



Ishi and the California Indian Genocide as Developmental Mass Violence

Robert K. Hitchcock and Charles Flowerday

Abstract

Ishi represents a form of sentimental folk reductionism. But he can be a teaching tool for the California Indian Genocide, John Sutter also. His mill was where gold was discovered – setting off a frenzied settlement in which Indians were legally enslaved and slaughtered, finally ending a decade after the Emancipation Proclamation. They had already experienced wholesale devastation under Spanish and Mexican colonization. The mission system itself was inhumane and genocidal. It codified enslavement and trafficking of Indians as economically useful and morally purposeful. Mexican administration paid lip service to Indian emancipation but exploited them ruthlessly as peons. The California genocide typifies an expanded understanding of genocide and how it operates in a developmental paradigm. We then turn to a related model of the indigenous experience. Using developmental genocide in a gangland “democracy” and Andrew Woolford’s *ontologies of destruction*, a 500-year wholesale assault, we champion genocide as generic while including specific modes *mediated* by economic or civil destruction and challenging the *unmediated* model – direct mass killing – as the archetypical form. Allied with this, a model mediated by civil war also helps explain genocide in the Americas, including California. Genocide of native peoples operates through a cultural and moral reductionism that allows them to be manipulated (and destroyed) as objects. There are both biological and cultural aspects to this deadly dehumanization.

Introduction

When a lone California Indian was found in the corral of a slaughterhouse near Oroville, California on August 29th, 1911, it came as a huge surprise to those who found him and to the sheriff and deputies who took him into custody and put him in jail. He quickly became the object of interest to townspeople for miles around, some of whom could well have been involved in the destruction of the man’s relatives and ancestors. The story of his ‘discovery’ reached the newspapers in San Francisco, and was read by two University of California anthropologists, Alfred Kroeber, and T.T. Waterman, who arranged to meet the man and take him into their care. Waterman arrived in Oroville on 31 August 1911 and attempted to communicate with the man, who came to be known as Ishi (the Yana word for ‘man’). A quiet and unassuming individual, Ishi never told anyone his real name.

Eventually, it was established that the man was a Yahí, a group of California Indians who were believed at the time to be extinct. The Yahí were a part of a larger grouping of Yana Indians. The Yana in the 19th century were hunters and gatherers and fishers who resided in the forests, canyons, and highlands of north-central California. Their original territory covered some 6,000 km² (2,300 mi²), approximately 48 km wide and 112 km long, roughly the size of Delaware. Yana land stretched from Deer and Mill Creeks near Oroville north to the central Sierra Nevada Mountains on the eastern border of the Sacramento River valley (for maps of this area, see Waterman 1918:40; T. Kroeber 1961:25; Madley 2013:16). The Yahí lived in the southern portion of the Yana range, the other Yana being divided into southern, central (known to themselves as *Gatai*) and northern (who referred to themselves as *Garii*) (Sapir 1910; Waterman 1918; Kroeber 1925; Johnson 1978). The Yana inhabited regions between the Feather and Pit Rivers in what are now Shasta and Tehama counties in northern California, while the Yahí were also found in what is now Butte County. The Yana and Yahí spoke a Hokan language which differed from some of their neighboring groups with whom they interacted through trade and exchange (Sapir and Swadesh 1960; A. Kroeber 1925; Heizer and T. Kroeber 1979:2).

In this paper we focus specifically on the Yahí, who were subjected to massacres by vigilantes and settlers between 1848 and 1871 which led to near extinction of the group. The Yahí, also known as the Mill Creek Indians (Kroeber 1972), endured repeated attacks aimed at extermination of the group as a whole.

In some cases, children were taken as captives. Ishi, for his part, was clearly a genocide survivor, living virtually alone after a group of surveyors found his hiding place in November 1908. He was with a small group of four people including his mother, who died soon afterwards. His sister and an elderly man Ishi were also with were never seen again; only Ishi was able to get away (Kroeber 1961:110-114). Ishi remained on his own from 1908 until he arrived in the slaughterhouse corral in August 1911.

The Yahí/Yana population, which may have numbered as many as 3,000 in the early 1800s, declined precipitously, in the case of the Yahí, to about 12 individuals in 1872. Madley (2013:46-47, Table 1) estimates that between 800 and 915 Yana and Yahí were killed between 1850 and 1871, while only two immigrants or settlers lost their lives in the conflicts. We discuss the conflicts and other issues that affected the well-being of the Yahí in the sections that follow. We also address the processes affecting the Yahí and Yana in the 20th and 21st centuries.

Ishi and the Yahí

Ishi himself has been the subject of numerous biographies, books, conferences, films, and opinion pieces (A. Kroeber 1912; T. Kroeber 1961; Heizer and Kroeber 1979; Burrill 1990, 2001, 2014; Riffe 1992, 1998; Bergin and Collins 2000; Kroeber and Kroeber 2003; Starn 2004, Vizenor 2001; Day 2016). There are formal discussions of Ishi that are open to the public which are held regularly in Oroville, California, the most recent of which was on 2 November 2019 (www.ishifacts.com, accessed 24 June 2020;

Richard Burrill, personal communication, 2020). Sometimes incorrectly termed 'the last wild Indian' Ishi definitely became an icon and an important symbol of beleaguered indigeneity in the brief time between coming to public attention in 1911 and his death on 25 March 1916.

It is important to note that Ishi was both a victim and a survivor of genocidal massacres aimed at the destruction of his people on the basis of who they were. He was born in 1854¹ and raised as a hunter-gatherer, living on wild natural resources. For much of his life, he was essentially on the run and in hiding along with his mother, Yè tshulti, and other relatives and friends who had survived the Three Knolls Massacre in 1865. Together, they might have numbered between 30 and 45 individuals (T. Kroeber 1961:239). Ishi and his relatives and friends survived in part by avoiding conflict as much as possible with the settlers, ranchers, and others who came into or resided in Yahi land.

He and his campmates did not engage in the theft of livestock or directly confront white residents of the Deer Creek and Mount Lassen areas, preferring instead to hide away in the steep canyons in the region. There is evidence, both oral and archaeological, that the Yahi sometimes visited remote cabins and procured items such as clothing, metal tools, nails, and other items for their use, which they kept in their camps (Waterman 1918; Johnson 2003). Other Yahi, however, were known to have been involved in livestock theft and attacks on other tribes and a few settlers (T. Kroeber 1961:60-61).

While not the focus of this paper, Ishi had extensive dealings with anthropologists, linguists, museum workers, and medical personnel. Many of these interactions could be construed as positive. He lived in the museum of the University of California, then in San Francisco. He became good friends with Thomas Talbot Waterman, Alfred Louis Kroeber, Edward W. Gifford, and Saxton T. Pope (T. Kroeber 1961:148-154). He also became a good friend of Juan Dolores, a Papago Indian with whom he shared quarters in the museum (156-160). He had many other dealings with university staff and members of the public. He went shopping, usually on his own, on Seventh Avenue, between Golden Gate Park and Judah Street, where he became friendly with many of the shopkeepers and merchants (162-164). He enjoyed teaching people some of his skills, such as archery, arrow-making and the manufacture of arrowheads. He showed Saxton Pope how he used bows and arrows to in Golden Gate Park. In May 1914 he was part of a 14-day expedition to his home territory of Deer Creek, which included his two anthropologist friends, Saxton Pope and his son, and a Mr. Apperson, a local resident of the area. In many ways, it was a difficult trip for Ishi to make, in part because he viewed it as a return to 'the land of the dead' (206, 208-217).

From a contemporary perspective, Ishi can be seen in some ways as having been exploited for his knowledge and experience. He became a ward of the government and of the University of California. When offered the chance to

1. Some authors have his birth date as 1860 or 1861

return to Deer Creek or to a reservation where he could be with other Indians, however, he told the Indian Agent G.E. Kelsey, that he wanted to remain where he was at the museum with his friends (T. Kroeber 1961:217-218). After his death, Ishi's body was subjected to an autopsy against his wishes, and his brain was removed, later to be sent to the Smithsonian Institution in Washington, DC. This led to enormous controversy that engulfed the Anthropology Department at the University of California at Berkeley and raised serious questions about the ethics of treatment of Indigenous people (Scheper-Hughes 2001, 2003; Starn 2004). Ishi has been commemorated in numerous ways, including the naming of a wilderness area after him, the Ishi Wilderness, a 41,339-acre (167 km²) area in Lassen National Forest in northern California. There are at least two monuments honoring Ishi, one of them on the Oro Quincy Highway in Oroville, and the other above Black Rock on a ridge separating Deer Creek and Mill Creek in a spot called 'the Narrows.'

Genocide of the Yahi and Yana

The application of the term genocide to what happened to California Indians has not been without controversy. In the 19th century, the term genocide was not used; instead, the term extermination was employed. As Cahuilia-Luiseno author Edward D. Castillo noted in his *Short Overview of California Indian History*, posted on the State of California Native American Heritage Commission website (www.mahc.ca.gov, accessed 5 June 2020), the first California Governor, Phillip Burnett, in his address to the

new legislature, argued, "That a war of extermination will continue to be waged between the races, until the Indian race becomes extinct' (Burnett 1851:15; Castillo 2010:15). An idea behind Governor Burnett's speech was to transform what in essence were vigilantes into state-sponsored 'ranger-militiamen' (Madley 2016:187). On 7 August 1853, the *Yreka Mountain Herald* called for state-sponsored total annihilation of all northern California Indians (Madley 2016:221). The same newspaper said later that month, 'Let extermination be our motto" *Yreka Mountain Herald* 27 August 1853).

It was clear that the sentiment among white residents of northern California was extermination with what later was to be termed 'genocidal intent' (Madley 2016:236). 'Indian hunting' became a common practice of numerous white communities. As was pointed out by some military commanders (e.g. Captain Henry M. Judah), this was not war but an effort to destroy entire Indian communities (Madley 2016:237-238). Much of the killing was done by state-sponsored militias who were well-armed and unwilling to negotiate with the Indians with whom they came in contact. In some cases, the military provided arms to volunteer companies who then went out and killed hundreds of northern California Indians.

Prior to the Gold Rush that began with the discovery of gold by James W. Marshall at Sutter's Mill on 24 January 1848, the U.S. military had been involved in the purposeful destruction of California Indians, including Yana and Wintu. This was seen in the case of the actions of Colonel John C. Frémont and his scout Kit Carson and their men who

destroyed a village on the Sacramento River with artillery and rifle fire and then rushed into the village with sabers, pistols, axes and butcher knives. Indians who tried to escape were cut down by mounted soldiers with tomahawks. Estimates of victims ranged from 150 to over 700, with perhaps 300 killed in the pursuit. The Sacramento River military massacre foreshadowed 'what would become a common rationalization for such atrocities, the notion of pedagogic killing' (Madley 2016:48). The idea behind this concept was, according to Thomas E. Breckenridge, a member of the expedition writing at the time, that killing Indigenous Californians would teach survivors not to challenge whites (Breckenridge 1846). The Frémont Expedition set the pattern for the Anglo-American approach to California Indians, which involved either killing them or removing them, placing them on reservations or rancherias where they could be controlled. This approach differed from that pursued by Mexico in the mission system in California, which was built in part on the exploitation of Indian labor but was aimed more at conversion and exploitation than it was on the purposeful destruction of California Indians (Castillo 2010).

Genocides of Indigenous people in the 19th, 20th, and 21st centuries occurred in a number of different contexts (Jones 2006:67-94; Kiernan 2007; Hitchcock and Koperski 2008; Rensink 2009, 2011; Ostler 2020). These contexts range from ones in which there is competition over land and natural resources to multiethnic settings with socioeconomic stratification, power differentials, and pronounced differences among the various groups. In the past, including in California in

the 19th century, a significant proportion of the genocides of Indigenous peoples occurred during the course of colonial and settler expansion into frontier zones.

The term genocide refers first of all to purposeful physical destruction of a defined group. Fein (1990:24) sees genocide as "sustained purposeful action by a perpetrator to physically destroy a collectivity and social reproduction of group members." She also says that these actions are carried out regardless of the surrender or lack of threat offered by the victims. A key aspect in many of the definitions of genocide is intent (Jones 2006:20-22, 353). It is important to note that genocide is by no means a simple or unified phenomenon. Genocide frequently, but not always, involves systematic efforts to destroy collectivities, many of which are minorities.

From a critical review of the rapidly growing literature on Indigenous peoples' genocides most writers use a fairly broad definition of the concept of genocide. While some analysts see genocide as a set of acts committed with the intent to destroy groups in whole or in part, as defined by the *United Nations Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide* (United Nations 1951) others extend the concept to include such actions as intentional prevention of ethnic groups from practicing their traditional customs, forced resettlement; denial of access to food relief, health assistance, and development funds, and purposeful destruction of the habitats utilized by Indigenous peoples, sometimes termed ecocide (Clavero 2008; Crook and Short 2014).

The United Nations' *Convention on*

the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (Article II) defines genocide as follows:

In the present Convention: genocide means any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial, or religious group, as such:

- (a) Killing members of the group;
- (b) Causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group
- (c) Deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part;
- (d) Imposing measures indeed to prevent birth within the group;
- (e) Forcibly transferring children of the group to another group (United Nations 1951).

In California, miners, ranchers, farmers, and business people who entered from outside of the state, especially after 1848, engaged in all of the acts that were outlined in the United Nations Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (United Nations 1951). The primary strategy that was employed was physical destruction, often at the hands of volunteers and militias. Madley (2016) estimates that California's Indian population declined from some 150,000 to 30,000 between 1846 and 1870 (p. 3). The genocidal processes included outright massacres and murders, removals of people from their ancestral homelands and confinement to small reservations, where substantial numbers died of disease and starvation, and the taking of children away from their families, some of whom were used as

slaves. Rape and the spread of sexually transmitted diseases (STDs) among native women caused both severe physical and psychological trauma and affected female reproduction.

Behind these horrific acts was an intense racial hatred, what today is termed 'systematic racism.' Crimes against Indians were carried out with impunity; there were rarely efforts to fine or jail perpetrators for their actions. Two significant works on California Indian genocide came out in the 21st century, Brendan Lindsay's *Murder State: California's Native American Genocide 1846-1873* (2012) and Benjamin Madley's *An American Genocide: The United States and the California Indian Catastrophe, 1846 to 1873* (2016). Lindsay (2012) and Madley (2016) both see the motivations for the killings as pre-existing racism and fear of 'the other,' exacerbated by the complicity of the state not only in allowing genocidal acts but in rewarding them in some cases. Also important was the not-so-benign neglect of the media, faith-based institutions, and members of the public in failing to call into question more vocally the genocidal acts and misbehavior of fellow Californians. There were exceptions, of course, such as the editorial opinions of the *Daily Alta California* newspaper on 11 March 1850, which argued 'We hope and trust that the U.S. troops in California will prevent further violence' (Madley 2016:125-127).

The California Indian Genocide remained unclassified as a genocide until the comprehensive scope of the mass violence came to the fore (Lindsay 2012; Madley 2016). Fenelon and Trafzer (2014:13) explain it as follows:

Like other colonizers, the United States sought total domination of Native Americans, and federal and state officials allowed pioneers to murder, rape, kidnap, steal, and destroy Native Americans, creating systems for *superordinating* settlers, militia soldiers, and government officials to *subordinate* Indians, thereby developing caste-like social systems fully *alienating* Indigenes, usually on their own lands (p. 13, emphasis in original).

They go on to say, 'These rationalizations provided the basis for the denial, dismissal, and distortion of genocide in America, most specifically in California, because of six major reasons:

- (a) the difficult analysis of genocide in California because of the *lack of precedent*;
- (b) *general denial* among scholars, historians, and sociopolitical forces;
- (c) an inability to establish *intentionality* (critical to proving genocide);
- (d) inapplicability of *contemporary models*;
- (e) lack of temporal sequencing between systems (e.g., missions to U.S. Indian policy); and
- (f) failure to take responsibility by descendants and beneficiaries of genocidal policies (similar to throughout the United States generally) (p. 13, emphasis original).

Clearly, the California Indian genocides stand out, in part because of their complexity and because of their scope.

Chalk and Jonassohn (1990) classify genocides according to the motives behind them. They distinguish four types of genocide: (1) to eliminate a real or potential threat, (2) to spread terror among real or potential enemies, (3) to acquire economic wealth, and (4) to implement a belief, theory, or ideology (p. 29-32). In California, it can be argued, all four motives were behind the actions of the perpetrators. Vigilante violence was sometimes done in reprisal for actions taken by Indians such as the murder of their employers, as occurred, for example in the case of two ranchers who had Indian slaves and workers on their ranch who they mistreated in numerous ways, Charles Stone and Andrew Kelsey, near Clear Lake, California in December 1849. Vigilante groups were formed to seek out those responsible, but they ended up killing hundreds of Pomo and Wappo men, women and children (Madley 2016:114-116). The actions were aimed at eliminating opponents and at terrorizing the Indians into subservience (see Chalk and Jonassohn 1990:29, 36-37; Madley 2016:120-127). Even if they did not wipe out entire groups, the killing of expert hunter-gatherers removed much needed labor in Indian groups, who were both loved ones and family members, contributing to subsistence procurement difficulties and starvation (Madley 2016:125).

Smith (1987) sees genocide as an aspect of (1) war, and (2) development, and he notes that in the past it appeared in a variety of contexts, including conquest, religious persecution, and colonial domination (p. 23-25). Smith distinguishes five different types of genocide, one of which he also calls utilitarian genocide. This kind of

genocide, according to Smith occurred especially in the sixteenth- to nineteenth-century period when colonial societies came in contact with indigenous peoples in the Americas, Australia, Tasmania, and Africa (1987:23). Genocides were perpetrated, as Smith puts it, “out of cold calculation of gain, and, in some cases, as sadistic pleasure” (1987:23). The basic objectives of 19th century genocides of Indigenous peoples were, according to Smith, Indian land, resources, and labor (1987:25). In Smith’s view, genocidal actions against Indigenous peoples are not simply accidental or unpremeditated events but are acts done purposely to achieve economic objectives.

An equivalent category to the utilitarian genocide discussed by Smith (1987) and that of genocide aimed at acquiring economic wealth suggested by Chalk and Jonassohn (1990:29) is what Fein (1984:8-9) refers to as developmental genocide. This kind of genocide generally is preceded by the movement of individuals, governmental organizations and bureaucratic institutions into frontier zones where Indigenous groups resided and earned their livelihoods. Admittedly, there was significant variation in the ways in which encroaching individuals and agencies dealt with resident groups. In some cases, the outsiders attempted to negotiate with local people; in other cases, they took their land and resources away from them without their permission; and in still other cases they tried to annihilate them (Fein 1984:8). Resident Indians, for their part, responded in a variety of ways: some of them actively resisted the incursions, others sought to negotiate, and still others retreated into remote, inaccessible areas. Most importantly, California Indians adapted and endured

in the face of colonial violence and settler encroachment.

The California Gold Rush between January 1848 and 1864 brought some 300,000 people from all over the world into northern California (Rawls 1976; Johnson 1978:362; Shaler 2020). The presence of large numbers of outsiders led to greater conflicts over resources and the expansion of tensions between immigrants and Indigenous people. Miners, with little experience in dealing with Indigenous people, pushed for removals or extermination. Some of them, however, depended on Indian labor in the gold fields and for supplying them with food such as deer, acorns, and salmon. Population pressure on the northern California resource base exacerbated the difficulties of Indigenous people in sustaining themselves economically (Madley 2016:70-71, 100). Placer mining activities resulted in environmental impacts ranging from toxins such as mercury in streams and rivers to the sedimentation of water courses that in the past had supported sizable populations of fish and other resources (Madley 2013:21). Oral histories of northern California Indians contain stories about immigrants purposely destroying oak trees in order to reduce the availability of acorns, a staple food of many northern and central California Indigenous people (Hitchcock). Purposeful destruction of high-value Indian resources, combined with the fouling of streams, rivers, and lakes with toxins from mining activities, can be seen as ecocide.

There are at least four types of data on genocides of California Indians: (1) reports and admissions of perpetrators, (2) bystander or observer reports, some of them documented in media sources, (3)

testimonies of victims and oral histories, and (4) forensic evidence (Madley 2016:10). All four of these types of data were employed in the following analysis of genocides, massacres, mass killings, and murders of Yana and Yahi. Yana and Yahi customs are such that names of the dead are not used, and there are few, if any, formal records of Yana and Yahi memories of how they were treated. Nevertheless, it is possible to provide a tabular record of some of the genocides and human rights violations against northern and central California Indians (see Table 1).

Several observations can be made about this table. First, the perpetrators of the violence against central California Indians ranged from individual settlers, ranchers, and miners to self-appointed vigilante groups and the U.S. military. Particularly disturbing were the vigilantes who carried out killings, torture, and kidnappings of Indian adults and children. The California state legislature provided financial and moral support to “Indian-hunting campaigns,” especially after 1851 (Madley 2013:20-21). The legislature also underwrote the costs of weapons

Table 1. Genocidal Massacres of Native Californians

Location	Date	Victims	Perpetrators	Reference(s)
Sacramento River, California	March 1846	Wintun and Yana	U.S. Military unit under Colonel John C. Frémont	Breckenridge (1846); Lindsay (2012:94-95); Madley (2016:45-48, 363)
Sutter’s Mill, California	March 1849	Nisenan. Miwok	Settlers and militias	Madley (2016:428)
Clear Lake Island, California	15 May 1850	Pomo	Settlers and ranchers; U.S. Army unit	Lindsay (2012:248); Garsha (2015); Madley (2016:40, 228-243, 431)

Bridge Gulch, California	23 April 1852	Wintu	settlers	Madley (2016:206-207)
Yontocket Ranch, California	Spring 1853	Wiyot	Settlers, miners and a 33-man company	Norton (1979:54-56)
Round Valley, California	1856 – 1859 (battles and shootings)	Yuki	Settlers, vigilantes, and mercenaries	Carranco and Estle (1998); Baumgardner (2006); Madley (2008, 2016:256-266)
Eureka, California	26 February 1860	Tolowa	Settlers and townspeople	Madley (2016:209, 220- 224, 231-232)
Three Knolls, Mill Creek, California	August 13-14, 1865	Yahi	Settlers	Anderson (1909:71-81); T. Kroeber (1961:79-82); Madley (2013)
Dry Creek	Early 1866	Yahi	Settlers	Waterman (1918:39); T. Kroeber (1961:82-88);
Kingsley Cave, Mill Creek Headwaters	April 1871	Yahi/Yana	Settlers	Waterman (1918:71); Riffe (1992)

For additional information on the treatment of California Indians, see Madley
(2016:363-550, Appendices 1-7)

and ammunition for militias (Madley 2016:199-200). Immigrants who passed through the Mount Lassen area began killing Yana in 1848. The attacks and massacres picked up in the mid-1850s, some of them recorded by Indigenous authors including Byron Nelson (1978), Jack Norton (1979) and Edward Castillo (2010). The Yahi and Yana sought refuge in the highlands and canyonlands of northern and central California, and their remoteness provided them with a degree of protection, at least until the numbers of settlers, ranchers, and farmers expanded in the mid-1860s. As noted earlier, the Yana and Yahi preferred to avoid conflicts with other groups, so attacks on settlers and livestock thefts relatively uncommon. This did not mean that the perpetrators of the massacres (e.g. Anderson 1909) did not use retaliation as a justification for their actions.

Developmental Genocide

What transpired with the Yana and Yahi can be seen as a concrete example of mass developmental genocide. Campaigns against the Yana and Yahi were both state-sanctioned and carried out by vigilantes who had no connection whatsoever with the state. The expeditions undertaken against the Yana and Yahi were aimed at both extermination and forced removals to reservations and rancherias, one example being the Round Valley Reservation in Mendocino County. High mortality rates occurred both during forced marches to reservations and during the occupation of the areas set aside for Indians, some due to stress, starvation, and disease (Madley 2013:31, 2016:257-261). In terms

of extermination efforts, there was a difference between the U.S. Army and the vigilantes: the army tended to kill smaller numbers of Indians and take more captives, while the vigilantes, militias, and civilians tended to 'be more genocidal: shooting, beheading, burning, enslaving, and scalping most of those Indians they attacked' (Madley 2016:224). The *Yreka Mountain Herald* argued on 26 December 1853, "We can never rest in security until the redskins are treated like the other beasts of the forests." Dehumanization, decimation, and denigration were the order of the day in the 1850s. Indians were shot down without provocation and their bodies mutilated by the vigilantes. Indian property was confiscated and kept by the perpetrators of the massacres.

Militia General William L. Kibbe's units carried out the Pit River Militia Expedition from July to December 1859, claiming that they had killed well over 200 people and had captured 1,200. Some of them were Yana, who the media, including the *New York Times* on 16 December 1859 declared were 'nearly exterminated' (Madley 2016:271-276). The actions of militias and military units and individual volunteers were decried by such organizations as the Northern California Indian Association (Lindsay 2012:349) and by the media in many of the towns in northern California.

Things began to change during the Civil War from 1861 to 1865, with a reduction in funds and weapons for the U.S. Army and vigilantes, and rising public consciousness about the mistreatment of Indians, which led to more frequent criticism of what was happening in northern California. Two California state senators asked, 'Shall

the Indians be exterminated, or shall they be protected' (Madley 2016:284). During the Civil War there began to be more intense scrutiny and criticism of what was happening with California Indians, particularly their enslavement and confinement to poorly managed reservations and rancheria, which saw widespread starvation and high disease rates in California in 1862 and 1863. Yana in northern California retreated further into the mountains but prepared themselves for a defensive guerilla operation to protect themselves from the vigilantes. In fact, there were few, if any, attacks on settlers but the vigilante attacks intensified in 1865-66, including the Three Knolls massacre which took the lives of many of Ishi's kinsfolk and led to his disappearance into the remote areas of Deer and Mill Creek.

It is important to note that during this period there were some efforts by ranchers and farmers to protect Yana workers from the vigilantes (Madley 2016:325-326). One of the last massacres of Yana occurred in 1871 at Kingsley Cave near the headwaters of Mill Creek. After that, there were only sporadic reports of Yana by settlers and ranchers until the 20th century, when Ishi and his family were found by surveyors in 1908 at their hideout known as Grizzly Bear's Hiding Place.

Conclusions

The Yana, like other California Indians whose numbers had been reduced substantially by violence from as many as 3,000 people prior to 1847 (T. Kroeber 1961:15) to as few as 30 in 1885 (Waterman 1918:40), have shown enormous resilience in the face of severe

adversity. Rejecting the discourses on extinction (see Brantlinger 2003), they worked closely with other northern California Indians, including Wintu and Achomawi (Pit River Indians) in promoting a social, cultural, political, and economic resurgence that is nearly unmatched in Indian Country. In 1923 the Yana joined the Wintu and Achomawi on Redding Rancheria where they engaged in a variety of activities aimed at promoting the well-being of the three peoples. The federal government terminated the Redding Rancheria in 1959 during the era when it was seeking to reduce the number of Indian groups who were recognized, and therefore in a position to receive Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs, and Indian Health Service support. The assets of the Redding Rancheria were sold, but the three tribes retained some of the land where they lived through individuals who had purchased or been allocated plots by the government in the past. The early 1980s were taken up with regaining federal recognition, which the three tribes managed to do in 1985 after a complex set of legal and other actions. Once they got federal recognition again, the Wintu, Pit River, and Yana went about formulating a constitution, which was completed in 1989. They set up the Redding Rancheria Economic Development Corporation in 1993. Redding Rancheria is recognized as a national leader in the development of its people in their traditional homelands. They have built up a successful business operation. The Rancheria invests heavily in economic development, education, health services, water, roads, and community support programs including mother tongue language programs in the schools.

Redding Rancheria's Win-River Resort and Casino is highly successful and is known for its positive, supportive management, excellent working conditions, and well-paid staff. The Redding Rancheria is a major contributor to Shasta County's economic growth through regular payment of property and other taxes and distributions of benefits from the business operations. The casino is the largest employer in the county. Working relations with Redding, the closest city, are excellent and are reminiscent of the Fox-Mesquakirelations with nearby Tama, Iowa. A superb video was made of the efforts of the Wintu, Pit River, and Yana in 2013. Titled "With the Strength of our Ancestors – the Story of Redding Rancheria," it is on the Redding Rancheria website (Redding Rancheria).

Development, which is often seen by Indigenous peoples as problematic because it is usually aimed at modernization, assimilation, and economic but not social growth, is now seen by the Yana, who number some 200 on Redding Rancheria, as something that is positive. The mass developmental violence that they had faced in the 19th century is definitely remembered but not discussed openly with outsiders by the Yana. They have endured and maintained their customs, beliefs, and cultural traditions. While Ishi was described as 'the last Yahi' and evidence of tribal extinction, Ishi, his father, Yètati, who died in 1857, his mother, Yè tshulti, who died in 1908, and Ishi, who died in 2011, had relatives and friends who survived the massacres and who told their stories to about what they experienced to Yana and Pulga Maidu and white Californians in the 20th and 21st centuries.

It is no longer possible to deny the California Indian genocide, especially when there is so much detailed documentation of what occurred. On June 18, 2019 Governor of California Gavin Newsom issued a formal apology to the Indian peoples of California, calling what happened to them a genocide (Cowan 2019). In the process, he called for the creation of a Truth and Healing Council aimed at reporting on the historical relationships between the state and its Indigenous people. The 200,000 Californian Indians and their neighbors and friends all look forward to the day when native people's rights are on an equal footing with those of all people.

Acknowledgments

Support of the research on this paper is based was provided by grants from the University of New Mexico, Michigan State University, and the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. One of us (Hitchcock) wishes to express his appreciation to Shelly Davis-King for taking him to Deer Creek to visit some of the places where Ishi and his relatives and friends lived. We thank the editors of the Humboldt Journal of Social Relations, an anonymous reviewer, Richard Burrill, and Melinda Kelly for their valuable comments, criticisms, and insights. We also extend our deepest gratitude to our northern California Indian consultants for sharing stories about their histories, experiences, and memories.

References

Anderson, Robert Allen. 1909. *Fighting the Mill Creeks: Being a Personal Ac-*

- count of Campaigns Against Indians in the Northern Sierras*. Whitefish, Montana: Kessinger Publishing.
- Baumgardner, Frank H. 2005. *Killing for Land in Early California: Indian Blood at Round Valley*. Tucson: Algora Publishing.
- Brantlinger, Patrick. 2003. *Dark Vanishings: Discourse on the Extinction of Primitive Races, 1800-1930*. Cornell: Cornell University Press.
- Breckenridge, Thomas E. 1846. *Memoirs*. Folder 2, no. 52. St. Louis: State Historical Society of Missouri.
- Burnett, Phillip. 1851. Governor's Message. California: California Legislature
- Burrill, Richard. 1990. *Ishi: America's Last Stone Age Indian*. Chico: The Anthro Company.
- Burrill, Richard. 2001. *Ishi Rediscovered*. Barron's Art Guides, Chico: The Anthro Company.
- Burrill, Richard. 2014. *Ishi's Return Home*. Chico: The Anthro Company.
- Burrill, Richard. 2020. Personal Communication.
- Carranco, Lynwood and Estle Beard. 1981. *Genocide and Vendetta: The Round Valley Wars of Northern California*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Castillo, Edward D. 2010. *Short Overview of California Indian History*. Sacramento: State of California Native American Heritage Commission.
- Chalk, Frank and Kurt Jonassohn. 1990. *The History and Sociology of Genocide: Analyses and Case Studies*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Clavero, Bartolome. 2008. *Genocide and Ethnocide, 1933-2007: How to Make, Unmake and Remake Law with Words*. Milan: Giuffre.
- Cowan, Jane. 2019. 'It's Called Genocide': Newsom Apologizes to the State's Native Americans. *New York Times*, 19 June 2019.
- Crook, Martin and Damien Short. 2014. *Marx, Lemkin and the genocide-ecocide nexus*. *The International Journal of Human Rights* 18(3):298-319.
- Day, Mark. 2016. "Ishi's Life: A California Genocide Primer." *Indian Country Today* (NewsMaven.com, March 25). Retrieved Oct. 30, 2019
- Fein, Helen. 1984. "Scenarios of Genocide: Models of Genocide and Critical Responses" Pp. 3-31 in *Toward the Understanding and Prevention of Genocide: Proceedings of the International Conference on the Holocaust and Genocide*, edited by Israel W. Charny. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.
- Fein, Helen. 1990. "Genocide: A Sociological Perspective." *Current Sociology* 38(1):1-126.
- Fenelon, James V. and Clifford Ed. Trafzer. 2014. "From Colonialism to Denial of California Genocide to Misrepresentations: Special Issue on Indigenous Struggles in the Americas." *American Behavioral Scientist* 58(1):3-29.
- Garsha, Jeremiah J. 2015. "'Reclamation Road': A Microhistory of Massacre Memory in Clear Lake, California." *Genocide Studies and Prevention: An International Journal* 9(2):61-75.
- Heizer, Robert and Theodora Kroeber. 1979. *Ishi: The Last Yahi: A Documentary History*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Hitchcock, Robert K. 1970-present. Field Notes.
- Hitchcock, Robert K. and Thomas Koperski 2008. "Genocides of Indigenous Peoples" Pp. 577-617 in *The*

- Historiography of Genocide*, edited by Dan Stone. London: Palgrave.
- Johnson, Jerald Jay. 1978. "Yana." Pp. 361-369 in *Handbook of North American Indians. Vol. 8: California*, edited by William C. Sturtevant. Washington, DC: [Smithsonian Institution](#).
- Kiernan, Ben. 2007. *Blood and Soil: A World History of Genocide and Extermination*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Kroeber, Alfred L. 1912. *Ishi, the Last Aborigine*. Pp. 304-306 in *The World's Work*, July 2012.
- Kroeber, Alfred L. 1925. "Handbook of the Indians of California". *Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin 78*. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution.
- Kroeber, Karl and Clifton Kroeber, 2003. *Ishi in Three Centuries*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Kroeber, Theodora 1961. *Ishi in Two Worlds*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Lindsay, Brendan C. 2012. *Murder State: California's Native American Genocide 1846-1873*. Lincoln: University of California Press.
- Lynwood, Carranco and Estle Beard. 1981. *Genocide and Vendetta: The Round Valley Wars of Northern California*. Berkeley: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Madley, Benjamin. 2008. "California's Yuki Indians: Defining Genocide in Native American History." *Western Historical Quarterly* 39(3):303-332.
- Madley, Benjamin. 2013. "The Genocide of California's Indians." Pp. 17-53 in *Centuries of Genocide: Essays and Eyewitness Accounts*, edited by Samuel Totten and William S. Parson. Fourth Edition. New York and London: Routledge.
- Madley, Benjamin. 2016. *An American Genocide: The United States and the California Indian Catastrophe, 1846-1873*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Nelson, Jr., Byron. 1978. *Our Home Forever: The Hupa Indians of Northern California*. Salt Lake City: Hupa Tribe.
- Norton, Jack. 1979. *Genocide in Northwestern California: When Our Worlds Cried*. San Francisco, CA: American Historians Press.
- Ostler, Jeffrey. 2020. *Surviving Genocide: Native Nations and the United States from the American Revolution to Bleeding Kansas*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Rawls, James J. 1976. "Gold Diggers: Indian Miners in the California Gold Rush." *California Historical Quarterly* 55(1):28-55.
- Redding Rancheria. 2013. "With the Strength of our Ancestors – the Story of Redding Rancheria." Video documentary. Retrieved on June 5 2020 at www.redding-rancheria.com.
- Rensink, Brenden. 2009. "The Sand Creek Phenomenon: The Complexity and Difficulty of Undertaking a Comparative Study of Genocide Vis-à-vis the Northern American West." *Genocide Studies and Prevention* 4(1):9-27.
- Rensink, Brenden. 2011. "Genocide of Native Americans: Historical Facts and Historiographic Debates" Pp. 15-36 in *Genocide of Indigenous Peoples*, edited by Samuel Totten and Robert K. Hitchcock. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Transaction Publishers.
- Riffe, Jed. 1992. *Ishi: The Last Yahi*. Documentary. Berkeley: Jed Riffe Films.
- Riffe, Jed. 1998. *Bear's Hiding Place: Ishi's*

- Last Refuge*. Documentary. Berkeley: Jed Riffe Films.
- Sapir, Edward. 1910. "Yana Texts." *University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology* 9(1).
- Sapir, Edward and Morris Swadesh. 1960. "Yana Dictionary." *University of California Publications in Linguistics, Volume 22*. edited by Mary R. Haas.
- Scheper-Hughes, Nancy. 2001. "Ishi's Brain, Ishi's Ashes." *Anthropology Today* 17(1):12-18.
- Scheper-Hughes, Nancy. 2003. "Ishi's Brain, Ishi's Ashes: Reflections on Anthropology and Genocide" Pp. 99-131 in *Ishi in Three Centuries*, edited by Karl Kroeber and Clifton Kroeber. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Shaler, Andrew. 2020. "Indigenous peoples and the California gold rush: labour, violence and contention in the formation of a settler colonial state." *Postcolonial Studies* 23(1):79-98.
- Smith, Roger W. 1987. "Human Destructiveness and Politics: The Twentieth Century as an Age of Genocide" Pp. 21-38 in *Genocide and the Modern Age: Etiology and Case Studies of Mass Death*, edied by Isidor Walliman and Michael N. Dobkowski. New York: Greenwood Press.
- Starn, Orin. 2004. *Ishi's Brain: In Search of America's Last "Wild" Indian*. New York: W.W. Norton.
- United Nations. 1951. "General Assembly Resolution 260A(iii) of December 9, 1948." United Nations Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide. New York: United Nations.
- Vizenor, Gerald. 2001. "Ishi Obscura." *Hastings Environmental Law Journal* 17(3):299-305.
- Waterman, T.T. 1917. "Ishi, the Last Yahi Indian." *Southern Workman* 46(10):528-537.
- Waterman, T.T. 1918. "The Yana Indians." *American Archaeology and Ethnology* 13(2):35-102.

About the Authors

Robert K. Hitchcock is currently a professor in the Department of Anthropology at the University of New Mexico. He is also an adjunct professor of Geography at Michigan State University. Much of his work is on the human rights of Indigenous people and refugees, particularly those in Africa, the Middle East, and North America. He serves as a member of the Board of Directors of the Kalahari Peoples Fund (KPF), a non-profit 501©3 organization that assists disadvantaged people in southern Africa. Hitchcock's most recent book is *People, Parks, and Power: The Ethics of Conservation-related Resettlement* (with Maria Sapignoli, Springer, 2020).

Charles Flowerday is head of C. Flowerday Communications. He has been the editor for the School of Natural Resources, University of Nebraska–Lincoln (UNL). He holds master's in anthropology and journalism from UNL; a master's in psychology and religion from Union Theological in New York; and a bachelor's in English from Princeton. He is co-editor of *An Atlas of the Sand Hills*, a reference volume on the natural history of the Nebraska Sand Hills; editor of *Flat Water: A History of Nebraska and Its Water*, a reference work of environmental history; and co-editor of *Selected Readings in Anthropology of Religion*.