

## **UC Merced**

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

#### **Title**

Reply to Aschmann

#### **Permalink**

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/5wc7f939>

#### **Journal**

The Journal of California Anthropology, 4(1)

#### **Author**

Anderson, E. N.

#### **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