

## **UC Merced**

### **The Journal of California Anthropology**

#### **Title**

On Kroeberian and Post-Kroeberian California Ethnology

#### **Permalink**

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/08655899>

#### **Journal**

The Journal of California Anthropology, 4(1)

#### **Author**

Kunkel, Peter H

#### **Publication Date**

1977-07-01

Peer reviewed

Father Mora's initial directives on operating the missions of Baja California required swift and certain punishment for delinquencies such as the failure to attend religious services and also required the elimination of all forms of recreation, however innocent, that they had practiced as gentiles.<sup>3</sup> Even the fanatic Father Serra never went that far.

*University of California, Riverside*

### NOTES

1. Miguel Venegas, "Empresas Apostolicas. . . ." Paragraphs 1135-1136 in the fine manuscript copy in the Bancroft Library.
2. Peveril Meigs, "The Dominican Mission Frontier of Lower California," University of California Publications in Geography 7:59 (1935).
3. Manuscript in the California Transcripts of the Bancroft Library dated November 4, 1773, and Archivo General de la Nación, Hacienda Ser. II, Vol. 3, pp. 127-134. A microfilm copy is also in the Bancroft Library.



## *Reply to Aschmann*

E.N. ANDERSON

I am very grateful to Professor Aschmann for correcting my more speculative flights. It is, of course, true that the Jesuit and Dominican missions killed off the native populations as fast as the Franciscans did, and that the Jesuits were out of the field by 1769. My impression is still that overall Jesuit policy was relatively mild—cf. the well-known experiment with Utopian planning among the Indians in Paraguay, for instance—and that this relatively mild policy was one of the reasons for their downfall in the New World. Their record in Baja California was certainly a sad one, however. As to the Dominicans, my memory seems to have simply played me false. It appears that

things were even worse than I thought for the unfortunate missionized Indians of the Californias!

*University of California, Riverside*



## *On Kroeberian and Post-Kroeberian California Ethnology*

PETER H. KUNKEL

I have just read Albert Elsasser's (1976) review of *Native Californians: A Theoretical Retrospective*, edited by Lowell Bean and Thomas Blackburn. As author of one of the articles in this collection, I am puzzled by Elsasser's reference to "certain authors" in the collection (including me) as "post-Kroeberian." Furthermore, I wish to protest the out-of-context, fragmental quotation from my article, by which Elsasser misrepresented my attitude toward Kroeber and the basic "older" data on California ethnography.

The quote involves a rhetorical question as to why California scholars "failed to come forward with data relevant to the nature of food collecting peoples." The full context of this phrase clearly shows that I was speaking of participation in the recent intensive symposia on the subject, such as that which generated the Lee and DeVore (1968) collection of articles on hunting peoples. In context, I was expressing a pride in the accomplishment of the "older" California ethnology and regretting that it was not represented in such symposia. Elsasser seems to have read on the run. Otherwise he is simply twisting my meaning to infer some kind of criticism of the basic California ethnologists, for whom I actually have great respect.

My article in the Bean and Blackburn collection is essentially the same article that appeared in Vol. 1, No. 1 of this journal

(Kunkel 1974). Its conclusions are entirely based on analysis of data collected by Kroeber and other "older" ethnologists. In connection with my research into the basic ethnological literature of California, I had personal discussions with Kroeber, Gifford, and Barrett. In addition, I sent draft manuscripts to others, including (as I recall) Loeb, Driver, and McKern. My research was under the guidance of Ralph Beals. I worked especially closely with Barrett in my analysis of Pomo political organization. Barrett completely agreed with my interpretation of Pomo political organization. (I have a letter from him to that effect among my notes, stored back in the States). Of the others whom I consulted, only Driver offered a criticism of my political analysis. His criticism was essentially a caution against using, in too general a way, an interpretation he had himself made in his *Wappo Ethnography*.

My contact with Kroeber was brief, and I certainly would not wish to imply too much from it. However, he did (a) express interest in the fact that I was doing the political analysis; and (b) imply some disagreement with the social organizational analysis of one of his former students, in a manner consistent with my own thinking on the point in question. I honestly believe that Kroeber would have approved the "non-unilinear" aspect of my ultimate analysis, with respect to tribal groups in the northern portion of the present state. However, by the time my work was completed Kroeber had died and we were *all*, unfortunately, "post-Kroeberian." I would have been very interested in Kroeber's reaction to my final presentation and would have had great respect for his opinion.

Elsasser is naive if he assumes that all of the "older" authors he mentioned (essentially pre-World War II field workers) were in theoretical or methodological agreement with each other or, always, with Kroeber himself. Those whom I consulted were all happy to see their data being used for a new type of analysis and showed no resentment that a "young" person

was presuming to reinterpret their findings.

I have been working overseas for nearly three years and have not seen the Bean and Blackburn book. In fact, Elsasser's review is my first notice that it has been published. I have not read the articles of the other "young authors," so I cannot speak for them. However, I suspect that their work may have been misunderstood by Elsasser as mine has been.

It was especially amusing to reflect on Elsasser's implied "generation gap," using the age of fifty as the watershed dividing "young" and "old" California ethnologists. As of December 8, 1976, I am 60 years old.

*University of Maryland  
Far Eastern Division  
(Kadena, Okinawa, Japan)*

#### REFERENCES

- Elsasser, Albert B.  
1976 *Review of Native Californians: A Theoretical Retrospective*, Lowell John Bean and Thomas Blackburn, eds. *Journal of California Anthropology* 3(2):95-96.
- Kunkel, Peter H.  
1974 *The Pomo Kin Group and the Political Unit in Aboriginal California*. *Journal of California Anthropology* 1:7-18.
- Lee, Richard B., and Irven DeVore  
1968 *Man the Hunter*. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co.



### *Reply to Kunkel*

ALBERT B. ELSASSER

In regard to Peter Kunkel's objection to parts (or all) of my review of *Native Californians: A Theoretical Retrospective*, I do indeed owe him an apology if he believes I was misrepresenting him. I can assure him that I