

## Bibliography

- Armstrong, A. L.  
1936 A Bull Roarer of Le Moustier Age from Pin Hole Cave, Cresswell  
Crags, Derbyshire. Proc. Preh. Soc. E. Anglia 6:330-34.
- Bowers, S.  
1885 Relics in a Cave. Pacific Science Monthly, 1:45-47.
- Henshaw, H. W.  
1887 Perforated Stones from California. Bur. Amer. Ethnol., Bull. 2.
- Kroeber, A. L.  
1925 Handbook of the Indians of California. Bur. Amer. Ethnol.,  
Bull. 78.
- Loeb, E. M.  
1929 Tribal Initiations and Secret Societies. Univ. of Calif. Publs.  
in Amer. Arch. and Ethnol., 25:3.
- Spier, L.  
1928 Havasupai Ethnography. Amer. Mus. Nat. Hist. Anthro. Papers,  
Vol. 29, Pt. 3.
- Van Valkenburgh, R.  
1952 We Found the Lost Indian Cave of the San Martins. Desert  
Magazine, 15:5-8.

### 79. CALIFORNIA POPULATION DENSITIES, 1770 AND 1950

Robert F. Heizer

#### ABSTRACT

A comparison of population maps for aboriginal California and modern California (based on the 1950 U.S. census) is presented. This shows a preference by both Indians and whites for the same general areas, even though the stimuli which effected population distribution in aboriginal times was different from that of today.

\* \* \* \* \*

To satisfy my curiosity, I recently compared the density of California Indian population at the time of Hispanic settlement (1770) with that reported by the last Federal Census (1950).

The two population density maps (Figs. 4a, b) are shown here. The first is reproduced from Kroeber (1939:154, map 19) and shows density by 100 sq. km. (equivalent to 38.52 sq. mi.) of the aboriginal tribes of California. Here the Wiyot, Yurok, Pomo and Foothill Yokuts tribal areas were occupied most heavily (roughly 2+ persons per sq. mi.). Those groups whose density was 25-45 and 45-70 per 100 sq. km. (between 1 and 2 persons per sq. mi.) lived west of the Sierra Nevada crest and along the southern coast and Colorado River. The thinnest held regions shown as 0-5 and 10-25 persons per 100 sq. km. (i.e., 0-.14 and .38 to .61 persons per sq. mi.--i.e., less than 1) are the mountain and desert regions of the eastern and desert southern sections of the state.

Distribution of Indian population was a reflex of the favorability of environment in terms of natural resources serving aboriginal economic needs. Better watered regions produced more food and more Indians lived in these areas. Coastal and valley areas, together with upland areas bordering valleys were held by larger numbers than desert and mountain regions where winter snow, deficiency of rainfall and limited economic resources made the areas less habitable and less productive (Kroeber, 1939:153-55).

The 1950 population distribution is essentially the result of one hundred and ten years of American occupation. Two main centers, a northern one focusing on San Francisco Bay and a southern one centering in Los Angeles are apparent. These are urban-industrial centers which have evolved in response to wholly different stimuli than those which can be shown to have effected the aboriginal population distribution. Indian and white settlement patterns (Heizer and Baumhoff, 1956; McEntire, 1946; Scott, 1959) are so different that there can be no direct comparison except to point out that coastal and valley areas are in both cases the seats of largest numbers, and desert mountain regions were least attractive to both pre-Hispanic Indians and ourselves today.

As to actual population numbers, the 1950 California population was 10,586,000. The aboriginal California total has been computed by Stephen Powers (1877), C. Hart Merriam (1905), A. L. Kroeber (1925:880-91) and S. F. Cook (1943, App. I). Powers computed a total of about 700,000 California Indians, Merriam reduced this to 260,000, and Kroeber settled upon 133,000, a figure which Cook increased slightly to 150,000. More recent attention to determining aboriginal numbers has been given by S. F. Cook who has published on the San Joaquin Valley tribes (Cook, 1955) and the north coast of California

(*ibid.*, 1956). M. A. Baumhoff has treated the problem of numbers of individuals among the northwestern California Athabascan groups (Baumhoff, 1958) and for a series of northern California tribes (Baumhoff, n.d.). This recent work by Cook and Baumhoff suggests that the figure of 150,000 California Indians may be too low, but no revised grand total has yet been proposed.

For the reader who may not know where to find references to works where the aboriginal population of North America is considered, I add here citations to Mooney (1928), Spinden (1928), Kroeber (1939, chap. 11) and Rosenblatt (1935).

For all practical purposes the prehistoric archaeological resources of the San Francisco and Los Angeles areas have been destroyed by urban development (housing tracts, road-building, etc.), and the large populations in both areas produce numbers of relic collectors who are actively engaged in ferreting out and completing the destruction of those few sites or remnants of sites which remain. As California's population continues to expand the process of obliteration of its prehistoric sites will be accelerated through these two processes.

#### Bibliography

Baumhoff, M. A.

1958 California Athabascan Groups. *Anthrop. Records* 16:5. Berkeley.

n.d. Ecological Determinants of Aboriginal California Population. Doc. Disser., Univ. of Calif. (Berkeley), 1959.

Cook, S. F.

1943 The Conflict Between the California Indian and White Civilization: I The Indian Versus the Spanish Mission. *Ibero-Americana*, No. 21. Berkeley.

1955 The Aboriginal Population of the San Joaquin Valley. *Anthrop. Records* 16:2. Berkeley.

1956 The Aboriginal Population of the North Coast of California. *Anthrop. Records* 16:3. Berkeley.

Heizer, R. F. and M. A. Baumhoff

1956 California Settlement Patterns. *In* Prehistoric Settlement Patterns in the New World. Viking Fund Publs. in *Anthrop.*, 23:32-44.

Kroeber, A. L.

1925 Handbook of the Indians of California. *Bur. Amer. Ethnol. Bull.* 78.

- Kroeber, A. L.  
1939 Cultural and Natural Areas in Native North America. Univ. of Calif. Press. Berkeley.
- McEntire, D. et al.  
1946 The Population of California. Commonwealth Club of Calif. San Francisco.
- Merriam, C. H.  
1905 The Indian Population of California. Amer. Anthropol., 7:594-606.
- Mooney, J.  
1928 The Aboriginal Population of America North of Mexico. Smithsonian Inst. Misc. Coll., 80:7, Publ. No. 2955.
- Powers, S.  
1877 Tribes of California. Contribs. to North Amer. Ethnol., Vol. 3. Washington.
- Rosenblatt, A.  
1935 El Desarrollo de la Población Indígena de América. Terra Firme, 1:1:115-33; 1:2:117-48; 1:3:109-41. Madrid.
- Scott, M.  
1959 The San Francisco Bay Area: A Metropolis in Perspective. Univ. of Calif. Press. Berkeley.
- Spinden, H. J.  
1928 The Population of Ancient America. The Geographical Review, 18:641-60.

## 80. TWO EARLY REPRESENTATIONS OF CALIFORNIA INDIANS

Robert F. Heizer

### ABSTRACT

Portrayals of California Indians of the Costanoan and Wintun groups dating from the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries are reproduced. Details of dress are shown.

\* \* \* \* \*