

RECEIVED

SEP 15 2015

ASIA-OFA



Fernandeano Tataviam Band of Mission Indians

Federal Petition

**Office of Federal Acknowledgment
Bureau of Indian Affairs
U.S. Department of Interior**

**Supplementary and Updated Information
to the Petition of 2009**

CRITERIA 87.3(b)

Supplementary and Updated Information to the Fernandeño Tataviam Band of Mission Indian Petition of 2009

Section 83.7 (b). The predominant portion of the petitioning group comprises a distinct community and has existed from historical times to the present.

As presented in the supplement and the original petition, the social organization of California in general, and southern California in particular, is composed of a regional network of lineage communities that trade, share ceremonies, and intermarry. This regional pattern existed in the pre-contact period, as far as scholars can reconstruct, and many principal aspects of the regional network and lineage communities continue to define the social and political patterns of the present-day Fernandeños; but all southern California tribes share similar social and political patterns. We refer the reader to the first section [83.7. (a)] of this supplementary report on the recognition of pre-contact social organization, as mainly described by the eminent anthropologist, Alfred Kroeber. That section also links the San Fernando baptismal records to specific historical lineage communities, or as Kroeber says, tribelets, (see pages 1-5). The Mission padres recorded the names of the tribelets, and recognized their presence as an obstacle to achieving a Christian community and managing the economy of the estate under the mission plan.

This section provides updates and additional material about the continuity of marriage patterns, lineage communities, cultural practices, and their changing patterns since 1767, when extensive colonization of Alta California began. The establishment of San Fernando Mission in 1797 is a key marker for the Indians in the San Fernando region. Both pre-contact social and cultural organization and more contemporary scholarly discussion, building on the work of Kroeber presented in section (a), above, are addressed.

Pre-contact Social and Cultural Organization

Village Community vs. Lineage Community.

“Regarding ‘tribelet’ Kroeber has applied the term to the largest landholding group in California. But the problem with ‘tribelet’ is that it labels California as unique — the term being applied to no other indigenous people.”¹ As already quoted above, Kroeber argued that there is a very

¹ Phillips, George Harwood, *Chiefs and Challengers: Indian Resistance and Cooperation in Southern California, 1769-1906* (Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 2014), p. 8. See also Kroeber, Alfred, “The Nature of Land-Holding Groups in Aboriginal California,” in Heizer, Robert F., ed., *Aboriginal California: Three Studies in Cultural History* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1963), p. 94; Fried, Morton H. *The Notion of the Tribe*, (Menlo Park, CA: Cummings, 1975), pp. 56-59.

specific form of social organization in California, and he coined the expression “tribelet” in order to differentiate California Indians from the tribal forms of organization in other parts of North America, but also to identify them as tribal forms. “This village-community or ‘tribelet’ is the native California equivalent to the ‘tribe’ among other American Indians,” Kroeber wrote.² In Kroeber’s defense, he did mention that the California tribelets were similar to the lineal organization of many Australian Aborigine communities. The anthropologist William Duncan Strong did not find “true villages and village chiefs” in California, but suggested that precontact times were not adverse to political and social centralization, although his data did not support that argument. According to prominent ethnohistorian George Harwood Phillips, “Strong concluded that the formation of ‘large villages composed of several independent clans was a comparatively recent [*i.e.*, post-contact] process.’”³ It appears that researchers were looking for tribes or social organization that did not appear in pre-contact southern California.⁴ What were the researchers looking for or expecting?

Phillips suggests they were looking for “true villages,” for which he uses the expression “village community,” referring to a form of social organization found in many places around the world. He describes a village community as:

Each village community was autonomous and self-governing and owned a territory that was recognized by outsiders. It often consisted of more than one village, sometimes several, of which one was the primary settlement. A distinct characteristic of the village community was that its residents were not necessarily biologically related. That is, a village community might be composed of unrelated lineages. As such, residence was often fluid. The headman of the most prominent lineages was the leading governmental official. Headmen of other lineages formed an ad hoc village council that regulated its public affairs, such as monitoring war, ceremonies, and food procuring activities.⁵

Phillips further explains, “Most Southern California Indians, however, governed themselves in lineages.” By this he means that the California lineages were organized by a single lineage of blood relations. Although married-ins were living there as well, the dominant social and political

² 000261.BL, pp. 15-16.

³ Phillips, pp.10-11, quoting Strong, William Duncan, *Aboriginal Society in Southern California* (University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology 26, no. 1, 1929, reprinted by Malki Museum Press, Banning, CA, 1972), pp. 56-57.

⁴ See the discussion in Phillips, pp. 9-11.

⁵ Phillips, p. 9; Phillips cites Kroeber, “The Nature of Land-Holding Groups in Aboriginal California,” p. 95; Bean, Lowell J. “Social Organization in Native California,” in Bean, Lowell John and King, Thomas F., eds., *Antap: California Indian Political and Economic Organization* (Ramona, CA: Ballena Press, 1974), p. 15.

force was the lineage, a relationship of blood ancestry. The married-ins are not blood relatives, but any children had with a lineage member are automatically members. A main difference between the “village community” and the lineage is the presence of several non-biologically related lineages living and engaged in social, political, and community relations. As the literature suggests, the multi-lineal village community is quite common among Indian tribes in North America. For example, the Cherokee lived in villages that are usually composed of seven biologically different clans, with all seven clans having cultural rights to take part in the village government and economic and social relations.⁶ While for many American Indian nations the village community is a pre-contact tradition, the literature argues that for California Indians, the village community, when defined as a government or community of several non-biologically related lineages or clans, did not exist during the pre-contact period.

Phillips continues with a description of the California Indian lineage:

The standard definition of the lineage holds that it was a consanguineal kinship group in which all members considered themselves biologically related, because they could trace their descent in a direct line from a founding ancestor. Leading the lineage was a headman, who with a council of elders regulated marriage, the rights of succession and inheritance, residence and kinship rules, the distribution of goods and resources, the observation of proper religious duties, and the recruitment of the necessary man power for work or warfare. Although members were sometimes adopted into a lineage, the majority of members were automatically incorporated at birth. Membership, therefore, was primarily based on descent, and because descent was reckoned through the males, the lineage was patrilineal. It also served as an exogamous unit in that wives had to come from other lineages. All lineages sharing a common ancestor formed a clan, and because clan members considered themselves biologically related, they could not intermarry. The clans also had political functions in that it temporarily brought people together for ceremonial, economic, or military purposes. On occasion it became the basic political unit. If ‘government’ is defined as the structure and process by which a people manage their public affairs, then the lineage, clan, and village community were types of government.⁷

In a note, Phillips writes, “To be noted is that the terms ‘clan’ and ‘lineage’ have sometimes been rather loosely used. Gifford acknowledged that in a study published in 1918 he had erroneously used ‘clan’ instead of ‘lineage’ in identifying the basic political unit in California. To his credit,

⁶ See Champagne, Duane *Social Order and Political Change: Constitutional Governments Among the Cherokee, Choctaw, Chickasaw, and Creeks*. (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1992), Chapters 1 and 2.

⁷ Phillips, p. 9.

eight years later, he admitted and corrected his mistake.”⁸ The literature suggests that lineage communities, rather than village communities, were the primary, if not exclusive form of social organization among southern California Indians, before Spanish contact. The term “lineage community” refers to the fact that there is one base lineage constituting the community. The village community is characterized by multiple non-biologically related lineages or clans living in the same territory or village. The history of southern California Indians is largely a history of lineage communities struggling to preserve themselves within the changing political and economic relations created by Spanish, Mexican, and American contact. Lineages may rise and fall, and that is often a function of demographics. Large families or lineages often have greater political influence, while smaller families have less. Lineages without offspring disappear, and during the rough and turbulent periods of southern California colonialism, there was significant demographic decline in many lineages.

There appears a certain bias in the literature in favor of the village community over decentralized lineage communities, perhaps because the lineage communities are less familiar. Nevertheless, throughout the historical and contemporary period, lineage communities continue to be the primary form of social and political organization among reservation and non-recognized California Indians. The literature suggests that the post-contact period shows a movement away from lineage communities toward the village community or multi-lineal community. The appearance of multi-lineal or village communities is certainly an observable pattern. However, it is important to distinguish between the formations of an externally required village community as opposed to the formation of a village community based on internal consensus. Missions and reservations can be seen as externally influenced social formations. When southern California Indians formed reservations, they were not composed of one lineage group, but rather of several, not necessarily consenting, lineage communities. Nevertheless, within the reservation framework, the separate lineage communities have agreed to form General Council types of government in order to preserve the autonomy and political power of the several lineage communities. While southern California Indians needed land, reservations, and recognized forms of government, the formation of reservation communities, based on a multi-lineal model, did not, and still does not, conform to the social organization of autonomous lineage communities that long characterized the region. Voluntary village communities, where several lineages formed a coalition, preserving the rights and powers of each lineage community, occurred throughout California Indian history. Several lineage communities may have had historic social or marriage ties or common interests to gather together for usually temporary mutual goals and actions. As this section will demonstrate, the present-day Fernandeño Tataviam Band of Mission Indians is such a voluntary village community, composed of a coalition of three lineage communities that retains the integrity of each constituent lineage community.

⁸ Phillips, p. 340, note 19. See Giffords, Edward Winslow. “Clans and Moieties in Southern California,” (University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology 14, no. 2, 1918).

The regional relations of the precontact lineage communities are fundamental to understanding their culture, economy, and marriage patterns. Lineage communities are not complete societies, since they cannot allow members to marry members of the same lineage community. Before contact, intermarriage was always with other Indians. The rule however, was not to marry within the lineage community, though marriage was allowed with other groups, regardless of culture, language, or location. The region where San Fernando Mission was established was comprised of several different language groups, several different cultural groups, and numerous autonomous lineage communities.⁹ The matrilineal Chumash lineage communities also married out of their community. Marriages often were made across cultural, language, and territory, and created a regional network of relations. With a network of ties between lineage communities, trade, ceremonies, political alliances, and social relations could be maintained, and carried on over long periods. Without the regional economy and relations, the lineage communities would have been greatly inhibited economically, politically, and ceremonially.

A list of historical lineage communities that populated San Fernando Mission is provided by anthropologist John Johnson.¹⁰ Johnson categorizes the lineal communities by language group. The most common regional languages were: Chumash (Ventureño), Tataviam, Gabrieleño, Kitanemuk, Vanyume, and some others. Marriage patterns regularly crossed language and cultural boundaries. Some people spoke multiple languages, and married-ins usually had to learn the language of their spouses' lineage. At times, the multi-lingual individuals played the role of interpreters and intermediaries between culturally and linguistically different lineage communities. Language use did not define political identity, as each lineage community made cross-language and cultural marriages, and formed relations as suited their interests and needs.

This section incorporates the same information already given in section 87.3 (a), outlining the connection of contemporary lineages to historical lineage communities as given in the records of San Fernando Mission.

The San Fernando Mission records provide documentation of baptisms, marriages, and burials of all the mission recruits or neophytes. The standard baptism records provide information about the date of birth and date of baptism, name of the baptizing mission, the officiating priests, and the witnesses who served as godparents. The baptism records often include names of parents, if they are Christians, and often the parents' place of origin, or birth, and the parents' baptism number, and name of the parents' baptizing mission. The place of origin is usually a lineage community name, or as Kroeber says, a tribelet, or a lineally related family attached to a central tribelet settlement.

⁹ See 80799.Johnson, pp. 251-255; 80855.Kroeber.

¹⁰ 80943.Johnson, pp. 10-14.

Since names of the lineage communities are often given in the Mission record, it is possible to know the name of the lineage or place where the neophyte was born, and consequently the neophyte's lineage relations. When a neophyte was born at San Fernando Mission, the Mission is given as the neophyte's place of origin. However, it is usually possible to trace back through the baptism record to the neophyte's parents or grandparents, or older ancestors, if available, to find the name of the neophyte's lineage community. Descendants from Chumash lineage communities are traced through the mother, while the other lineage communities are traced through patrilineal relatives. For the adult baptisms, the estimated ages of the neophytes range over much of the 1700s, so the information affords a window into the places and marriage patterns before migration to the Mission. Johnson counts at least 130 rancherías (tribelets) or segments of tribelets that supplied neophytes to the San Fernando Mission record.¹¹ While the network of marriages and social and ceremonial ties extends throughout the region, and existed well before Spanish contact, the network is also seamless and extends to connections to even broader relations. Each generation was required to marry outside the local lineage community, and therefore new connections were created, and each generation had ties to a different mix of lineage communities or segments than the generations before. Therefore, trying to say that one generation of marriages and contacts was more significant than another is difficult, and oversimplifies the complex ties that existed and continue to exist within the same region of lineage community network relations.

Nevertheless, we can identify several lineage communities that, during the post contact years, created a cluster of social and political ties that form the contemporary Fernandeño band, consisting of three lineages. The Ortiz family has close ties and origins to Cahuenga. The expression Cahuenga refers to a place ("nga" being a locative suffix), but the community or lineage kinship group is known as Cabuepet ("pet," "bet," and "bit" being lineage suffixes). Such lineage communities are fundamentally a kinship group. Jose Miguel Triunfo (Triunfo) is the primary progenitor for the Ortiz family or lineage. He was born at San Fernando Mission, but his mother, Maria Encarnacion, was born at Cahuenga, and in the Cabuepet lineage. Triunfo's father was Miguel, a mixed blood who did not have a surname, and whose kinship ties are uncertain.¹²

A primary progenitor for the Ortega lineage is Maria Rita Alipas (Alipaz), who was born at the San Fernando Mission.¹³ Rita's paternal grandfather was Juan Maria, who was born at Chaguayanga (the place), or Chaguayabit (the lineage line).¹⁴ Her paternal grandmother was

¹¹ See 80943.Johnson, pp. 10-14 for the names of the more significant historical lineage communities or tribelets that contributed individuals to San Fernando Mission after 1797.

¹² See SF Baptism #02140 (San Fernando Mission Baptism # 02140).

¹³ See SF Baptism #2742.

¹⁴ See SF Baptism #0317.

Francisca Xaviera, born at Tochonanga (the place), or Tochonabit (the lineage).¹⁵ Both her paternal grandfather and her paternal grandmother were from lineages that spoke Tataviam, but from different lineages. Rita's maternal grandfather was Tiburcio Cayo, who was born at the lineage community at Tapuu, which spoke a Chumash dialect.¹⁶ Rita's maternal grandmother was Teresa, who was born to the Suitcabit lineage, which lived at present-day Encino, or Siutcanga.¹⁷ The Suitcabit lineage spoke a Western Gabrielino dialect.

The Garcia lineages have ties to many lineage communities, including sharing a common ancestry with the Ortega lineages among the Chaguayabit. Nevertheless, ties to the lineage community of Tujunga play a significant role for the Garcia family during the post-contact period. Maria Josefa (Josephine) Leyva is a commonly recognized progenitor among the Garcias.¹⁸ Josephine had lineal ties to Tujunga through her maternal grandfather, Francisco de Espiritu Santo.¹⁹ Francisco was married to Teofila, who was sister to the "Taari" or leader among the people who we now know as the Tejon tribe.²⁰ Through her father, Jose Juan Leyva, Josephine was related to several generations of ancestors at Escorpion, a Chumash village on the Western edge of the San Fernando Valley.²¹

San Fernando Mission as a Multi-lineal Community Village

When California Indians moved to San Fernando Mission, they were entering an entirely different social order that was designed to remake the new recruits culturally into members of a Christian community and subjects to the Spanish Empire. The missionaries had the closest relations with the mission Indians and had the most daily contact and influence upon them. The Indians arrived and were confronted with a multi-lineal community with church and an empire with bureaucracies and administration that in many ways spatially telescoped their regional ceremonial, marriage, and trade contacts into one location. The Mission was under the control of the Catholic Church and managed by Spanish Franciscan priests. Now government and social relations were conducted at close spatial range, and the lineage communities did not have the political autonomy or economic control over land, and were subject to external hierarchies in the Church and Spanish government. The Indians at Mission San Fernando consisted of individuals and families from over 130 separate settlements, which had previously formed into local lineage

¹⁵ See SF Baptism #0226.

¹⁶ See SF Baptism #0849.

¹⁷ See SF Baptism #0342.

¹⁸ See document 80291.LPC. Our Lady Queen of Angels Church, Old Plaza Church, Los Angeles, CA, Baptism Record: Vol. 4, Page 9, Number 53.

¹⁹ SF Baptism #0171.

²⁰ SF Baptism #1848.

²¹ 80944.SFR Baptism #02908. San Fernando (Rey) Baptism #02908.

communities. The priests and Spanish officials were not interested in perpetuating the leadership and kinship patterns of the Indians. However, as a practical matter they had to manage municipal government and manage labor through Indian leaders and officials who were supported by lineage communities. During the pre-contact period, lineage community leaders worked and cooperated through a network of kinship, ceremonial, and trade relations, and in the mission context they continued to do the same.

While the unmarried young people were quartered at the Mission in separate dorms for girls and boys, the adult Indians lived in a village about a half-mile north of the San Fernando Mission, close to water sources. While mission and Spanish Empire rules prevailed at the Mission, the Indian villages were left to the management of the Indian community and leaders. A significant portion of the life of Indians at San Fernando, Fernandeños, was outside the reach of the church and empire. The traditional lineage communities continued to operate in the Mission village and in the open, so that the missionaries observed the persisting social kinship patterns of Indians. The padres reported: “There are no Caciques or governors. The Indians respect only those who were the chiefs of their rancherias in paganism; and these do not molest them at all, nor do they demand any service from them.” “They still preserve the customs of their forefathers.” “All work in community, and from its products they eat and dress.” “All are dressed alike and partake of the same food.”²²

Rogelio Rocha reported that he lived in his father’s house northeast of the San Fernando Mission most of his life, and continued to live at the same ranch in the post-mission period until he was evicted in November 1885. As Rocha was quoted in the *Los Angeles Herald*, “After my father died I remained in possession of the ranch where he died and cultivated the same. They called it the Cienega. ... I lived there a great many years and cultivated the land.”²³ Extended families probably continued to live together, and leadership continued to be passed on to new members of the lineage group after the passing of elders. Rogelio further observed, “My father was captain of my people. His name was Jermain. He never went away... Then after my father died I became the captain, as all my people recognized me as such.”²⁴

The missionaries did not record Jermain or Rogelio as captain. While the baptism records included information about individuals who were recognized as captain, the padres did not keep further records of captains or of succession. The leadership of lineages was in the hands of the families, and did not have a formal social or political place within the Mission. Both the Spanish administration and Mission were trying to encourage secular and spiritual individualism,

²² Englehardt, Zephyrin *San Fernando Rey: The Mission of the Valley* (Chicago, IL: Franciscan Herald Press, 1927), pp. 26-33.

²³ 80842.LA Herald, p.3.

²⁴ 80842.LA Herald, p.3.

respectively. Church and state both worked to discourage tribal social, cultural, and political organization. However, the Indians continued to carry on many of their religious traditions, marriage patterns, and kinship systems. The Church and empire could not entice most of the Indians away from their traditions and lineage communities.

From the Indian point of view, the teachings of the Church and new rituals of baptism, mass, and the cycle of Christian holidays were seen as different ways to govern and seek spiritual protection, and introduced an alternative cycle of feast days. Before European contact, the Indians respected other peoples' cultures and ceremonies, and the Spanish added another group to the mix. The new cultural and administrative methods did not supplant or remove the pre-existing patterns of social and political order. The Indians kept up both the mission and empire social forms and requirements, while continuing to maintain their lineage communities. The lineage communities were not formally recognized by the mission or empire, and were ignored as institutions that did not fit into goals of the Church or empire, but were understood to some extent and tolerated as necessary for carrying on labor and political relations with the Indian lineages. Church and empire, while wanting to encourage spiritual or secular individualism, were not in a position to convince most Indians to give up their traditions, identities, lineage communities, ceremonies, languages, and other ways of life and culture.

It is critical to understand that membership in the Mission, as a "multi-lineal village community" was not entirely voluntary. While there was a certain amount of voluntarism associated with joining a mission, after an Indian joined the mission community, there was no means of withdrawing. The Indians, once accepting baptism, could not leave the mission and return to their home lineages, assuming there was still some of the lineage community remaining away from the mission. The missionaries forbade Indians from leaving the mission, and those who did and were chased and, if caught, were punished. Missions were places of cultural, social, and political assimilation, and were significant instruments of the Spanish empire's pacification goals to integrate the Indians into Spanish society. While the King held Indian land in trust, the land earmarked for Indians was not the whole extent of their original territories, but rather enough land for their livelihood within Spanish municipal and departmental government.

From the point of view of the Spanish, and later Mexican, state, the missions were transitional arrangements to move Indians sufficiently into Spanish, later Mexican, economy and political administration, so that the Indians would adopt municipal government and farm sufficient land, and become part of the Spanish, later Mexican, government and economy. The remaining land would be granted to Spanish subjects, or Mexican citizens, and put into production for the state and national benefit. United States policy later took the California Indian mission experience as a model for moving Indians out of tribal relations and onto reservations for assimilation into

mainstream US society.²⁵ The missionaries rejected the states' secularization plans, and wanted to preserve the missions as permanent establishments serving Indian communities, somewhat like monastery communities, with the Church and padres helping preserve the trust over Indian land, for the benefit of the Indians and missions.

San Fernando Mission was, to a large extent, managed by the Franciscans, and to a lesser extent by the Spanish and later Mexican governments. Spanish language and culture were added to the multi-cultural regional languages and cultures of the Indian lineage communities. As a major historian of Mission San Fernando has written,

The Indians speak three distinct idioms, but there are many who understand Spanish, but speak it imperfectly....The method (as we understand it) which the Indians should employ to speak and understand the Spanish language would be to increase the Spanish population; for experience teaches us that the Indians who live among the Spaniards or in their ranchos, speak and understand it.²⁶

However, very few Fernandeño Indians learned to read or write.

The parents give their children no education whatever. They possess only so much as the Mission Father give them....No one is known to have distinguished himself in arms or letters; for, as said before, they lack all characters; and in this Mission no one has yet is known to be able to read and write.²⁷

The general absence of Spanish or English literacy persisted through the Fernandeño leadership and people well after the Mission closed. A few received some, perhaps a year or two, of English schooling at Lopez School in the 1870s, but otherwise many were not literate until the early 1900s. The inability to read and write was a serious issue during the early American period under new laws, language, and institutions. San Fernando Mission did not assume the responsibility to educate most Fernandeño children.

While at San Fernando Mission, the Indian lineages continued to marry outside of their kinship group. During the Spanish and Mexican periods, few non-Indians married Indians. Spanish subjects and Mexican citizens were labeled "gentes de razon," literally persons of reason. Indians were labeled Indios, and were considered untouchable within the Spanish and Mexican colonial

²⁵ Castile, George Pierre and Robert L. Bee *State and Reservation: New Perspectives on Federal Indian Policy* (University of Arizona Press, 1992), Introduction.

²⁶ Engelhard, Zephyrn *San Fernando Rey: the Mission in the Valley*, (Chicago, IL: Franciscan Herald Press, 1927), pp. 26-28.

²⁷ *Id.* at pp. 28, 33.

caste systems. Very few Fernandeños had children with Spanish or Mexican persons, and the Indians continued to marry among the other Indian lineages at the Mission. The marriage system was very similar, except now everyone lived closer to each other, and the marriages were increasingly performed in the San Fernando Mission Church. The padres' understanding of Indian marriages was: "The Indians make no compact or conditions in their matrimonial affairs. The suitor himself or through a substitute gives to the father of the bride two or three dollars in beads. The gentile gives to the bride a shawl similar to a cape, made of the skins of rabbit, or otter, or lamb, as also a small basket."²⁸

The mission system brought the systematic baptism of all children with willing parents, and all agreeable adults. The padres measured their success by the number of Indians who were baptized, married, buried, or had sacraments performed on behalf of the Indians. Baptisms were generally performed in the mission church, but early in the mission's history, Indians were baptized in their own villages or in a village nearby. With baptisms came godparents and with weddings came witnesses. Sometimes the importance of a wedding could be determined by persons attending the wedding or who agreed to serve as a witness. The priests, however, managed the selection of godparents for the Indian baptisms. Only Indian persons who the padres judged as having good character and willingness to serve the church were selected. The distribution of godparents is not an indicator of the integration of the Indian community at San Fernando. Many Fernandeño Indians had godparents who were not Indians. For example, Francesca Xavier, a progenitor of the present-day Ortega line, was baptized in 1799, and her godfather was Juan Francisco Reyes (1749-1809). Reyes was a prominent land grant holder of Rancho Los Encinos and served as alcalde of the Pueblo of Los Angeles in 1790, and 1793-1795. He and family members served as godparents to many individuals in the Los Angeles area settlements over several generations. As leading members of the community, the Reyes family took on religious and social obligations. A purpose of the godparenting at the mission was to integrate Indians into the spiritual community of the larger Los Angeles area colony. Nevertheless, witnesses and godparents played an important role in building extra-kinship relations, something like shared ceremonial relations in the precontact period.

Community Reinforced by Godparenting and Witnessing

Before contact, it was not unusual for captains of lineage communities to strategically marry their children to other well-placed families in other lineage communities. Such ties provided social and political contacts among leading families. At San Fernando, strategic marriages still took place, but now godparenting became another strategy for Indian leaders who the padres would support for such duties. Godparenting often cemented or reflected the strength of social

²⁸ Engelhard, Zephyr *San Fernando Rey: the Mission in the Valley*, (Chicago, IL: Franciscan Herald Press, 1927), p. 29.

relations between lineages. During the mission period there were specific ties between the three lineages and families of the present-day Fernandeño Tataviam Band of Mission Indians. Since many of the progenitors of the Ortega, Ortiz, and Garcia families are among the godparenting group at the Mission, the Mission fathers must have given their permission and approval, and supported the resulting spiritual and social relationships. The social ties of the mission period carry over to the present-day coalition of lineage communities. The following are some of the more significant and interesting witness and godparenting relations.

On May 22, 1823, Francisco del Espiritu Santo was padrino, or godfather, to Joseph, son of Tiburcio Cayo and Teresa, progenitors of the Ortega line. Francisco was then a widower to Teofila and parent to Eugenia (Mendez), who were all three progenitors of the Garcia line. Francisco was a member of the Tujubit (Tujung) lineage community.²⁹

On February 4, 1827, at the marriage of Francisco Papabubaba and Paula Cayo, progenitors of the Ortega line, Conrado Leyvas and wife, Estefana, both served as padrinos for the newlyweds.³⁰ A padrino for a marriage is a witness who has testified that the marriage partners have the ability or freedom to marry without impediment. A padrino, to faithfully testify, would have to know the couple well enough to vouch that the proposed marriage was not in doubt or contradicted other obligations or vows. Conrado Leyvas worked at Rancho Cahuenga, and was a member of the Cabuepet lineage community, the lineage community of the Ortiz line. Leyvas and Jose Miguel Triunfo worked together at Rancho Cahuenga in the 1830s until Leyvas' death in 1840.

On April 5, 1831, Samuel served as godfather to Ysidoro, son of Tiburcio Cayo and Teresa, both progenitors of the Ortega line. Samuel was a member of Chaguayabit, and therefore a blood relative to Francisco Papabubaba, who also had ancestry among the Chaguayabit. Samuel was granted land from San Fernando Mission in 1843, and he in turn granted the land to Ildefonso and Antonio, both sons of Jose Miguel (Triunfo) and Maria Rafaela Perfecto on March 1, 1851.

On February 19, 1837, Paula Cayo, who was married to Francisco Papabubaba (both progenitors of the Ortega line), served as padrina (godmother) to Gertrudis Cañedo, daughter of Maria Rafaela Perfecta Cañedo and Jose Miguel (Triunfo). The latter two are progenitors of the Ortiz line.³¹ Gertrudis Cañedo married Jesus Cordova and became progenitors of the Cordova line, who were living near Tejon Ranch by the late 1880s.³²

²⁹ SF Baptism #0171.

³⁰ SF Marriage #0765.

³¹ SF Baptism #2887.

³² 90294.SIRIS.r98; 80799.Johnson, pp. 275-77.

On October 28, 1840, Jose Miguel (Triunfo) and wife Rafaela Arriola (Cañedo), progenitors of the Ortiz line, were godparents to Jose Rafael Perfecto, the son of Urbano Chari and wife Marcelina Chihuya. Urbano Chari was a joint owner at Rancho Escorpion from 1845 until his death about 1860. Urbano was a member of the Siutcabit lineage at Encino, and he was a blood relative to Teresa, married to Tiburcio Cayo, progenitors of the Ortega line. The expression Chari meant that Urbano was the headman of his lineage community, Siutcabit.

On December 3, 1843, Marcelina Chihuya, married to Urbano Chari, was padrina to Francisco Xavier, son of Agueda.³³ Marcelina was the daughter of Jose Carlos Odon Chihuy, who was a captain and joint owner of Rancho Escorpion from 1845 into the 1850s. Urbano was joint owner of Rancho Escorpion between 1845 and 1860. Roque married Agueda and was joint owner of the Encino grant in 1845. Roque left for the gold mines and never returned. Agueda inherited joint ownership of the Encino grant in the early 1850s, with Rita, and Vicente de la Osa. Agueda was the sister of Paula Cayo, who was also Agueda's godmother and a progenitor of the Ortega line. Agueda was also aunt to Rita Alipas, a progenitor of the Ortega line. Paula Cayo was married to Francisco Papabubaba, and they were also progenitors of the Ortega line.

On September 1, 1845, Rita married Benigno at the San Fernando Mission Church.³⁴ Benigno was the son of Cosme and they were members of the Cabuepet lineage community associated with the Ortiz line. Furthermore, in 1843 Cosme was one of the successful 41 petitioners for ownership of one square league of land next to Samuel's land grant of the same year. Rita was the daughter of Francisco Papabubaba and Paula Cayo, then joint holders with Roque and Roman, of the 1845 Encino land grant of a square league.

The Rita-Benigno marriage was accompanied by an impressive list of witnesses. The first witness (DM1) was Manuel (de la Santa Cruz) married to Maria Antonia. "DM" witnesses, like padrinos, would testify to the eligibility for marriage of one or both of the betrothed couple. Manuel's paternal grandfather Macario was a member of Suitcabit, implying, in a patrilineal system, that Manuel was also a member of the Suitcabit (Encino) lineage community.³⁵ Given his family line as Siutcabit, Manuel was a witness for Rita, and a relative. Manuel had a specific post at the Mission as keeper of the keys. DM2, the second testifying witness, was (Vicente) Francisco, who was the elected alcalde for the Mission Indian community for the year 1845. Vicente Francisco was one of the 41 petitioners for the land grant of 1843, and he later became a chief of the Tejon tribe, and was a signer of the 1851 Tejon Treaty, as leader of his lineage community, but not representing any of the San Fernando Mission Indians. Passing over the witnesses Thomas (DM3) and Secundino (W1), we come to (Pedro) Joaquin (W2) married to

³³ SF Baptism #3051.

³⁴ SF Marriage #00912.

³⁵ See SF Baptism #02666; SF Baptism # 00343; and SF Baptism # 0580.

Maria del Carmen. Pedro Joachim was alcalde for the year 1843, and negotiated the land grant of 41 petitioners in that same year. The group of 41 family leaders organized the election of Joachim as First Alcalde in late 1842 prior to the annual election. He was recognized as captain or spokesperson of the multi-lineal community of 41 headmen. The support that was given to Joaquin was also given to Vicente Francisco, who was alcalde in 1845. Vicente was listed among the 41 petitioners in 1843. Joaquin's first wife was Felipa, a sister to Francisco Papabubaba, and therefore, Joaquin was an uncle to Rita. Felipa died in 1842. Joaquin's new wife, Maria del Carmen, was well connected. Her mother Petra was married to Emeterio, who later, after the close of the San Fernando Mission, followed Petra to her lineage community, but quickly rose to leadership and was a signer of the Tejon Treaty of 1851 for the Senahow community.

The roles of god parenting and witnessing created another layer of community and reinforced social relations and political relations. Becoming a godparent required that the godparent look after the spiritual future of their godchild, which was a life long obligation that created a social tie to the child and family. Most likely the godparents volunteered and received approval by the padres before the baptism or wedding ceremonies. The mission burial records, however, do not show any additional information other than family relations to the deceased. The network of ties between families and lineage communities can be seen as a reaffirmation of already existing social relations, although sometimes creating new obligations. Even if a child dies early, the role of godparent sponsorship is often remembered and esteemed and a sign of respect between the godparent and family.

The godparenting and witness relations given above show that there were long standing social relations among the progenitors of the Garcia, Ortiz, and Ortega families that were active during the mission period and during its demobilization by 1846. All the post-mission landholders of Rancho Escorpion (Urbano Chari, Odon), Rancho Cahuenga and Rancho Tuhunga (Triunfo), Encino (Tiburcio Cayo, Francisco Papabubaba, Rita and Agueda), as well as Samuel's grant (Samuel, Ildefonso and Antonio [Triunfo]) are interconnected through a network of godparenting and Christian witness duties and obligations.

The network was similar to the loose relations of the network of regional tributes or lineage communities that existed before San Francisco Mission was established. There were elected alcaldes, who were strongly supported by a coalition of lineages in the 1842-1845 period. The formation of the collective action of the 41 family headmen should not be interpreted entirely as community of individuals or citizens of the alcalde government. Petitioners were acting together, on behalf of their lineage communities.

It should be remembered that there were annual cycles of both Christian and regional Indian ceremonies held at the Mission each year. The Christian and non-Christian festivals were gathering places as well expressions of cultural and social identity.³⁶

People came from about a 100-mile radius in southern California to join in the festivals. According to Isabelle Villegas Brooks, writing in 1837,

The Indians were divided into four groups or rancherías, each under an alcalde, or foreman, who was responsible to the majordomo. . . . Those tribes known as the Mission Indians were the Tjungas [Tujungas], El Encino, and El Escorpion, and, of course, those who lived in the mission proper. . . . The Indians had special fiestas of their own; the greatest of these was the anniversary of the death of an Indian chief. Indians came to San Fernando from what at that time were great distances. Whole tribes would make the yearly pilgrimage, some coming from Tehachapi, and others from San Jacinto . . . The feature of the fiesta was a dance in which all members of the different tribes joined. A large image of the Indian chief was erected, around which a fire was built. As the dancers moved in a circle about the image, they cast into the fire some personal belongings of their dead. The music to the dance was the wailing and weeping of the dancers themselves.³⁷

The Christians introduced Christmas, Easter, New Years Day, and perhaps most of all, the feast day of Saint Fernando on May 30th. The Christian holidays became regular days for gathering of extended family and opportunities to meet and discuss mutual issues social, political and otherwise. These traditions carried on well into the future and to the present.

The coalition of 41 families and their open political action to secure a square league of land for their farms was prompted by a crisis – San Fernando Mission lands were under discussion by Mexican officials for rent or sale. The Indian lineages wanted to secure enough land to support their families if the Mission was rented, sold, or otherwise dismantled. This response to crisis fits well with Kroeber's observation that the tribelets gathered primarily during visits, festivals, and in reaction to common external threats.

Also whenever there was anything like a council of the group, when war was threatening, or especially when a festival was announced and a dance was held, it was the largest, principal, or most permanent settlement within the tribelet that would be the gathering point for all members of the group. . . . They acted together in

³⁶ 90150.A.SFS.

³⁷ 000365.HD.

times of emergency. They were likely to act together in time of visits, festivals, and dances.³⁸

The Indians' reaction to the external threat, including forming of coalitions, was undertaken but did not constitute permanent extra-lineage community, political, or economic associations or institutions. The primary social group, the lineage community, remained the main social form. Even in the period of extensive change and land loss, the lineage community was mobile and flexible, its membership always identifiable, and proved extremely versatile in surviving the establishment of San Fernando Mission as well as carrying on after the Mission's dismantling by 1846.

The Coalition of Lineage Communities After End of San Fernando Mission

The San Fernando Mission was in some ways organized as a multi-lineal community, with its ultimate goal the formation of a government under Spanish and Mexican law. The Indians at San Fernando adapted to the new environment by participating in the municipal government, and working and worshipping within the Mission management. The lineage communities were not formally recognized within the San Fernando Mission, since headmen and captains were not constituent parts of the formal mission goals, municipal government, or religious community. The municipal governments and Christian worship were highly individualistic, and ideally looked to a form of government and religious community in what is now often called a voluntary association. Since the Indians already had their own lineage communities and religion, they were participating in the Spanish-Mexican government under Spanish-Mexican law, which was imposed upon them. Nevertheless, the continuing annual Indian religious ceremonies were part of the regional network as before. Mission Indians were not encouraged to marry "gentiles" (meaning non-Christian Indians), and usually did not do so. Mission Indians married other mission Indians, but continued to hold to their kinship rules, marrying out of their lineage communities, as they had done before the mission period.

In California most non-Indian Spanish subjects and later Mexican citizens were considered "Gente de Razon." As Engelhard wrote,

All that were not Indians went by the designation *Gente de Razon*, people who reasoned, or used their reason or intelligence. The Indians followed their instincts or appetites more generally, it was said. ... At this mission (San Fernando Rey) we know of no other classes of people but those *de Razon* and Indians. ... Those *de*

³⁸ 000261.BL, pp. 10-11, 14-16.

Razon, some of them, came up from Lower California, while others came from the Province of Sonora.³⁹

Indians, adhering to different cultures, were not considered marriageable unless they abandoned Indian life and took up Spanish or later Mexican mainstream life, spoke Spanish, and adopted Christian norms, religion, and national political allegiances.

At the end of the mission period, the vast majority of Mission Indians at San Fernando continued to speak Indian languages. Most did not speak good Spanish, and few could read and write. Virtually none spoke English, nor could they read or write English. The Mission educated very few Indians to read and write, and they were not prepared for the outside world as citizens in either Mexican or American political life. Most did not have any knowledge of American laws, institutions, local government, or culture. Despite the efforts of the Spanish and Mexicans, the Indians did not maintain the *alcalde* form of government after 1846. Efforts to do so by US Indian agents did not succeed. Indians throughout southern California returned to their lineage communities and continued to manage relations between lineage communities or coalitions of lineage communities. Leadership patterns changed toward more active leaders and more achievement-oriented selection of captains or leaders. New circumstances following the era of state and church-managed missions required more active leadership; but the Indians continued to rely upon their lineage communities for social organization and community, while baptisms and godparenting remained strategic tools to strengthen and formalize relations and ties among the lineage communities.

Following the US-Mexican war, regional cultural complexity increased, now including Christianity, Spanish and English languages, new externally managed American state government, markets, wage labor, and taxation. Despite these changes, the Indians remained organized as extended families or lineage communities. In addition to patterns of social and cultural change, the 1860s witnessed drought conditions and devastating epidemics, especially smallpox.⁴⁰ By the early 1870s, the ranch style or mission estate gave way to American-style farming of grains. The arrival of train tracks in the San Fernando Valley by 1875 opened the land to rapid population growth, and the domination of real estate interests. The Indians were not prepared for the rapid cultural and political changes, but retained their networks of extended families, and continued relations with other lineages that remained within the Indian community at San Fernando. One advantage of the lineage community as a form of social organization is that it was not confined to any one place. The lineage communities moved to Mission San

³⁹ Engelhard, Zephyr *San Fernando Rey: the Mission in the Valley*, (Chicago, IL: Franciscan Herald Press, 1927), p. 26.

⁴⁰ Robinson, John W. *Los Angeles in Civil War Days, 1860-1865* (Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 2013), pp. 113-114.

Fernando, and remained active culturally and politically during the mission period. When dramatic cultural, governmental, and economic changes emerged in the American period, the extended families adapted to wage labor, taxes, loss of land, private property, small pox epidemics, and other disruptive forces. Lineage communities are portable and culturally mobile, and were able to adapt to the work, urbanization, religious, demographic, and other significant changes that confronted them during the 1846 to 1900 period.

During the 1830s many Indians had abandoned the missions. The policy of secularization had made it more possible for Indians to leave the missions. After San Fernando Mission was demobilized in 1846, there were about 300 Indians living at the Mission. Many left the Mission. After 1846, the Fernandeño community consisted of those families and Indians who chose to remain at San Fernando. In the 1850 census about 130 Indians are identified as living in the San Fernando Valley. The progenitors of the three main present-day families, when possible, chose to live at San Fernando. Many others went to live and work at ranches or returned to their non-mission family lineages. Some went to Los Angeles, and others went to live and work at Rancho Tejon. Many of the culturally Chumash Indians from San Fernando Mission returned to the Oxnard-Ventura areas. Others followed when Rancho Escorpion fell into ownership and management by non-Indians. In the post-mission period, the Fernandeños are those families who remained to live at San Fernando or nearby, and maintained social relations with other Indian families at San Fernando.

The San Fernando Indian community became *a coalition of lineage communities*. The Garcia and Rogerio Rocha lines had ties to Tujubit (Tujungu). The Garcias and Rochas had direct interests in the 1843 grant made to the 41 petitioners. The Ortega line had ties to Siutcabit (Encino) and Chaguayabit in the Santa Clarita Valley. The Ortiz family had ties to Cabuepet (Cahuenga), while the Cano family was from Catalina Island. There were several land grants to San Fernando Indians. Jose Miguel Triunfo was granted land near the Cahuenga land site in 1843. Jose Miguel exchanged Rancho Cahuenga for Rancho Tuhunga, which he sold, and was living at Encino in January of 1851, where he soon died. On March 1, 1851, Samuel gifted his 1843 land grant to two sons of Jose Miguel, and they sold the land by 1862. Samuel went to manage farming in the Indian community at Rancho Escorpion at least until 1870. Samuel was born into Chaguayabit, and had direct ties to Rita and Francisco Papabubaba, progenitors of the Ortega family. Rita and her sister Agueda, with their grandmother Teresa, and Roman, inherited the Encino land grant of 1845. Through the sharp practices of their business partner, Vicente de la Osa, they lost their shares of Encino land to him. The land grants from Governor Pio Pico were given to Indians in fee simple, and without protections against sale of the land. The Indians lost control of or sold the land grants by the early 1860s. None of the San Fernando land grantees could read or write Spanish or English. As a group they knew very little about US government, taxes, and institutions. Rogerio Rocha, on the advice of Eulogio F. de Celis, whose family was an owner of

Rancho Ex-Mission San Fernando between 1846 and 1872, paid taxes on the land at Rancho Cienega, near the old Indian village north of the San Fernando Mission.

As already noted in Section a, the Indians fought for the land through agreements with the de Celis family and cases such as *Porter v. Pablo Cota*, which continued from 1876-1878. This lawsuit shows the Cano-Capistrano, Ortega, and Ramirez-Cota lineages in collective action. The Ramirez-Cota family is hard to trace, and seems not to reappear in the 1900 or later censuses. Gregorio Camilo, grandson of the captain of the Jotativit lineage community, was a confidant of Rogerio Rocha, but his line is difficult to trace after 1896. Descendants from the above mentioned lineages are eligible for membership in the present-day Fernandeño Tataviam Band of Mission Indians.

Loss of control over land and diseases took their toll on the San Fernando Indian community and on the lineage communities. The following accounts demonstrate the survival and continuity of the main Ortega, Garcia, and Ortiz lineage lines.

The Ortega Lineage

The progenitors of the Ortega line are from the lineage communities of Tapuu and Chaguayabit. Tapuu was a Chumash community in eastern Simi Valley. Tiburcio Cayo was born at Tapuu in 1793, and baptized at San Fernando Mission in 1803. His mother Tiburica was baptized the next year. In 1810, Tiburcio Cayo married Teresa, from the Siutcabit lineage at Encino. In all they had seven children, although only three survived to adulthood. The oldest surviving child was Paula Cayo, who inherited from her father, the honorific expression Cayo. At San Fernando Church, in 1827, Paula Cayo married Francisco Papabubaba, whose lineage came from Chaguayabit, which was located in present-day northern Santa Clarita Valley. Francisco appears to have moved to Encino to live with his new wife. By 1840, if not before, Tiburcio Cayo, following the Mexican policies for liberation and land ownership, negotiated to have a square league of land near the ancient village at Encino, a substation of the San Fernando Mission. Most likely, in the early 1840s, Roque, an Indian from the Santa Barbara Mission, married Tiburcio's daughter, Agueda. Fearing the land agreement with the church was not legally sufficient, in 1843 Tiburcio negotiated a land grant from the Mexican Governor, Manuel Micheltoarena. Tiburcio Cayo died in 1844, leaving the land to Roque, Roman, and Francisco. Roman and his wife, Paula, were baptized at San Fernando Mission and married in 1827. Paula's parental lineages were from Simi and Humaliwo (Malibu), while Roman's family was from Sanja, in the northeastern part of the San Fernando Valley.

After the expulsion of Governor Micheltoarena from California, Roque, Roman, and Francisco feared that their land deed would not provide sufficient title for the new governor, Pio Pico, and so renegotiated a new land grant in 1845. In the early 1850s, Roque left for the gold fields and

never returned, and was presumed dead. Francisco Papabubaba died in 1847. Sisters Rita (Francisco's oldest surviving daughter) and Agueda each inherited each 1/3 joint ownership of Encino. Roman held the last third.⁴¹ Through fraud and sharp dealings, Vicente de la Oso acquired title to the Encino land grant, and by 1857, Rita, a progenitor of the Ortega family, was landless. She moved back to San Fernando Mission where her husband could find work. In the 1860 census, Antonio (Maria Ortega) was four years old and living in his mother's household. By 1862, Rita's husband, Benigno, had died, and she married Fernando Ortega, with whom she already had had a long relationship dated to the early 1850s. In the early 1860s, Rita had several more children with Fernando Ortega, including Luis Eduardo Ortega. Fernando Ortega was a half-blood Yaqui Indian from Sonora, Mexico.

The 1860s were a difficult decade in the San Fernando Valley, with significant droughts, and a smallpox epidemic that severely affected the Indians. The Indians still living at the village north of San Fernando Mission were greatly affected. Many died and most were buried without markers. Sometime around 1867, both Maria Rita Alipas (Alipaz) and Fernando Ortega died, leaving their children orphaned. Geronimo Lopez was godfather to Luis Ortega, and was raised by the Lopez family. Antonio Maria Ortega worked for Rancho Ex-Mission San Fernando as a child of about ten years old in the late 1860s, and then was taken into the Lopez family for schooling and protection.

Antonio Maria Ortega and Louis Eduardo Ortega are progenitors of the present-day Ortega family. Louis Ortega raised a family of five children in San Fernando. However, in 1924, at age 62, Louis Ortega moved to find work at ranches near Fresno, California. Antonia Maria Ortega participated as defendant with several other San Fernando lineages members in the 1876-78 land case, *Porter v. Cota*. Antonio was well connected to the Garcias, Cano-Capistranos, Cota-Ramirez, and others. While working for the Lopezes at Lopez Station in the late 1870s, Antonio Maria met his future wife, Ysidora Garcia. The parents of Ysidora were Catalina Leyva Garcia and Santiago Garcia. Both were from Sonora in Mexico, and both were Indians. In the 1880 census, Ysidoro and family all reported they were Indians, she reporting she was born in Mexico. The Garcia parents were both Indians from Sonora, and possibly Yaquis. Santiago who was killed by a bear in 1873, and Catalina and children moved to San Fernando, where they lived near the Geronimo Lopez family and near other Indians. Antonio married Ysidora Garcia, and baptized their first child Christina in 1881. By 1889, Antonio and Ysidora bought a house in San Fernando, a few blocks from the Lopez Adobe, which was always a center for Indians in San Fernando. They would live in the same house on Coronel Street for the rest of their lives. Antonio and Ysidora had nine children who lived to maturity. Five of those children produced large families, which now make up the core of the Ortega lineage.

⁴¹ 80332.SCUS. Saturnino Reyes Deposition, 1852.

The Garcia Lineages

Eugenia Mendez, the informant for J.P. Harrington, was a progenitor of the Garcia line. She was born to Teofila in 1817, and her mother died after about two years. Teofila was the sister to the Taari, or lineage leader, among the people we know now as the Tejon Tribe. Eugenia's father was Francisco de Espirito Santo, a member of the Tujubait (Tujungu) lineage, who died when Eugenia was about 12 years old. Eugenia was born and married at San Fernando Mission. Her first husband was Ramon, a relative from the lineage community of Chaguayabit on his mother's side. They married in 1832. Ramon and Eugenia had five children according to the Mission record. One of their children, Leandra Culeta, was born in 1840, and is a progenitor of the Garcia family. Ramon died in 1845, and Eugenia married Carlos in 1846. Eugenia lived a long life, and as was possible for widows, she returned to her lineage relatives at Rancho Tejon. She was recorded among the Tejon Indians in the 1915 Tejon Census, a count carried out by an Indian service officer.⁴² Eugenia was living at Tejon by the 1890s, if not before.⁴³ There is no record of Eugenia in the 1850 census living in San Fernando, and she apparently left San Fernando Mission during the late 1840s.

Eugenia's daughter, Leandra Culeta, was married at an early age to Joseph Cupertino, who was an Indian baptized at San Fernando Mission. She appears to have remarried by the 1860 census, when she and her husband were living in Saticoy, a Chumash village at the edge of Ventura, California. Leandra Culeta and Juan Leyva are recorded as parents to Maria Josefa Leyva in 1865 at the Plaza Church in downtown Los Angeles, CA.⁴⁴

The godparents to Maria Josefa Leyva are worth noting. In 1845, after the close of the San Fernando Mission, Ladislao (Stanislaus) worked as a laborer for the Dolores Ochoa ranch. His lineage was Punivit. Ladislao, together with Vicente Francisco, San Fernando Mission Alcalde in 1845, and chief of the Tejon band in the 1870s, were witnesses to the marriage of Pastor Cano and Maria del Carmen.⁴⁵ In 1827, Ladislao was witness to the wedding of Paula and Ramon (Roman), who were later joint owners of the Encino land grant with Maria Alipas, progenitor of the Ortega line.⁴⁶ In the early 1850s, Ladislao left the San Fernando Valley to join the Sebastian Reservation near Fort Tejon. He rose to leadership at Sebastian Reservation and was recognized for a period as the principal chief among the Tataviam speakers at Fort Tejon San Sebastian Reservation.⁴⁷ After Sebastian Reservation was dismantled, Ladislao lost his political following,

⁴² 80948.DC.

⁴³ 80963.BME, p. 1.

⁴⁴ 80291.LPC.

⁴⁵ 80890.SFR #00751.

⁴⁶ SF Marriage #0777.

⁴⁷ 00048.B.FTO.

as he was getting very elderly. He married a woman from the Tejon lineage and settled at Rancho Tejon.⁴⁸

The other godparent was Maria Felicitas, the daughter of Pastor Cano, a captain from Catalina Island. Maria Felicitas was active in the Indian leadership at San Fernando. She was a political confidant of Rogerio Rocha, and sister to Setimo (Lopez), the informant to J.P. Harrington. Maria and her husband, Jesus Capistrano, were named defendants in the *Porter v. Cota* case from 1876-1878. The godparenting between Maria Felicitas and Maria Josefa Leyvas created a social relationship between the Cano family and Leandra Culeta, her husband Juan Leyvas, and daughter Josefa, all three of the latter being Garcia family progenitors.

Mary Felicitas may have played a major role in the life of Maria Josefa Leyvas. In the 1870 census, Maria is living in the household of Juan Capistrano and Felicia Capistrano (Maria Felicitas), and Josefa is 5 years old. After the baptism in 1865 of their daughter Maria Josefa, Juan Leyvas or Leandra Culeta do not appear in the record. It seems that they both died before 1870, victims, perhaps, of the severe smallpox epidemic during that period, which claimed over half the Indians in the Los Angeles area.⁴⁹ Josephine (Maria Josefa) is not found in the 1880 census. Josephine appears not to be living in the household the Felicia Capistrano or in the household of Catalina Garcia, her future mother-in-law.⁵⁰ Josephine may have spent several years living with the Capistranos, and could well have been living upon the land and suffered eviction like the rest of the defendants in the *Porter v. Cota* case. She would have been about 11-13 during those events, and too young to be mentioned in the case as a defendant. Nonetheless, she, would have established relations with some of the leading families among the San Fernando Indians who were involved in that case, including Antonio Maria Ortega.

In 1880, Josephine was 15 years old, and most likely she was not living alone; if she left San Fernando, she soon returned. She began a relationship with Isodore (Ysidoro) Garcia, an Indian of Mexican descent whose family was living among the San Fernando Indians near the Lopez Ranch and the Cano-Capistrano family residence. On May 23, 1882, Isodore and Josephine baptized their daughter, Petra Sara Garcia at the La Plaza Church in the old square of Los Angeles. Petra was born on January 31, 1882. Josephine had three children with Isodore: Petra, Frances, and James.

Isodore Garcia was the brother of Ysidora Garcia, who married Antonio Maria Ortega. The common lore of the Garcia and Ortega families recognizes and incorporates the Indian background of the two Garcia siblings. Both Charlie Cooke and Rudy Ortega, Sr. often told

⁴⁸ 80404.A.Lopez.

⁴⁹ See Robinson, *Los Angeles in Civil War Days*, p. 114.

⁵⁰ 80940.USC; 80889.USC.

stories of the Indian ways of Isodore and Ysidora's father, Santiago Garcia, and how he was killed fighting with a bear. There is a canyon now named Santiago Canyon, in memory of the incident where Santiago Garcia was killed. Through Isodore and Ysidora's parents, Santiago and Catalina Garcia, both the Ortega and Garcia lineages share a common blood ancestor. When two lines share a common blood ancestor, then the two lines form a clan, and the two lines cannot marry amongst each other. The Ortega and Garcia lines share this view, and through the years to the present, members of the two lines have not intermarried.

In 1882, the Garcias were evicted from their home in San Fernando, most likely on Rancho Ex-Mission San Fernando territory, as a result of the adverse decision in the *Porter v. Cota* case. Isodore and Josephine moved their family to Newhall Ranch where they found work and set up a household. Their new location was about 10 miles north of San Fernando, and was close to the traditional Tataviam settlements in the Santa Clarita Valley.

About 1890, Isodore and Josephine had a falling out. She, oldest daughter Petra, and son James Garcia left the Newhall Ranch household and moved to Kern County, near the Tejon Ranch, where Josephine's grandmother, Eugenia Mendez, was living. Josephine and Isodore would be reunited in the early 1930s. They lived in San Fernando and later Oxnard, during the last days of their lives.

Isodore remained in Newhall with daughter Frances, who partnered with Alfred (Frederick) Cooke. Cooke was of English-American descent, and also had an Indian descendant from San Gabriel Mission. Frederick and Frances Garcia Cooke had 12 children and generated a large extended family. This lineage is often called the Garcia-Cooke family.

Josephine Leyvas Garcia also partnered with William Abraham Gardner in rural Kern County, and they had four children between 1894 and 1903.

During the middle 1890s, Petra Garcia was living with her great grandmother, Eugenia Mendez, at Rancho Tejon. Petra returned to Newhall by 1899, when she married Joseph Rivera. Petra and Joseph had one child, Margaret, who later married Eldridge Amos Ward, and became Margaret Rivera Ward. Margaret and her husband generated a large family that is identified as the Ward line. Petra and Joseph Rivera, however, did not live together.

Josephine's son, James Garcia, also stayed at Tejon Ranch in the 1890s and ultimately married Marie Miranda, a stepdaughter of Tejon Tribe Captain Juan Lozada. The Jim Garcia family lived at Rancho Tejon and they appear to have integrated into the Tejon tribal community.⁵¹

⁵¹ 80885.USC. 1930 Census and 80886.USC. 1940 Census.

Petra Garcia went on marry Jose Jesus Valenzuela, a non-Indian Mexican, and had four children by 1910. This group is known as the Valenzuela line.

The Ortiz Lineage

After selling his land grants by 1851, Jose Miguel (Triunfo) and family moved to Encino and joined with Rita, Roman, Teresa, and Agueda, who were still owners of their square league. Jose Miguel died by March 1, 1851, and his two sons Alifonso and Antonio received Samuel's land grant as a gift. Rosaria Arriola, the daughter of Jose Miguel and Rafaela is a progenitor of the contemporary Ortiz family.⁵² Rosaria married Miguel Ortiz, a Mexican, and bore three children, two boys and a girl. The two sons, Miguel Rafael Ortiz and Joseph Ortiz, and their descendants are well known to the contemporary San Fernando Indian community. Joseph Ortiz and family have been active in a multi-lineal community with the Ortega and Garcia lines. Joseph Ortiz was born in 1861.⁵³ By 1877 Joseph and his mother left San Fernando and moved to the Tejon Ranch area. Joseph had some schooling, but between 1878 and 1893, Joseph was employed at Tejon Ranch, where J. J. Lopez was his manager.

In 1893, Edward Beal, the former US Indian Agent for the San Sebastian Reservation, died.

Beal, with money from his wife, bought the land that constituted San Sebastian Reservation when its land title was challenged by owners of Mexican land grants. Beal purchased the land and invited the Indians to stay and work, just as the Lopez family had protected and offered work to the Indian community at San Fernando. After Beal's death, his son did not have the same relationship to the Indians, and many began to leave employment at Tejon Ranch. The Tejon tribal members, however, refused to leave, and started a series of court cases and land negotiations over ownership of land at Tejon Ranch.

The Joseph Ortiz family left the Indian community at Tejon Ranch around 1893 and moved to Bakersfield, where they could carry on work as farm workers. By the early 1920s, Joseph Ortiz was getting old, and decided to return to San Fernando. Once there, he moved into a house on Kewen Street in the neighborhood of the Ortegas and other San Fernando Indian families.

Joseph's brother, Miguel Rafael (known as Ralph) was living in San Fernando, running some local businesses, and owned property. While Ralph Ortiz's family was well known in the community and they were active community participants, Joseph's family was willing to identify as Indian and join in the multi-lineal alliance that forms the contemporary tribal community at San Fernando. Joseph had six children. The descendants of Joseph Ortiz are considered members of the Ortiz lineage among the present-day Fernandeño Tataviam Band of Mission Indians.

⁵² LA Baptism #1022; 80108.A.USC; 80079.A.USC.

⁵³ 80078.A.USC; 00113.A.LN; 80126.DC.

The Cano-Capistrano Line

The Pastor Cano family decided to stay at San Fernando after the close of the Mission, and worked for Rancho Ex-Mission San Fernando until at least the late 1850s. Pastor had two children, Maria Felicitas, born in 1844, and Fernando, born about 1853. Fernando Cano may have been one of the last children baptized at the San Fernando Mission in 1855, the result of an occasional visit from a Catholic priest. Fernando, a baptism name, appears to be the same person as Setimo Lopez, the informant for J. P. Harrington in 1915. Setimo said he had an older half brother, Martin Violin, born of the same mother and a different father. It is hard to find a Martin in the San Fernando Mission records who fits that set of facts. Martin Violin spent most of his life, about 40 years, working as a boatman on the coast in the Santa Barbara-Ventura area. Setimo reported that Martin left home when Setimo was about 10 years old, so that would be about 1863. The Cano family is not found in the 1860 census, and there is no Martin listed with the family in the 1850 census. It could be that Martin Violin lived with his father, not at San Fernando. If Setimo shared a mother with Martin, then Josefa Leonisa (Palma, Cano) was Martin's mother. This was possible since Josefa was born in 1818 and bore Maria Felicitas with Pastor Cano in 1844, at the age of 26 years. It is possible that Josefa Leonisa had an earlier partner and a child, before partnering with Pastor Cano. However, there is no confirmation in the San Fernando Mission records. There is also no record or comment that Martin Violin married or had children.

Pastor Cano is not listed in the 1870 census; most likely he died sometime before 1870, possibly another victim of the smallpox epidemic of the 1860s. Josefa Palma, Felicita Villa, Jesus Capistrano, and Setimo are mentioned as defendants in the *Porter v. Cota* case of 1876-78. Felicita was already partnering with Jesus Capistrano, a non-Indian Mexican, and they had one child, Juan Capistrano, born in 1872. In the 1880 census Felicita is listed with the surname Capistrano. Josefa, the wife of a captain, and Felicita, daughter of a captain, both cooperated with Antonio Maria Ortega, progenitor of the Ortega line, and the Pablo Cota-Teresa Ramirez line. The three lineages worked to hold onto and use land that had been protected by the de Celis family and Andres Pico, before the sale of the land to Porter in 1872.

Felicita's son, Juan, married and had two children, Frank and Felicita. In the 1910 census, Juan and family lived next door to the Antonio Maria Ortega family on Coronel Street in San Fernando. By 1910 the protection and work offered by the Lopez family was fading, as Catalina and Geronimo Lopez were getting very aged. In 1905, Setimo went to work for the commercial farmer Peter Lopez, and worked for him for at least the next 25 years. There are no records of the Setimo Lopez family that might indicate whether he had surviving children. Setimo and family do not seem to be in the census records after 1880. In 1910, Juan Capistrano had two children, Felicita and Frank. We have not been able to trace the daughter Felicita, but Frank lived in the

San Fernando Valley until at least 1935, and by 1940 moved to El Monte, California with his 10 children.

There is discussion among the contemporary Fernandeño Tataviam Band of Mission Indians that Cano family members were participating in the tribal community and in tribal events. However, they have not come forward to verify their descendancy and apply for membership. They are eligible for membership if their lineage documents verify ancestry to Pastor Cano.

Other Possible Lineages

Two other lineages bear mention. The Gregorio Camilo lineage has not been easy to trace. Gregorio was a trusted confidant to Rogerio Rocha, but we cannot trace Gregorio or his lineage after 1896. Also, the Pablo Cota-Teresa Ramirez line played a critical and leading role in the 1876-78 land case of *Porter v. Cota*. Pablo Cota (Francisco Pablo) appears in the 1870 census, but not thereafter. Cota's sister or daughter, Teresa, married Jesus Ramirez, and had three children ages 9, 7 and 5, in the 1880 census.⁵⁴ Their presence on the 1880 census suggests that all three children were present on the land during the legal case of *Porter v. Cota* (1876-78), and Teresa partnered with Jesus Ramirez as early as 1871. Nevertheless, after the 1880 census, we cannot track the Ramirez or Cota families. Both the lineage descendants of the Camilo and Cota-Ramirez lines are eligible for membership, if they can prove lineal descent and long-term commitment to the Indian community at San Fernando.

There may be other lineage groups that could come forward for membership. They need to prove their lineal organization and descent, while at the same time showing long-term commitment to the San Fernando Indian community and agreement to live within the contemporary multi-lineal constitutional government.

Fernandeño Community in the Post-Mission Period (1846 to 1910)

The contemporary Fernandeño lineage formations solidified by 1910.

Over the 1846 to 1910 post-San Fernando Mission period marriage patterns changed in terms of eligible partners. During the mission period, San Fernando Mission Indians primarily married other Indians, and were restricted mainly to Christian Indians who lived and worked at the Mission. Lineages continued to marry across cultural, linguistic, and politically defined lineage groups. The network of the pre-contact region was transported into the Mission, where lineages

⁵⁴ 80958.USC; 80959.USC; 80960.USC; 80961.SFR #03026; 80962.SFR.

continued to marry for strategic and political ends. Few, if any, non-Indians married an Indian during the Spanish and Mexican periods. The Spanish colonial caste system made cultural Indians off limits. Although the Mexican secularization plans offered Mexican citizenship and political equality, at least in principle, Indians were rare marriage partners, and only if they were willing to abandon Indian cultural identity and lifestyle.

During the 1846-1910 period, however, marriage patterns began to change. The lineages continued to marry outside of their lines. A person inside a lineage was off limits to any other member of the lineage for marriage purposes. This rule holds to the present, regardless of how complicated and increasingly populated the various lineages become. The membership rule continues that same policy, and only those born into the lineage are eligible for membership. Now, however, lineage membership is reckoned through bilateral descent from either mother or father, or both. In traditional times there might have been a rare adoption, but nowadays such a consideration is impossible for any person. Marriage partners became more diverse during the American period, and more frequently were outside the regional and mission networks. Many, women especially, started to marry non-Indians, predominantly people of Mexican descent, but ultimately over time Americans and Europeans. For the progenitors of the Ortega and Garcia lines, there was a preference for marriage to Mexican Indians. The marriages of Ysidora Garcia into the Ortega line, and Isodore, her older brother, into the Josefa Leyva line, created common ancestors in both the Ortega and Garcia lines. The shared common ancestors for both of the Ortega and Garcia lines form a clan arrangement, and prohibits marriage between the two lineages.

Traditionally membership in a lineage was reckoned through the patrilineal line, and through the matrilineal line for Chumash cultural members. A person had to be a member of the bloodline to be a member of a lineage. Individuals who married into the lineage were not deemed members. For many American and Mexican marriage partners, this was often considered a severe rule, but it holds to the present. For purposes of tribal membership, the tribe is defined as a coalition of lineage groups, and married-in individuals do not have membership. This rule may be traditional, but it is not explicitly expressed in the literature. A hint of it may exist in the rule that a married-in widow may return to live in her birth lineage, suggesting that her real social home remains with her own lineage group.⁵⁵

Deeper into the American period, the unilineal kinship pattern began to change. In traditional times kinship was based on either patrilineal or matrilineal descent; but during the American period, the rule shifted toward a bilateral descent system, which followed the American pattern. Lineage membership become increasingly bilateral, reckoned through both the father and

⁵⁵ 000261.BL, p. 11.

mother. The lineages no longer export their daughters to other lineages, and reckon descent only through the father or mother, as the traditional rules prescribed. Increasingly, all blood descendants of a lineage member are considered members of the lineage. In the formerly patrilineal arrangements, only children of the sons were lineage members. Now mainly since 1900, all children of the sons and daughters of the lineage are now considered members of the lineage. The loss of a reciprocal lineage marriage system, as well as the marriage of individuals who do not support lineage relations and economy, suggests that the lineages began to take care and responsibility for all descendants. This responsibility for all lineage members may have its origins in the norm of continued protection of persons, especially women, who married into other lineages, and were abused or disrespected. The women often were rescued by their birth lineage, the marriage gifts thrown back at the offending lineage, and the rescued female married off to another lineage within a day or two.⁵⁶

Throughout the 1846-1910 post-mission period, most San Fernando Indians could not read or write Spanish or English, and few spoke English. Many continued to speak Indian languages at home, and spoke Spanish with accents and not fluently. A Spanish-speaking community grew up around the Indians living in San Fernando. The old town part of San Fernando was often derisively called Sonora Town. Nevertheless, most Indians preferred to learn English, and did not celebrate California holidays, such as Cinco de Mayo, unless they were invited to participate. The standard Christian holidays became the main holidays for the San Fernando Indian lineages.

While the cycle of regional Indian ceremonies continued annually during the mission days, during the American period such celebrations became economically infeasible, and the associated purposes of economic exchange, marriage connections, and mutual ceremonial exchanges among lineage groups became increasingly difficult to support. The wage labor system, where Indians were paid about half as much as Anglo-Americans, and the loss of land, all led to increased impoverishment among the San Fernando lineages. However, the oral history suggests that some ceremonies were continued, increasingly in private. In a personal communication, Rudy Ortega Sr. recalled that as a child in the 1930s he saw San Fernando lineage members performing ceremonies while wearing ceremonial dress.⁵⁷

As before, as Kroeber explained, “They acted together in times of emergency. They were likely to act together in time of visits, festivals, and dances.”⁵⁸ The lineages and lineage coalitions did not have regular times to meet, except for prearranged festivals, ceremonies, and family

⁵⁶ Heizer, Robert F. *The Indians of Los Angeles County: Hugo Reid's Letters of 1852* (Los Angeles, CA: Southwest Museum Papers, #21, 1968), p. 27.

⁵⁷ Personal communication from Rudy Ortega, Sr. to Professor Duane Champagne, San Fernando, CA, 2008.

⁵⁸ 000261.BL, pp. 10-11.

gatherings. During the mission period gatherings occurred during the Christian ceremonial cycle, and then also through the annual regional Indian gatherings and ceremonies at San Fernando Mission. In the post-mission period, the lineage families continued to gather during the Christian holidays and took up American holidays such as Independence Day on the Fourth of July and Thanksgiving. The lineages participated in local San Fernando festivals, and during the 1930s attended festivals surrounding the revival and restoration of the San Fernando Mission buildings. The main crisis that brought the lineages together was the loss of land, and several lineages gathered together to try to hold land at Rancho Ex-Mission San Fernando, which resulted in the *Porter v. Cota* case. Lineage community activities remained focused around lineage and multi-lineal gatherings. At such gatherings, lineage members exchanged information, strategized, conducted continuing ceremonial activities, and met with leaders who were gathered for the event.

The post-mission San Fernando Indian community consisted of multiple, often coexisting, lineage communities. Many of the lineage groups were small, with few surviving members, and some disappeared. Only those lineages that lived at San Fernando, or lived nearby, or were evicted after 1876 and forced to leave, but eventually returned, were considered Fernandeños.

The Multi-Lineal Indian Community at San Fernando (1910 to Present)

The story San Fernando Indians in the 20th century is the story of lineages, and the formation of a multi-lineal community, and eventually a voluntary multi-lineal constitutional government. The emergence of the Ortega, Garcia, and Ortiz families in the post-1910 period has a lot to do with demographics. During the difficult and changing conditions of the second half of the 19th century, Indian populations in California and elsewhere were rapidly declining. Diseases and harsh, changing economic conditions for Indians often caused a decline in the population of San Fernando lineages, as well. The new rules of intermarriage outside of the regional Indian lineages allowed individuals to choose to take up the non-Indian cultures of their spouses. Increasingly, being Indian was a choice and commitment, and there were many choices available. The Ortega, Garcia, and Ortiz lines were blessed with large families and over the 20th century several generations of ever-expanding numbers of family members. In contrast, Rogerio Rocha and his wife Maria Manuela, had only one child who died very young. Apparently, Maria Manuela could not bear any more children. Rogerio was the only surviving member of a large family generated by his father Jerman. Consequently, the Jerman-Rogerio line ceased. Samuel had several children, but none survived to adulthood. Other lines remained in San Fernando. Setimo Lopez can be traced to 1828, but may not have had children. Maria Felicitas married Jesus Capistrano, and a Cano-Capistrano line can be traced, along with family members' participation at the social level. Nevertheless, the story of San Fernando Indians during the 20th

century is largely the story of the Ortega, Garcia, and Ortiz lines. Options are open for other lineages to join.

Lineage Gatherings

Kroeber's statement bears repeating: "They acted together in times of emergency. They were likely to act together in time of visits, festivals, and dances."⁵⁹ Lineage gatherings took place during holidays, partly because American and Christian holidays dominated the calendar, and partly because the demands of wage labor organized peoples' schedules around five day work weeks, weekends, and holidays. Holidays were times when families could gather, and the large extended families could get together. Certain lineage members, often older head persons, took on the obligation to organize family gatherings. Among the Garcias, Frances Garcia Cooke organized family gatherings for her direct lineage until her death in 1946. Thereafter, Frances Cooke's oldest daughter, Mary Garcia, organized family gatherings until her death in 1975. Among the Ortegas, Antonio Maria and his wife, Ysidora, held family gatherings until Ysidora's death in 1931. Thereafter, daughter Vera Ortega Salazar organized family events until the late 1970s. Other Ortega lineage members helped, including daughter Sally Ortega Verdugo and son James Ortega and his wife Laura, who were active during the 1940s, until James's illness and death. Gatherings for holidays, events, and crisis situations were opportunities to meet and socialize, but also a time for significant discussion and consensus decision-making that affected individuals, families, and the lineage communities.

David Salazar, Sr. has explained, "Christmas, New Years. It was for everybody. ...All the relatives, and if they brought somebody they could come too. Because I had my aunts' kids and my uncles' kids. Everybody would come over. They'd come in groups. They liked my mom's cooking. She loved to have them by."⁶⁰ He also observed, "And it was through weddings, funerals and holidays. And all of them were very important. I think my dad was even at Rudy's wedding, and those kind of things is... what kept our tribe together was the people."⁶¹

For more comments on the role of community and gatherings see the documents in the attached footnote.⁶²

⁵⁹ 000261.BL, pp. 10-11.

⁶⁰ 90325.FTO.DSS.

⁶¹ David Salazar Sr., 90317.FTO.DSS, pp. 2-3.

⁶² The following comments focus on family gatherings: 90325.FTO.DSS; 90326.FTO.DSS; 90327.DSS; 90338.FTO.VS; 90339.VS; 90340.VS; 90344.FTO.JO; 90358.FTO. JO; 90385.FTO.ROS; 90404.FTO.ROS; 90405.FTO.LO; 90436.FTO.AC; 90449.FTO.EO.ROJ; 90404.FTO.LO; 90405.FTO; 90436.FTO.AC; 90449.FTO.EO.ROJ; 90457.FTO.EO.ROJ; 90459.EO.ROJ; 90663.FTO.CC; 90921.FTO.KST.KG.

The Community Non-Profit

In 1971, the lineages decided to form a non-profit. Vera Salazar had been advocating the formation of a culture center since the early 1940s. Vera was a younger daughter of Antonio Maria Ortega, and in his latter days, he passed onto Vera much of his knowledge about culture, ceremonies, and medicine. Vera wanted a platform for teaching history and culture to lineage members. She saw that Rudy Ortega, Sr. was very interested in Indian history and identity, and she provided guidance and support to Rudy, encouraging him to form a cultural non-profit. Rudy was still in high school in the early 1940s, but he took up the project. The war intervened, but Rudy returned after serving as a soldier in the Pacific. The war equipped Rudy with broader experiences, and a greater understanding of American government and organization. Vera continued to encourage formation of a cultural center, and after continued discussion, a non-profit organization was incorporated in 1971. The non-profit center remains in operation to the present, now for 44 years, and has been supporting a variety of lineage, local Tataviam community, and pan-Indian goals and activities.

The non-profit over the years has changed names, but today it goes under the name of Pukúu, which means “one,” an expression of community unity. One reason for forming the non-profit was that it could have more inclusive membership than was and is allowed under the lineage community rules. Many of the married-in people wanted to have a more active role in the future and benefit their children and the community. However, lineage community rules did not accept married-ins as eligible to vote or take leadership positions, or, later under the new constitution, to hold elected office. The non-profit is organized under California state law, and membership rules allow married-ins to vote and take office. The non-profit also allowed married-in and other interested local, usually Indian, community members to participate, hold office, serve on the board of directors, and to participate in activities. A major goal of the non-profit was to serve the lineage community as a cultural center, but also to engage with local community, and pan-Indian organizations at the level of powwows, and service delivery to the Los Angeles Indian community. The non-profit has been a legal platform for fundraising, grant writing, and pan-Indian identity and presence.

During the 1970s and later, the Los Angeles Indian community was very active and held powwows at different locations managed by different groups nearly every weekend. One way to participate in the LA Indian community was to attend the powwows and to participate in the dancing. Many Indian tribes participate in the dancing, even tribes that did not practice powwow or plains style dancing showed up and began to dance. Many of the Apache and Navajo families joined in the plains style dancing, since their own traditions had different ceremonial ways. The intertribal dancing was foreign to their traditions and history. Some Apache and Navajo wanted to participate and so they asked and received permission from their elders. Similarly, among

California Indians, their dance and music traditions are very different from the northern and southern plains or powwow style. The Fernandeños also took up plains style regalia and dancing as a means to join with the extensive Los Angeles pan-Indian community. The Fernandeños held their own dances, attended Los Angeles events, and went to dance at powwows held at California Indian reservations, especially at Santa Ynez. During festivals and activities surrounding remembrance of San Fernando Mission, the Fernandeños attended and supported the events. Schools, organizations, and public events often asked for dancers, and opening prayers, which the Fernandeño continue to supply and engage. The Fernandeño were and continue to be engaged in Los Angeles Indian community and government, and actively participate in many issues with federally recognized southern Indian tribes.

As the non-profit explains on its website,

Since 1971 Pukúu Cultural Community Services continues to serve 100% very low-income American Indian men, women, and families in the Los Angeles county. Pukúu serves nearly 200 new people each year, both single adults (20%) and families with children (80%). The One Stop Emergency Service (OSES) is a service provided by the Los Angeles County Community Services American Indian Block Grant, and the Fernandeño Tataviam Band of Mission Indians to provide emergency assistance to low income American Indians who reside in Los Angeles County. The Fatherhood Journey creates a sacred circle where fathers are given an opportunity to be more engaged in the lives of their children and serve as better role models. The Stronger Family Fund is a new service to assist in the family fundamentals. From grassroots programs to youth and families activities, Pukúu has given and continues to provide scholarships to California American Indian students.⁶³

In recent years, the long-standing student scholarship program has been renamed the Rudy Ortega Scholarship Fund, in honor of the late long time leader among the Fernandeño lineage communities, Rudy Ortega, Sr.

The Pukúu nonprofit has been a vehicle to engage the contemporary world and to participate with tribal organizations and communities in Los Angeles County as well as southern California. The nonprofit is a voluntary association under state law. However, while membership and participation extends beyond the traditional lineage communities, Pukúu's goals and leadership are expressed and supported by the Fernandeño lineage communities. The membership and leadership of the lineage communities are actively engaged in the programs and activities of Pukúu. The nonprofit not only expresses the cultural and humanitarian goals of the lineage

⁶³ See (<http://www.pukuu.org/services>), last visited on 8/27/2015.

communities, it provides a working platform, a voluntary association, that is part of American legal and political regulations for cultural and community service programs. Married-ins are not allowed to vote or hold office within the multi-lineage communities and government, but are enabled to participate and provide leadership in the non-profit framework. The Fernandeños have found a voluntary association solution that provides capability and integration into pan-Indian and Los Angeles County institutions, while at the same time the fundamental rules of the lineage communities and the emergent multi-lineal coalition are preserved within the tribal government.