

When Strangers Met: Sex and Gender on Three Frontiers

ALBERT L. HURTADO

Albert Hurtado shifts our focus from women's survival strategies to the systems of constraint that often endangered their survival. He does this by exploring the most intimate of "cross-cultural exchanges," sexual relationships. Sex, like other basic activities such as eating and sleeping, might appear to be one constant of human relationships, and thus outside the range of history. Hurtado demonstrates that sex, too, is a social and historical category by showing how understandings of sexuality differed vastly among Spaniards, Euro-Americans, and various Indian peoples. In particular, Spanish Mexican and American gender systems had no equivalent for a variety of Indian cross-gender roles, which allowed some people to assume the roles of the other sex. In some cultures, they were actually understood to be the other sex; in others they constituted a third gender, neither traditionally male nor female. Men who adopted cross-gender roles, often called berdache, could only be understood as homosexuals by Europeans, who likewise misinterpreted Indian women's sexuality in many instances. Hurtado explores how these differences, coupled with vastly unequal power relationships, affected Indian women on three frontiers—in California under the Spanish mission system and later during the gold rush and in the Upper Missouri during the fur trade.

The evidence is grim. Indian women, Hurtado suggests, were subject to enormous abuse, including rape, venereal disease, and slavery. His research paints a picture vastly different from that suggested by histories of Indian-white relationships in other circumstances, particularly the marriages "according to the custom of the country" among European men and Indian women during the early Canadian fur trade.¹ We need to consider differences in the Europeans' enterprises, economies, and social expectations on various frontiers, as well as variations in Indian cultures, as we untangle what "intimacy" meant in different circumstances.

In the meanwhile, Hurtado offers an important caution. In our desire to recognize the historical agency of women and racial ethnic peoples, we must not ignore the realities of exploitation and abuse or the very limited options many people confronted. Systems of social constraint could sometimes be very constraining indeed. And, as Hurtado reminds us, in order to be able to exercise historical agency, one must first survive.

The West of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries was a cosmopolitan place—a meeting ground for people of disparate cultures and conflicting motives. Equipped with widely different ideas about correct social behavior, Indians, Hispanos, Anglos, and others frequently misunderstood and mistrusted each other. Yet these people who met as strangers came to live in close association for decades and often entered into sexual relationships—marriage, long-term cohabitation, and briefer connections as well. In some cases these intimate relationships softened the racial friction and violence that so often characterized the frontier. Especially in the fur trade Indian women joined with white men to make families that were the backbone of the trade and frontier society. These relationships produced mixed-blood (*métis*) children who populated the Great Lakes and Canadian frontiers.² In what is now the southwestern United States, the Spanish American frontier assumed a racially and culturally mixed character that in many ways resembled that of Mexico. Marriages and informal alliances between Indians, Spaniards, and others produced a mixed race, or “*mestizo*,” population that dominated the Hispanic settlements of the region.³ Such unions were, as Richard White has said of the Great Lakes region, “a bridge to the middle ground, an adjustment to interracial sex in the fur trade where the initial conceptions of sexual conduct held by each side were reconciled in a new customary relation.”⁴

The bridge provided some Indian women with new, albeit sometimes fleeting, survival routes in a changing world. Yet not all Indians could or would cross that bridge, and some of those who did found that the path was very rough going. This essay will compare several very different people, places, and circumstances—the Franciscan missions, Upper Missouri fur trade, California gold rush, Indians and whites from various nations. It focuses particularly on the experiences of Indian women and to a lesser extent on the *berdache*, a class of morphological males who dressed and acted as women.⁵ The *berdache* and the women in these stories probably represent a minority example in the range of Indian experiences, yet they serve to emphasize a major theme of this essay. Changes in social and economic relations put some people at risk—notably the *berdache* and women who were particularly vulnerable. At the same time that some couples built lasting relationships that benefited both parties, interracial sexuality exacerbated Indian-white conflict and violence. While some newcomers welcomed the seemingly open sexual possibilities of the frontier, they usually condemned—at least in public—behavior that challenged conventional European ideas about gender. The intimate experiences of Indians and whites that are presented here are not merely idiosyncratic episodes that are unconnected to the main currents of American history.⁶ On the contrary, their sexual histories illustrate how broad-based historical change affected personal life.

Concepts about sex and gender are at the heart of this matter. Sexuality, as John D’Emilio and Estelle Freedman have argued, “has been continually reshaped by the changing nature of the economy, the family, and politics.”⁷ Sexuality is a part of gender relations, a social construction

that varies according to time and circumstances.⁸ The historical analysis of gender, feminist scholar Carroll Smith-Rosenberg asserts, "forces us to reconsider our understanding of the most fundamental ordering of social relations, institutions of social relations, institutions and power arrangements within the society we study."⁹ Thus, this essay, which is focused on a particular aspect of gender relations, illuminates some of the challenges to Indian societies that were in contact with unusual new cultures in North America. In addition, it explains some of the results—whether intended or not—of the colonization of Indian resources and society.

Needless to say, it is a difficult task to disclose the private lives of any group, much less people who did not leave a personal record of their innermost thoughts and feelings. Moreover, much of what we know of Indian history comes from the writings of white men, most of whom had ethnocentric biases as well as the preoccupations of their gender.¹⁰ Still, the perspective of ethnohistory permits the cautious use of these sources to unravel some of the complex mysteries of sex and gender in the multi-ethnic American West of more than a century ago.

To begin to understand what happened, we must first know something of Indian, Hispanic, and Anglo ideas about sex and gender. Though sexual norms varied from tribe to tribe, it is fair to generalize that Indians had different ideas about sexuality than did Europeans. The Blackfeet, for example, considered it a disgrace for a young girl to become pregnant before marriage, yet anthropologist John C. Ewers reports that "chastity before marriage was more an ideal than a reality." Blackfeet men bragged of their conquests of single and married women alike.¹¹ Plains Indians generally tolerated premarital and extramarital sex among men but sought to maintain the virtue of women. A girl's reputation for chastity, or lack of it, affected her chances of marrying well. Nevertheless, love affairs, adultery, and elopements occurred among Plains Indians.¹² Serial monogamy was the usual marital pattern, but polygyny was also accepted, especially for chiefs, shamans, and other powerful people.¹³ Divorce was usually easily effected if one partner wanted it. Public ceremonial sexual practices were also known in some tribes, particularly the northern Plains Indians with their buffalo-calling ceremony. Women took lovers, but at their own risk, for their husbands might punish them if they found out. On the other hand, husbands might lend their wives to visitors or trade their sexual services for goods. However, these arrangements were thought of as gift-giving, part of the endless round of reciprocity that marked Indian life. True prostitution—sex as a purely commercial transaction—was rare among Indians before the arrival of Europeans, if it existed at all.

California poses special difficulties in describing sexual behavior and gender roles before European contact. There were more than one hundred distinct groups within the current state boundaries, each with its own language and customs. Nevertheless, patterns emerge from the anthropological literature on the tribes that inhabited the regions that came under mission influence. As with other Indian tribes, it was important for

children to marry well. With most tribes premarital sex did not seem to be a matter of great importance. After marriage, however, fidelity was expected and husbands had the authority to punish their errant wives. The Chumash, who lived in the Santa Barbara Channel region, permitted husbands to whip their adulterous wives. To the north, not far from Monterey Bay, a wronged Esselin husband could demand an indemnity payment from his wife's lover. In the Los Angeles region, a Gabrielino cuckold could claim the wife of his wife's lover. Yet the women in these unions possessed some power of their own over their sexual lives. They could divorce husbands who were cruel or who were otherwise not to their liking. As with the Plains tribes serial monogamy was a common marital pattern and polygyny was one of the privileges that came with wealth, power, and high status.¹⁴

Many tribes on the plains and in California also tolerated—perhaps even respected—the *berdache*, although this is a matter of current debate. It is not altogether clear that the *berdache* engaged in homosexual acts in all tribes, but in some cases they did. More importantly, a *berdache* was not viewed as a deviant male, but as an embodiment of male and female characteristics. In some tribes the *berdache* were regarded as a third gender, endowed with special spiritual attributes and other qualities. When they were so regarded, or when they were regarded sexually as women, their sexual unions with men were not understood as homosexual. Often chiefs would take a *berdache* as a second wife. Unmarried *berdache* often took serial lovers who were regarded as perfectly normal men.¹⁵ In some tribes women also cross-dressed and took on male roles.¹⁶ Such behavior struck Europeans as unnatural, lascivious, and wanton, even though native people regulated sexuality according to their own customs.

Indian sexuality reflected Indian gender roles that differed radically from European norms. Fertility and birth made the power of Indian women palpable to tribesmen. Many Indian societies were matrilineal. In some California tribes women could be shamans and chiefs. Women engaged in other activities that Europeans regarded as men's work, e.g., farming, skinning, butchering. In some tribes, women had considerable control over their sexual lives.¹⁷ Nevertheless, marriage was an important arrangement that established kinship between families, and while women usually could refuse an unwanted union, their families applied pressure to secure especially valuable alliances. The widespread practice of giving the prospective bride's family a gift (sometimes called a "bride price") emphasized reciprocal exchange between families rather than the outright purchase of the woman. While husbands in some tribes—especially on the northern plains—gave or gambled away their wives' sexual service, the wives were not free to dispense favors on their own and risked severe punishment if they did.¹⁸

Indians' sex and gender customs differed from the sexual ideology of Christian Europeans in many respects. Protestants and Catholics alike condemned extramarital sex, homosexuality, and polygamy. Divorce was

difficult or impossible to obtain, and—ideally—the brides and grooms who approached the marriage altar were virgins. Ideas about sexual desire in women changed markedly from the eighteenth to the nineteenth century. In the mid-1700s the notion that women enjoyed sex found wide support, but sex was for procreation and not pleasure alone.¹⁹ In the following century, however, a new idea took root. Women, according to some physicians and social ideologues, were frail, nervous, and uninterested in sex except as an act necessary to procreation. Women's challenges to male authority and the uncertainties of modernizing America inspired these theories that seemed to consign women to child rearing and household chores.²⁰ These theories about women's sexual nature fit well with the cult of true womanhood, which required them to be pure, pious, and domestic. Moreover, women were thought to exert a civilizing influence on men who had naturally coarse instincts.

Despite—or perhaps because of—the strictures that society placed on sexual behavior, illicit sex flourished in eastern cities even though prostitution seemed to be at odds with prevailing moral standards. Society tolerated the institution in part because it was believed that men were virile and aggressive, while women seldom wanted or enjoyed sex. This belief drove single and married men to brothels to satisfy their animal urges, while women remained at home in blissful ignorance, or perhaps grateful that they did not have to submit to their spouses' base instincts.²¹

A comparison of Anglo and Hispanic sexual attitudes and practices shows similarities and differences. Ideally, Hispanic women were secluded, except when closely chaperoned, to protect their chastity and the honor of their male relatives. In practice women had greater latitude of action than the ideal permitted, especially in frontier regions. Hispanic ideas about female sexuality also differed from Anglo theories. According to Anglo standards, normal women were sexually anesthetic, but in Hispanic lore, Latinas were easily seduced, partly because they were physically weaker than men and partly because women were incapable of mastering their own strong sexual impulses. Hispanic sexual life was further complicated because men acquired honor and status by seducing other men's wives and daughters. At the same time, the Catholic Church decreed that sex should be limited to the marriage bed for the sole purpose of procreation, which should be achieved through the so-called missionary position. All other sexual practices were sinful and prohibited.²² Spaniards did not always follow the sexual ideology that the church prescribed in their relations with Indians. While Crown and church permitted Spaniards to marry native people, informal sexual relationships also occurred with great regularity and resulted in a large mixed-race mestizo population.²³

In California's Franciscan missions, Spanish ideas about sex and gender contrasted sharply with local Indian traditions. Missions were supposed to inculcate Catholic and Spanish values in the Indians and prepare them for life as ordinary citizens. Guided by Catholic teachings, missionaries were determined to eradicate sinful behavior, including

common Indian practices like extramarital sex, easy divorce, homosexuality, and polygyny.²⁴ Thus, during confession, the friars took care to closely question neophytes about their sexual behavior.²⁵

Religious and lay Spaniards alike, who considered homosexuality an execrable sin against nature, one to be extirpated at all costs, had no other sexual framework within which to understand Indians' cross-gender roles. Much to the dismay of Spaniards, *berdache* Indians were ubiquitous in California. Captain Pedro Fages in 1775 reported that the Chumash were "addicted to the unspeakable vice of sinning against nature," maintaining that each *ranchería* had a transvestite "for common use." Fages apologized for even obliquely mentioning homosexuality because it was "an excess so criminal that it seems even forbidden to speak its name."²⁶ The missionary Pedro Font was more candid. He reported "sodomites addicted to nefarious practices" among the Yuma Indians and concluded that "there will be much to do when the Holy Faith and the Christian religion are established among them."²⁷

Other priests were as disturbed by *berdache* behavior as Font was. Father Francisco Palóu reported an incident at Mission San Antonio where a transvestite and another man were discovered "in an unspeakably sinful act." A priest, and two soldiers "punished them," Palóu revealed, "although not as much as they deserved." The horrified priest tried to explain to the Indians how terrible was their sin against nature only to be told that the two men were married. Palóu's reaction to this news was not recorded, but it is doubtful that he accepted it with equanimity. After a severe scolding, the couple left the mission vicinity. Palóu hoped that "these accursed persons will decrease, and such an abominable vice will be eradicated," as the Catholic faith increases "for the greater Glory of God and the good of those pitiful, ignorant people."²⁸

Civil and church officials agreed on the need to eradicate homosexuality as an affront to God and Spanish men alike. At Mission Santa Clara the fathers noticed an unconverted Indian who, though dressed like a woman and working among women, did not seem to have breasts, an observation that was made easier because Indian women traditionally wore only necklaces above the waist. The curious friars conspired with the corporal of the guard to take this questionable person into custody where he was completely disrobed, confirming that he was indeed a man. The poor fellow was "more embarrassed than if he had been a woman," according to one friar. For three days the soldiers kept him nude—stripped of his sexual identity—and made him sweep the plaza near the guardhouse—woman's work. He remained "sad and ashamed" until he was released under orders to abjure feminine clothes and stay out of women's company. Instead he fled from the mission to take up residence and a new transvestite life among gentiles.²⁹

The revulsion and violence that customary Indian sexual relations inspired in the newcomers must have puzzled and frightened native people. Formerly accepted as an ordinary part of social life, the *berdache* faced persecution at the hands of friars and soldiers. To the colonizers,

berdache were homosexuals and homosexual behavior was loathsome, one of many traits that convinced ethnocentric priests that California Indians were a backward race. In a word, they were "incomprehensible" to Father Geronimo Boscana. The "affirmative with them, is negative," he claimed "and the negative, the affirmative," a perversity that was clearly reflected in homosexuality. In frustration Boscana compared the California Indians with "a species of monkey."³⁰

Indian sexuality confounded Spaniards, but friars fretted over the sexual habits not only of neophytes. Some civilians and soldiers brought to California sexual attitudes and behavior that were at odds with Catholic and Indian values alike. Rape was a special concern of friars who condemned Spanish deviant sexual behavior in California.³¹ As early as 1772 Father Luís Jayme complained about some of the soldiers who deserved to be hanged for "continuous outrages" on the Diegueño women near the mission.³² Father Jayme worried that wanton soldiers would turn the Diegueños against the missions. "Many times," he asserted, the Indians were on the verge of attacking the mission because "some soldiers went there and raped their women." The situation was so bad that when the fathers approached the *rancherías* the Indians would flee, even risking hunger "so the soldiers will not rape their women as they have already done so many times in the past."

San Diego was not unique. Father Jayme complained that rapes had occurred at every mission. Junípero Serra, founder and father-president of the California missions, agreed with Jayme. Serra singled out Spanish muleteers who traveled between the missions as the worst perpetrators of sexual assaults. Rape, Serra believed, ultimately would alienate the Indians and imperil the mission system. The Indians, "until now as gentle as sheep," Serra wrote, "will turn on us like tigers."³³

Serra was a prophet. In 1775 eight hundred neophyte and gentle Diegueños, fed up with sexual assaults and chafing under missionary supervision, attacked Mission San Diego. They burned the mission and killed three Spaniards, including Father Jayme, beating his face beyond recognition.³⁴ As Jayme and Serra had predicted, sexual abuse made California a perilous place. Still, the revolt did not dissuade some Spaniards from sexual involvement with Indian women. In 1779 Serra was still criticizing the government for "unconcern in the matter of shameful conduct between the soldiers and Indian women," a complaint that may have included mutual as well as rapacious liaisons.³⁵

To reform Indian sexuality and protect unmarried female neophytes from Spanish assaults, friars closely watched their charges by day and kept them under lock and key at night. Unmarried men and women slept in separate quarters, although sexual segregation seems to have done little to halt illicit sexual behavior. Sherburne F. Cook, the foremost California Indian demographer, claimed that restrictions on sexuality may have induced neophytes to flee to the gentile tribes with whom they could enjoy life without unwanted sexual restrictions.³⁶ The 1824 Chumash rebellion is an illustrative case. During the revolt several hundred Santa Barbara



Monjerios, or girls' dormitories, like this reconstructed one at Mission La Purísima (California), were meant to keep young unmarried women from having voluntary sexual liaisons and to protect them from rape. Women were locked in such buildings every night. Unfortunately, the structures were unsanitary and poorly ventilated and contributed to the spread of diseases, which exacerbated the high death rates for women at the missions. (Courtesy *California History*.)

neophytes fled to the interior, where they exchanged women with Yokuts gentiles and abandoned other Catholic restrictions as well.³⁷

Even within the missions, the Franciscans' most stringent efforts did not stop determined neophytes from having forbidden sexual relations. In 1813 a Spanish government official sent a questionnaire to the missionaries inquiring about various aspects of mission Indian life. When asked about the vices most prevalent at each mission, the friars almost universally gave answers such as "impurity," "unchastity," "fornication," and "lust."³⁸ No doubt the friars had some individual successes in reforming Indian sexual behavior in the forty-four years that missions had existed, but according to their own reports, the missionaries had failed to inculcate Catholic sexual values in the neophytes.

But Spanish colonization had changed Indian sexual behavior in other ways. At the very least, sexual liaisons that were once accepted were now forbidden and had to be enjoyed furtively. There were other changes as well. Before Spaniards had arrived, true prostitution does not seem to have been customary in California, but during the mission era it became common.³⁹ A report of Father Jayme suggests how prostitution may have begun. In 1772 four soldiers raped two women at a ranchería known as El Corral. After the assault the soldiers tried to convert the act from rape

to prostitution by paying the women with some ribbon and a few tortillas. They also paid a neophyte man who had witnessed the assault and warned him not to divulge the incident. Insulted and angry, the Indians were not overawed by the rapists' threats and told Jayme. In retaliation the soldiers locked the neophyte man in the stocks, an injustice that outraged Jayme who personally released him.⁴⁰ These rapists had embarked on a program of sexual education. Food and gifts, they taught, could be had in exchange for sex.

Whether or not prostitution evolved from rapes, Spanish demands for sexual service led to the widespread sale of sex. Perhaps the adoption of prostitution was an Indian attempt to reduce the incidence of rape and exert some control over their sexual encounters with Spaniards. In any case, Indian men became involved as procurers. In 1780 Father Serra complained about a neophyte who procured women for the soldiers at Mission San Gabriel.⁴¹ A few years later a Spanish naturalist observed that the Chumash men had "become pimps, even for their own wives, for any miserable profit."⁴² So it would appear that the advent of prostitution was another unintended sexual result of the establishment of the California missions.

From a Catholic perspective the missions were failures as institutions of sexual reform, although they resulted in changes in Indian sexual life. From an Indian viewpoint the missionaries' intentions were not benign, but involved radical changes in all phases of Indian life. Franciscans railed bitterly against rape, prostitution, and other sexual practices that the Catholic Church condemned. Nevertheless, some Spaniards persisted in assaults and purchased sexual favors. Since many of these men were young unmarried soldiers, the existence of rape and prostitution in frontier California is not especially surprising. It is worth pointing out, however, that missions and presidios advanced together on the Spanish American frontier. Soldiers protected priests' lives and mission property. Without them the missions could not have endured. Thus, even though missionaries decried sexual brutality, their very presence promoted it. Spiritual, military, and sexual conquest went hand in glove on the California frontier.

Fur traders represented a far different aspect of European and American imperialism than did Franciscan missionaries. These expectant capitalists, as a historian has termed the traders, had material rather than spiritual goals in mind and pursued their vocation with hardly a shadow of humanitarian concern for their Indian clients.⁴³ Traders were not celibate by inclination or priestly vows. Because their business compelled them to live for extended periods among Indians, many traders married Indian women.⁴⁴

The Mandan and Hidatsa villages on the bluffs of the upper Missouri provide a commanding view of sex and gender at work in the fur trade. These Indians had been farmers and traders for generations before the first whites arrived at their villages in 1738. Strategically located where the expanding horse and gun frontiers met, Mandan and Hidatsa traders were

an important force on the upper Missouri in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.⁴⁵

Indian women were one of the prime attractions of the Missouri villages. In 1798 David Thompson, a North West Company trader, reported that his companions wanted to go to the Mandan communities chiefly for women. Thompson—like many other white visitors—remarked on the practice of providing “a bedfellow” to a traveler, adding, “if he has any property.”⁴⁶ Since traders often gave the women and their husbands presents, whites frequently equated the practice of wife lending with prostitution, but the Missouri tribes and other Plains Indians were involved in a far more complicated sexual enterprise than that. For them, the provision of a sexual partner was a matter of hospitality that cemented friendships and trading relationships. Moreover, they believed that coitus transferred power from one man to another, using the woman as a kind of transmission line. The Mandan institutionalized this principle in the buffalo-calling ceremony, a famous rite where old, respected hunters copulated with the wives of younger men who sought to invoke the elders’ spiritual aid. These acts also symbolized intercourse with life-giving buffalo, ensured fertility, and drew nigh the bison herds. Other tribes of the northern plains also practiced ritual intercourse.⁴⁷

The Indians who celebrated these rites no doubt considered their participation to be a sacred obligation, but when whites arrived on the scene the situation became confused. Mandans regarded fur traders as powerful persons, so whites were welcomed into the buffalo-calling ceremony, much to the carnal delight of the members of the Lewis and Clark expedition. As Pierre-Antoine Tabeau drolly remarked, the men of Lewis and Clark were “untiringly zealous in attracting the cow.”⁴⁸

Public sexual rites and the frank solicitations of Indian men and their wives were not the only erotic attractions of the Missouri villages. They were also slave marts where fur traders could purchase women. Slave women were captives from enemy tribes, often Shoshone, Sioux, and Arikara. Sacagawea, a Shoshone woman, was one of them. Her husband, Toussaint Charbonneau, purchased her and another young woman from Hidatsa traders sometime between 1800 and 1804.⁴⁹ The purchase of slave women for wives was not a romantic arrangement. Expedience and price were the main considerations of Francis A. Chardon who bought an Arikara woman at Fort Clark in 1838. His diary entry shows how casually such purchases were made. Tired of living alone, Chardon concluded “to buy myself a Wife, a young Virgin of 15—which cost \$150.” A month later Chardon received a present. An Arikara, or perhaps a Gros Ventre man, gave him a twelve-year-old Assiniboine girl, one of eight female captives taken during a fight that killed sixty-four of their kin.⁵⁰

Sacagawea, it is fair to say, is the best known of the luckless slaves who passed through the Missouri villages, but much about her life remains shrouded after her service with Lewis and Clark. Needless to say, we know far less about the uncounted anonymous women who shared her fate. The story of one of them, an extraordinary woman known only as

52. *Ibid.*, 264–65.
53. Weist, “Beasts of Burden,” 44.
54. Abel, ed., *Chardon's Journal*, 165.
55. *Ibid.*, 181.
56. Albert L. Hurtado, “‘Hardly a Farm House—A Kitchen without Them’: Indian and White Households on the California Borderland Frontier in 1860,” *Western Historical Quarterly* 13 (1982): 245–70; Hurtado, *Indian Survival*, 39–71.
57. Brigham D. Madsen, *The Shoshone Frontier and the Bear River Massacre* (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1985), 33.
58. John Wayman, *A Doctor on the California Trail: The Diary of Dr. John Hudson Wayman from Cambridge City, Indiana, to the Gold Fields in 1852*, ed. Edgely Woodman Todd (Denver: Old West Publishing, 1971), 70.
59. H. B. Sheldon to Dear Friends, 25 June 1852, H. B. Sheldon Papers, California Room, State Library, Sacramento.
60. Butler, *Daughters of Joy*.
61. Warren Saddler, undated entry [1849 or 1850], MS Journal, vol. 2, Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.
62. Hurtado, *Indian Survival*, 169–92.
63. Herman Francis Reinhart, *The Golden Frontier: The Recollections of Herman Francis Reinhart, 1851–1865* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1962), 45.
64. San Francisco Bulletin, 13 September 1856, quoted in Robert F. Heizer, ed., *The Destruction of the California Indians* (Santa Barbara, Calif.: Peregrine Smith, 1974), 278.
65. *Sacramento Union*, 1 October 1858, quoted in Heizer, ed., *Destruction of California Indians*, 279–80.
66. *Sacramento Daily Democratic State Journal*, 1 September 1855, quoted in Robert F. Heizer, ed., *They Were Only Diggers: A Collection of Articles from California Newspapers, 1851–1866, on Indian and White Relations* (Ramona, Calif.: Ballena Press, 1974), 29.
67. *Butte Democrat*, 24 September 1859.
68. See, for example, newspaper articles reprinted in Heizer, ed., *Destruction of California Indians*, 278–83.
69. Hurtado, *Indian Survival*, 169–92.
70. Sutter to Thomas J. Henley, 9 February 1856, Letters Received, Office of Indian Affairs, California Superintendency, 1849–1880, National Archives, RG 75, microfilm publication M234, reel 35; Albert L. Hurtado, “Indians in Town and Country: The Nisenan Indians’ Changing Economy and Society as Shown in John A. Sutter’s 1856 Correspondence,” *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 12, no. 2 (1988): 31–51.
71. Sherburne F. Cook and Woodrow Borah, *Essays in Population History: Mexico and California* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979), 278–310.
72. Anderson, *Kinsmen of Another Kind*, xi–xii, 58–76, 226–260.
73. Hurtado, *Indian Survival*, 169–92.
74. Longinos, *Journal*, 44.
75. Geiger and Meighan, eds., *As the Padres Saw Them*, 71–80.
76. Donald Jackson, ed., *Letters of the Lewis and Clark Expedition with Related Documents*, 2d ed., vol. 2 (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1978), 506, 521.
77. Abel, *Tableau's Narrative*, 183.
78. E. A. Stevenson to Thomas J. Henley, 31 December 1853, quoted in Heizer, ed., *Destruction of California Indians*, 13–16.
79. Cook, “Indian versus the Spanish Mission,” 28, 101–13.
80. Geiger and Meighan, eds., *As the Padres Saw Them*, 7; Brenda J. Baker and George J. Armelagos, “The Origin and Antiquity of Syphilis: Paleopathological Diagnosis and Interpretation,” *Current Anthropology* 29 (1988): 703–37.
81. Edward W. Hook III, “Syphilis and HIV Infection,” *The Journal of Infectious Diseases* 160 (September 1989): 530–34.