice*; Milliken, *Native Americans*.

17. Milliken, *Time of Little Choice*, 66. "Tamien" was the name of a village or perhaps (as Milliken argues) of an entire district of multiple villages in the area surrounding where the mission was established and in the middle of the contemporary city of Santa Clara. "Tamien" has also been used to refer to the South Bay Ohlone language. See Richard Levy, "Costanoan," in *Handbook of North American Indians*, ed. Robert F. Heizer (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution, 1978), 8:485-95.

18. Jackson and Castillo, *Indians, Franciscans, and Spanish Colonization*, 6.

19. Jackson, "Development of San Jose Mission," 230.

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

21. See, for example, Colin G. Calloway, *The American Revolution in Indian Country: Crisis and Diversity in Native American Communities* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995).

22. Lightfoot, *Indians, Missionaries, and Merchants*, 88.

23. Milliken, *Time of Little Choice*, 59.

24. *Ibid.*, 221.

25. Hackel, *Children of Coyote*; Milliken, *Time of Little Choice*.

26. David Weber, *The Spanish Frontier in North America* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992), 115.

27. Lightfoot, *Indians, Missionaries, and Merchants*, 62.

28. Lowell John Bean and Harry Lawton, "Some Explanations for the Rise of Cultural Complexity in Native California with Comments on Proto-Agriculture and Agriculture," in Bean and Blackburn, *Native Californians*, 29-35. See also Kat M. Anderson, *Tending the Wild: Native American Knowledge and the Management of California's Natural Resources* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006); Kent Lightfoot and Otis Parrish, *California Indians and their Environment: An Introduction* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2009).

29. Milliken, *Time of Little Choice*, 223-24.

30. Hackel, *Children of Coyote*, 12.

31. Lightfoot, *Indians, Missionaries, and Merchants*, 198-202.

32. Hackel, *Children of Coyote*, 422.

33. Mexican independence and state formation was an extended historical process. Whereas independence was first declared in 1810, Spanish forces did not leave the country until 1821. A monarchy ruled Mexico until 1824, and internecine struggles between those favoring federalism versus those favoring strongly centralized models of government raged during most of the mid-nineteenth century.

34. Sandos, *Converting California*, 106.

35. Jackson, "Development of San Jose Mission."

36. Sandos, *Converting California*, 108.

37. *Ibid.*, 110.

38. Randall Milliken, Alan Leventhal, and Rosemary Cambra, "Interpretive Recommendations and Background Report for the Coyote Hills Museum" (Submitted to the East Bay Regional Park District, Oakland, Calif., 1987), 11.

39. The information in this paragraph derives from personal communication with Alan Leventhal, February 2011.

40. Sandos, *Converting California*, 110.

41. Edward W. Gifford, *California Shell Artifacts* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1947); Les W. Field, Alan Leventhal, Dolores Sanchez, and Rosemary Cambra, "A Contemporary Ohlone Tribal Revitalization Movement: A Perspective from the Muwekma Ohlone Indians of the San Francisco Bay Area," *California History* 71 (1992): 412-31; Leventhal et al., "Back from Extinction."

42. Sandos, *Converting California* 21; Randall Milliken, "Ethnohistory of the Lower Napa Valley," in *Final Report of Archaeological Investigations in the River Glen Site (CA-NAP-261)* (Mill Valley, Calif.: Archaeological Consulting and Research Service, 1978); Randall Milliken, "The Spatial Organization of Human Population in Central California's San Francisco Peninsula at the Time of Spanish Arrival" (Master's thesis, Sonoma State University, 1983); Randall Milliken "An Ethnohistory of the Indian People of the San Francisco Bay Area from 1770-1810" (Ph.D. diss., University of California, Berkeley, 1991).

43. Lightfoot, *Indians, Missionaries, and Merchants*, 199.

44. Jackson and Castillo, *Indians, Franciscans, and Spanish Colonization*, 110-11.

45. See Jack Holterman, "The Revolt of Estanislao," *Indian Historian* 3 (1970): 43-54; Stephen J. Pitti, *The Devil in Silicon Valley: Northern California, Race, and Mexican Americans* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003); James J. Rawls, *Indians of California: The Changing Image* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1986).

46. See Sidney J. Mintz and Eric Wolf, "An Analysis of Ritual Co-Parenthood (Compadrazgo)," *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology* 6 (1950): 341-68.

47. Les W. Field, "Blood and Traits: Preliminary Observations on the Analysis of Mestizo and Indigenous Identities in Latin vs. North America," *Journal of Latin American Anthropology* 7 (2002): 2–33.
48. Jackson and Castillo, *Indians, Franciscans, and Spanish Colonization*, 111.
49. Tomás Almaguer, *Racial Fault Lines: The Historical Origins of White Supremacy in California* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994), 7.
50. Albert L. Hurtado, *Indian Survival on the California Frontier* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988), 135.
51. For the Sierra Miwok, see Jack Burrows, *Black Sun of the Miwok* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2000). For the Maidu, see Sara-Larus Tolley, *Quest for Tribal Acknowledgment: California's Honey Lake Maidu* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2003). For the Hupa, see Byron Nelson Jr., *Our Home Forever: The Hupa Indians of Northern California* (Salt Lake City: Howe, 1978); Jack Norton, *When Our Worlds Cried: Genocide in Northern California* (San Francisco: Indian Historian Press, 1979).
52. See Kevin Starr, *Americans and the California Dream, 1850–1915* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986).
53. Gelya Frank and Carole Goldberg, *Defying the Odds: The Tule River Tribe's Struggle for Sovereignty in Three Centuries* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010).
54. *Ibid.*, 4–5.
55. *Ibid.*, 151.
56. *Ibid.*, 30.
57. *Ibid.*, 22–62.
58. See Madison S. Beeler, "Northern Costanoan," *International Journal of American Linguistics* 27 (1961): 191–97; Edward W. Gifford, "Handwritten Linguistic Notes on San Lorenzo Costanoan," Ethnographic Document, unpublished manuscript 194, Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley, 1914; John P. Harrington, *Costanoan Field Notes: Chochenyo Linguistics* (New York: Krause International, 1921–39); Alfred Kroeber, "The Languages of the Coast of California South of San Francisco," *University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology* 2 (1904): 29–80; Alfred Kroeber, "The Chumash and Costanoan Languages," *University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology* 9 (1910): 237–71; J. Alden Mason, "The Mutsun Dialect of Costanoan, Based on the Vocabulary of de la Cuesta," *University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology* 11 (1916): 399–472; C. Hart Merriam, *Ethnographic Notes on California Indian Tribes III: Central California Indian Tribes*, ed. Robert F. Heizer (University of California Archaeological Surveys Reports 68, no. 3, 1967).
59. Field and Muwekma Tribe, "Unacknowledged Tribes."
60. *Ibid.*, 87.
61. Kroeber, *Handbook*, 464.
62. See Field et al., "Contemporary Ohlone Tribal Revitalization Movement"; Leventhal et al., "Back from Extinction."
63. Leventhal et al., "Final Report," XX.
64. Mark Hylkema, "Tamien Station Archaeological Report," in *Ohlone Past and Present*, ed. Bean, 249–71.
65. *Ibid.*, 268.
66. Alan Leventhal to author, February 2011.
67. Patrick Wolfe, "Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native," *Journal of Genocide Research* 8 (2006): 387–409.
68. See, e.g., Hurtado, *Indian Survival*; Norton, *When Our Worlds Cried*.