

I. CONTINUITY OF INDIAN POPULATION IN
CALIFORNIA FROM 1770/1848 TO 1955

A. L. Kroeber and Robert F. Heizer

This paper was written in 1955 by the authors in connection with combined Dockets 31 and 37 of the Indians of California vs. United States, allowed under the Indian Claims Commission Act of 1942, and submitted in evidence as Plaintiff's Exhibit No. RFH-27 in the Berkeley hearings of 1955. The detailed abstracts of the Roll of 1928 are in the possession of the junior author.

Tribes who sued separately (the so-called "splinter cases") were not studied by us in connection with the extent of their survivorship. This accounts for the absence of such groups as Shasta, Modoc, Paviotso, Washo, Yuma and Mohave in our treatment.

PART A. GENERAL

This is a study specially made to ascertain how continuously and comprehensively the Indian population of today represents the Indian population of California at the time of first colonization and missionization by Spaniards and Mexicans from about 1770 on,¹ and again as compared with the native population when the United States took over in 1848.

The areas from which all the native population was drawn off, to be "reduced" to missionization in the Spanish-Mexican period, covered perhaps a scant one-fourth of the present State of California. Beyond this was a marginal zone from which only part of the population was drained to the missions, or it was drawn off so shortly before secularization in 1834 that it was possible for the Indians to return to their old homes and endeavor to resume their aboriginal mode of life. With inclusion of this marginal zone, the proportion of California Hispanicized and missionized came to perhaps one-third.

The remaining two-thirds remained native until the Gold Rush of 1849--only one year after the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo. In this major segment of the State, some Indians had encountered passing parties of white men -- American trappers or Spanish military explorers -- before 1848. Many others had never seen Caucasians until 1849. A few groups were not reached by the American wave until 1850.

The effect of contact, especially of settlement under Caucasian control at missions, or of Americans settling in the Indian country, was three-fold.

First, the aboriginal Indian mode of life was disrupted, and it proceeded, more or less violently or gradually, to disintegrate and disappear.

Second, the Indians came to accept instead the white man's culture and life. Some of this acceptance was willing, some was reluctant, but the difference was only one of relative tempo.

Third, the Indian population decreased rapidly up to a certain point. The causes were multiple: introduction of new diseases for which no immunity had been established, lack of sanitation and medical care, expropriation and forced shifts of residence, warfare and violence, alcoholism, social adriftness and loss of purpose, etc. The decrease was terrifyingly rapid in the first decades after 1859, then slowed up. A minimum point was reached around 1900: probably slightly under 20,000.² After 1900, there was an increase, accompanied by an increase of intermarriage with whites. In other words, since 1900, the Indian blood has been increasingly diluted with white, perhaps more so than before 1900. There are about twice as many individuals in 1955 wholly or partly containing Indian blood as in 1900; but if these were statistically "compressed" into pure Indians -- two half-bloods counting as one full-blood, and so on -- this computed population would apparently still come out near 20,000.³

In short, between increasing acculturation and increasing genetic dilution, the California Indian is much less conspicuous in the total population than he used to be. Racially he survives, but he is socially submerged.

This has led to a current belief that the Indians are "dying out;" which is flatly contrary to fact. It is their aboriginal culture which has essentially died; and the native languages are also dying out, though somewhat more slowly. The "blood" or race is maintaining itself under the admixture that is taking place.

As a result of this misunderstanding, there is a widespread belief that many Indian groups, especially the smaller ones, have by now become extinct. This misapprehension is supported by the fact that the younger generation of Indians, schooled and accustomed to associating habitually with whites, often speak little if any of their ancestral language, and may have heard only conversational snatches about the culture of their great-grandparents -- in fact may not know even the tribe or birthplace of their grandparents.

Anthropologists sometimes have gone a step farther and when they can no longer learn from living informants the speech and modes of life of the ancestors of these informants, they talk of that tribe or group as being extinct -- when they mean merely that knowledge of the aboriginal language and culture has become extinct among the survivors. The survivors are there; they may even be full-bloods; racially or biologically the stock is not extinct; but they can no longer help the anthropologist acquire the knowledge about the group which he would like to preserve.

In other words, the Indian often has lasted better than some of the mental products of his race or hereditary strain; but there is prevalent vagueness or confusion over what about him has become extinct and what is still going.

In an effort to clarify this point an endeavor was made to analyze a strategic sample of the great roster or roll of the Indians of California as officially drawn up by the Bureau of Indian Affairs for enrolment under the law of 1928. This is preserved in a main ledger and several subsidiary ones kept in Sacramento; and is based on individual applications, accompanied by affidavits or certifications, on an eight-page form. Most of the earlier of these applications have been transferred from the Bureau of Indian Affairs to the National Archives. The law apparently did not require statement of tribal affiliation of applicants. Nevertheless most of the applications made in the early years of the law lean back to indicate the tribal affiliation, or in lieu of it the local affiliation or residence of ancestors as of June 1, 1852, so as to validate as accurately and convincingly as possible the descent of applicants from bona fide California Indian ancestors in 1852.

Dr. Sherburne Cook in 1953-54 examined the ledger roll at Sacramento, and extracted from it the application number, name, and ethnic or geographic appurtenance of several hundred individual applicants. Among these were 127 Carmeleño and part-Carmeleño Indians -- Costanoan Indians once attached to the Mission of Carmel at Monterey. There were also 35 Indians and part-Indians who stated their tribal affiliation as Chimariko, a group encountered in 1850 on a section of Trinity River in the vicinity of Burnt Ranch and New River. Both groups were "ethnographically extinct." That is, the linguistic and cultural data of which considerable memory remnants were still recordable in the very early nineteen hundreds -- by Merriam, Dixon, Harrington, Kroeber, Sapir, etc. -- could now no longer be secured as the older Carmeleño and Chimariko survivors had died off. Nevertheless, here, after 1928, were several dozen survivors satisfactorily claiming direct descent from both these groups, and thereby having their claims as California Indians officially validated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Groups which the anthropologists had long since given up as unproductive and culturally extinct, were evidently still going strong racially.

The 35 Chimariko were used as the first test sample. Examination by Dr. Dorothy Rainier Libby, of the applications filed in the National Archives in Washington, confirmed for all of the 35 individuals descent from one or more ancestors who were Chimariko and who were born or lived in the territory customarily attributed to the Chimariko. On these 35 applications, 27 children (mostly minors) of applicants were also mentioned by name; making a total of 62 Chimariko. Some of the 35 applicants had died since the early thirties; but from the rate at which the younger ones were having children, it was evident that the group was increasing; that the minor children of the early thirties had in many cases had children of their own by 1955; and that the number of legitimate Chimariko and part-Chimariko must now be at least 75 and possibly approaching 100. (The Federal Census of 1910 lists 31 Chimariko.)

It was decided to work out from the Chimariko to a larger sample of 600 individuals representative of all parts of California. Two main principles were followed in the selection of this sample:

1. Concentration on supposedly vanished, obscure, neglected, or "denatured" Indian groups, such as anthropologists tended to regard as unproductive for their purposes. This would include the little tribes that had suffered most heavily from gold miners and others; and the long Catholicized Indians of the Franciscan Missions, who, since secularization in 1834, might have tended not so much to die out as to socially merge in the resident Mexican population. There was much less need for investigating applicants from the larger and better preserved groups, such as Pomo, Paiute, Karok, Mono, Diegueño, etc., where the ancestral language was still being spoken by hundreds of tribesmen and existence and identity of the group was common knowledge.

2. Concentration also seemed desirable, so far as possible, on applications filed in the early years after 1928. The old Indians still alive then served as an authentic link with the past, and were mostly able to give quite definitely the tribe, village, or birthplace of most of their grandparents, sometimes even great-grandparents; whereas their children and grandchildren would only believe rather than know that their ancestors of 1852 lived in "Humboldt County" or "Kern County" -- either of which at that time harbored a half dozen or more distinct groups. In short, the earlier applications averaged much the richer in precise information as to tribal affiliation -- which would then also apply forward to their descendants, even though these descendants might no longer be able to supply the corresponding data themselves.

The 600 applications copied out were selected by us, first from Dr. Cook's extant lists; and then from examination of the great ledger at Sacramento for one day jointly by Kroeber and a graduate student in anthropology; followed by four days more search by the latter under our direction. From

the classified numbers and names thus obtained, 599 were selected as most likely to give significant results, and sent to Dr. Libby for follow-up in the National Archives. They yielded nearly 500 -- 491, to be exact -- pertinent, classifiable returns; 108 applications could not be found, contained errors of number or identity, or proved to relate to members of well-known and numerous tribes. The 491 significant returns were then classified.

These 491 genealogies from small, obscure, missionized, forgotten, or presumably "extinct" groups are tabulated in Part B of this report. For each such group there is given not only the number of individuals traced as belonging, but their degrees of Indian blood shown as a fraction (1/4, 1/2, 3/4, 4/4). These detailed lists, group by group, are followed by a tabulated summary.

In general the returns show that almost every group identifiable between 1770 and 1850 is represented by some lineal descendants surviving today. The exceptions are so few as to be almost negligible.

It must also be remembered that in almost every case the probable number of survivors is greater than the number cited, because the data are all from a sample of only 600 out of a total of around 40,000 applications -- the presumably most productive sample, it is true, but still only a small minority sample. To have analyzed the entire Roll would have taken a corps of workers many months and would have cost some tens of thousands of dollars.

Thus, when 7 living descendants are cited for a particular group, this does not mean there are only these 7, but that 7 have to date (1955) been individually traced within the sample used, and that there may actually be 17 or 27 or 37. Similarly, a 0 for survivors of the Costano Indians once brought to Dolores Mission in San Francisco does not mean that it is established that these Indians left no progeny surviving to the present, but merely that there was no one among the 599 applicants examined whose memory could any longer trace an ancestry leading back to a specific Indian convert at San Francisco.

In short, the figures for each group are not a ceiling but a minimum of which we are reasonably sure. The actual figures, if we could obtain them, would generally run considerably above the minima cited.

PART B. SPECIFIC DATANORTHWESTERN SMALL TRIBESChimariko

1/2 Chim. 1/2 Pit River (= 4/4)	1
1/2 Chim.	11
1/4 Chim. 1/4 other tribe (= 1/2) 3 tribes represented	6
1/4 Chim.	14
1/8 Chim. 1/8 other tribe (= 1/4)	2
1/8 Chim.	<u>1</u>
	35

These 35 individuals by 1931 had 27 (minor) children. Allowing for deaths among the 35 being more than counterbalanced by further children of the 35, and by children of their 27 recorded children, the present number of persons who can trace some degree of Chimariko descent is presumably at least 75 and may in 1955 come pretty close to 100.

Salmon River Region: Konomihu

1/2 Forks of Salmon	3
1/4 " " " 1/4 other tribe	1
1/2 "Shasta" at Forks of Salmon	<u>1</u>
	5

New River: Tlahomtahoi

New River 1/4	2
---------------	---

Shasta

(as they emerged in search for smaller tribes)

4/4 (born in "'28," "'28," '44, '48, '63, '65, '76, '79, all but first women)	8
1/2 Shasta, 1/2 other Ind. (born in '65, '73, '78, '82; 3 are women)	4

Shasta (continued)

1/2 Shasta 1/2 white (born '57, '57, '61, '64, '68, '71, '72, '76, '78, '79, 6 men, 2 women)	12
1/4 Shasta (born '81, '82, 2 men)	<u>2</u>
	26

ATHABASCANS

<u>Chilula</u>		<u>Nongatl</u> (Van Duzen, etc.)	
4/4	5		
3/4	1	1/2	2
1/2	<u>7</u>		
	13		
<u>Whilkut</u>		<u>Sinkyone</u> (incl. probables)	
4/4	3	4/4	2
5/8	2	1/2	23
1/2	2	1/4	<u>6</u>
1/4	<u>2</u>		31
	9		

Whilkut and ChilulaMixed and Doubtful as
between the Two

4/4	2
1/2	1
1/4	<u>1</u>
	4

Bear River Athabascans

1/4 (+1/2 Wiyot) 1

Mattole

4/4 (or Sinkyone)	1
3/4	1
1/2	5
1/4	7
1/8	<u>2</u>
	16

Lassik

(and "probably Lassik")

4/4	1
1/2	3
1/4	1
1/8	<u>1</u>
	6

True WailakiOf North Fork and Eel R. above
it.

1/2	3
1/8	<u>1</u>
	4

There are also those on Round
Valley Reservation.Kato

4/4	2
-----	---

CENTRAL CALIFORNIACoast Miwok

Tomales and Bodaga Bays
S. Rafael and Sonoma Missions

3/4 Coast Miwok	1	
1/2 CM + 1/2 <u>S. Clara M.</u>	1	
+ 1/2 <u>Solano Patwin</u>	1	
+ 1/4 S. Clara M.	1	
+ 1/2 S. Juan Bautista M.	1	
1/2 C M (mothers born 1816-1830)	<u>4</u>	9
1/4 C M + (1/4 Pomo (1/4 Solano)	2	
1/4 C M	2	
1/8 C M + 1/8 Pomo	<u>1</u>	<u>5</u>
		14

Probably Coast Miwok

Listed as "Sonoma Mission"

1/2	2
1/4	<u>4</u>
	6

Probably Suisun Patwin, lower Napa Valley

4/4	1	
1/2	<u>1</u>	2
See also 4/4 = 1/2 Coast Miwok, 1/2 Solano Patwin		<u>1</u>
		3

"Napa County Indian,"

Either Wappo or Suisun Patwin.

3/4	2
1/2	<u>2</u>
	4

Wappo

incl. Michiwas

4/4	4
3/4	2
1/2	<u>1</u>
	7

Plains Miwok, or Lower San Joaquin Yokuts, orDelta Nisenan Maidu

4/4	2
1/2	<u>2</u>
	4

Yuki

4/4 Yuki	10	
4/4 Yuki (+ Wailaki ?)	3	
1/2 Yuki	4	
1/4 Yuki	<u>1</u>	18

Doubtful Yuki

1/2	2	
1/4	<u>2</u>	4

Called Yuki (but more likely not)

[1/2 or 1/4 Probably Athabaskan (Wailaki, Lassik, etc.)]	5*	
[1/2 or 1/4 Possibly Athabaskan, probably some Wintun	2]	[7]

* Slips transferred to "Wailaki" Athab.

Yana

1/2 Yana 1/4 Wintun	1
1/2 Yana	7
1/4 Yana 1/2 other Ind.	2
1/4 Yana	<u>2</u>
	12

NORTHERN MISSIONSSonoma Mission

See Coast Miwok

Sonoma Co. Indians

Napa Co. Indians (Wappo)

San Rafael Mission

See Coast Miwok

COSTANO MISSIONSSan Francisco Mission

None traced in sample

San Jose Mission

In. S. Alameda Co.

Later refuge: Pleasanton

4/4 S. Jose	2
4/4 S. Jose or Plains Miwok or Yokuts	1
4/4 1/2 S. Jose 1/2 Pl. Miwok; 1/2 S.J., 1/2 Maidu	2
5/8 S. Jose plus S. Costanoan	1
1/2 S. Jose	4
3/8 S. Jose plus S. Costanoan	1
1/4 S. Jose	<u>1</u>
	12

Santa Clara Mission

1/2	1	
1/4	<u>1</u>	2
See also 2 more partials under Coast Miwok (1/2, 1/4)		<u>2</u> 4

Santa Cruz Mission

1/2 S. Cruz	1
1/2 S. Cruz 1/4 S.J. Bautista	1
1/2 S. Cruz 1/2 S. Gabriel	1
1/4 S. Cruz 1/4 S. Miguel	2
1/8 S. Cruz 1/8 S. Miguel	1
1/8 S. Cruz	<u>1</u> 7

San Juan Bautista Mission

4/4	3
1/2	8
1/4	<u>4</u> 15

(Plus fractionals in other mission blood)

Carmel Mission

Of Cook's 127, 38 were selected.

Of these there were:

4/4			2
1/2 (incl. 1 probable)			5
3/8			2 Costano, mainly Carmel
1/4		}	6
c. 1/4 ?			
1/8	3	}	9
c. 1/8 ?	6		
1/16	11	}	12
1/16 Carmel?	1		
1/32			<u>2</u>
			38
? Ancestry ?			<u>1</u>
			39

Manuel Butrón, one of J. Serra's soldiers, is mentioned in 26 of these. Quite possible that he was an ancestor of all of them.

Other Missions or tribes included in above:

S. Clara 1/4
 ? Esselen 1/4

Esselen (Possibly)

Carmel Mission (1/4) 1

Soledad Mission

Costanoan

One registrant (file No. 8412): f.S.L.O. 1/2
 m. Soledad 1/2

SALINAN MISSIONSSan Antonio MissionN. Salinan

4/4 S. Antonio	11	
4/4 (1/2 S. Antonio, 1/2 S. Miguel or San Luis Obispo)	2	
3/4 S. Antonio	3	
1/2 S. Antonio	2	
3/8 S. Antonio	1	
1/4 S. Antonio + 1/4 Carmel	1	
1/16 S. Antonio	<u>1</u>	
	21	

San Miguel MissionS. Salinan

4/4 S. Miguel	4	
4/4 (1/2 S. Miguel, 1/2 Costanoan)	3	
4/4 (1/4 S. Miguel, 1/4 Costanoan, 1/2 S. Ant.)	1	
1/2 S. Miguel	<u>3</u>	11
See also part S. Miguel:		
under S. Antonio	2	
under S. Cruz	<u>1</u>	<u>3</u>
		14

SOUTHERN MISSIONSCHUMASH MISSIONS

S. Luis Obispo (de Toloso)

4/4	0
1/2 plus Indian	1
1/2 probably, plus Indian	1
1/4	<u>2</u>
	4

Purissima Mission

None traced in applications examined.

S. Ynez Mission

Probably includes Cuyama or Interior Chumash.

4/4	3
3/4	1
1/2	<u>7</u>
	11

Plus scattering mixed with other Indian blood.

S. Barbara Mission

4/4	3
3/4	1
1/2	4
1/4	<u>3</u>
	11

Chumash Channel Islands

S. Cruz, S. Rosa, S. Miguel

Early merged in Santa Barbara and Ventura Missions.

Ventura Mission

4/4	2
4/4 probably	2
1/2	<u>1</u>
	5

SHOSHONEAN MISSIONSSan Fernando Mission

This may have included some Alliklik Serrano as well as Chumash Ventureno.

4/4	0
3/4	1
1/2	4
1/4	1
1/4 + 1/4 Kitanemuk (or Alliklik?)	1
1/4 + 1/8 S. Gabriel	$\frac{1}{8}$

S. Gabriel Mission

1/2	4
3/8	1
1/8 (+ 1/4 S. Fernando)	$\frac{1}{6}$

San Juan Capistrano

Very little mixture with other Indians recognized in records.
White mixture well recognized.

4/4 S. Juan Capistrano	2
1/2 (m' both 1814, 1820)	9
1/2-1/4	4
1/4	19
1/4-1/8	2
1/8	4
1/16	$\frac{1}{41}$

VARIOUS SHOSHONEAN GROUPSShoshone

= Panamint Shoshone

at: Darwin, Manzanar, Saline Valley, Death Valley, Scotty's Ranch,
Stovepipe Wells, Keeler, Panamint Valley.

also at Ballarat (identified by J. H. Steward as "Kawaiisu" -- see
below - 2:4/4 Shosh.)

4/4	14
1/2	1
1/2 Shoshone 1/2 Olancha Paiute	<u>1</u>
	16

Kawaiisu

4/4 Kawaiisu prob., b. at Tehachapi - "Paiute"	1
4/4 " " from Ballarat - "Shoshone"	<u>2</u>
	3

There must be others under various group names ("Tejon," "Paiute")
which cannot be positively identified from records which give no
locality beyond "Kern Co."

Uncertain or Misnamed Shoshoneans

"Paiute," b. at Onyx (probably Tubatulabal) 4/4	1
"Shoshone," b. at Weldon (probably Tubatulabal) 1/2	1
"Paiute," b. at Kelso (probably Tubatulabal) 4/4	1
- - - MM was "Shoshone" of Kern Co. 1/2	1
"Shoshone" from Tejon, b. at Amalia, Twin Oaks 1/2	<u>3</u>
	7

"Tejon"

Tejon Rancho was a refuge settlement, and briefly a reservation. It was in Kitanemuk territory, and the dominant group were Kitanemuk Serrano, but it almost certainly included Alliklik Serrano, probably Emigdiano Chumash, southernmost Yokuts, etc.

4/4	10	
3/4 + 1/4 (Gawia)	1	
1/2 + 1/2 Yokuts (Yaulamni, Bankalachi, Tachi, Wikchumni)	3	
1/2 + 1/2 Chumash = 4/4	<u>1</u>	15
1/2	4	
1/4 S. Fernando M. (+ 1/2 Tejon ?)	<u>2</u>	6
1/16 + 1/16 Chumash = 1/8	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>
		22

Serrano (proper)Morongo, S. Manuel, Twenty-nine Palms

4/4	9
1/2 + 1/2 Cah.	5
1/2	<u>3</u>
	17 *

* 3 of these are from Twenty-nine Palms.

NOT ON ROLLA. Mohave River Serrano: Vanyumé

Three individuals are known from mid-19th century, two men and a woman. They are Tavastan who introduced a song cycle; Fremont's interpreter of 1844; and Moha, then a young girl, who married a Mohave. The two men presumably also married among the Mohave and left descendants. Tavastan already had Mohave relatives, and so did Moha, indicating previous as well as subsequent penetration of Vanyumé blood among the Mohave.

B. Kamia Informants

in 1928-29

(From Gifford The Kamia, BAE Bull. 97:9. 1931.)

Chas. Beans	60
Narpai	80
Narpai's wife Rosa	70 1/2 Halchidhoma
José Hatpa.inya	90-100
Chas. Hihmiarp	50-60 1/2 Cocopa; lived in W. Diegueno
Placidias Aspa	part white
Total	<u>6</u>

RECAPITULATION OF 1955 INQUIRY INTO SURVIVORSHIP

	<u>4/4</u>	<u>3/4</u>	<u>1/2</u>	<u>3/8</u> <u>etc.</u>	<u>1/4</u>	<u>1/8</u>	<u>1/16</u>	<u>Tot.</u>	
Northwestern Small Tribes									
Chimariko			12		20		3	35	
Konomihu (Forks of Salmon)			4		1			5	1?
New River (Tlahomtahoi)					2			2	Cf. Chimar. 4202 } 4283 }
Shasta (fraction of)	8		16		2			<u>26+</u>	68
Athabascans (exc. Hupa, Tolowa)									"Wylackie"
Chilula (Redwood)	5	1	7					13	
Whilkut (Mad River)	3	2	2		2			9	
Whilkut and/or Chilula	2		1		1			4	
Bear River					1			1	
Mattole	1	1	5		7	2		16	4/4 may be Sinkyone
Nongatl (Van Duzen R.)			2					2	
Sinkyone (S. Fk. Eel)	2		23		6			31	Incl. probables
Lassik	1		3		1	1		6	Incl. probables
True Wailaki			3			1		4	Excl. Round V. Res.
Kato	2							<u>2</u>	

RECAPITULATION (continued)

	<u>4/4</u>	<u>3/4</u>	<u>1/2</u>	<u>3/8</u> <u>etc.</u>	<u>1/4</u>	<u>1/8</u>	<u>1/16</u>	<u>Total</u>	
Southern Missions									
Chumash									
S. Luis Obispo ("de Toloso")			2*		2			4	*1 prob., 2 all Indian
Purisima									
S. Ynez	3	1	7					11	
S. Barbara	3	1	4		3			11	
Islands, merged S.B., V. Ventura	4*		1					<u>5</u>	*2 prob. 31
Shoshonean Missions									
S. Fernando		1	4		3			8	
S. Gabriel			4	1		1		6	
S. Juan Capistrano	2		9	4	19	6	1	41	
S. Luis Rey									(Omitted; numerous survivors)
								<u>55</u>	Omitted, numerous
Various Shoshonean									
Panamint Shoshone	14		2					16	
Kawaiisu (2 Ballarat "Shosh")	3							3	(1 Tehachapi Paiute)
Uncertain, misnamed	2		3					5	Onyx, Weldon, Kelso, Twin Oaks
"Tejon" (Kitanemuk, + Alliklik?)	10	1	8		2		1	22	mixed mostly w. Indian
Serrano (Morongo, S. Manuel)	9		8*					17	*5: 1/2 Cahuilla 3 ex Twenty-nine Palms
Mohave River Serrano	3							3	Married into Mohave by 1850; not on Roll
								<u>66</u>	
Yuman Kamia	3		3					6	Listed by Gifford; not on Roll

BRIEF SUMMARY OF SURVIVORS

Northwestern Small Tribes	68	
Athabascans, <u>exc.</u> Tolowa, Hupa, reservation Wailaki	87	
Central California	72	
		227
Costanoan Missions	77	
Salinan Missions	35	
Chumash Missions	31	
Shoshonean Missions	55	
		198
Various Shoshoneans	66	
		<u>66</u>
		491

Footnotes

1. There are various computations of numbers of California Indians at the time of first Spanish settlement. S. Powers in 1877 suggested a figure of 750,000; C. Hart Merriam in 1905 calculated 250,000. A. L. Kroeber in 1925 came up with a figure of 125,000. Most recently, S. F. Cook has concluded that there were between 250,000 and 300,000 Indians in California at the time of discovery.
2. See A. L. Kroeber. California Indian Population About 1910. Univ. Calif. Publ. Amer. Arch. and Ethnol., vol. 47, No. 2, pp. 218-225, 1957.
3. This suggestion, of course, has to do only with Indians of California ancestry. Since 1955 there has been a very substantial emigration of Indians from other states to California. As of 1970 the estimated Indian population (recent entrants and descendants of original tribes) is about 100,000.