

HIDDEN HISTORIES: Gendered and Settler Colonial Landscapes in Northern California¹

Karen R. Roybal

Abstract: *This essay draws on Indigenous and women's histories to (re)tell a small portion of northern California's past that has been erased or silenced within the dominant historical record. Through this (re)telling, the essay details the complexity of contact, conquest, and the role of laboring bodies that more accurately defines the history of colonialism, settlement, and dispossession in the West and Southwest. As one of the women central to the settlement of the region, María Ygnacia López de Carrillo, mother-in-law to Mariano and Salvador Vallejo, is known by a select group of California residents as the "Mother of Santa Rosa"; however, her presence in nineteenth-century California historical records remains hidden. This work contributes to the growing scholarship of Chicana historians who examine intersectionalities of gender and power in the Spanish colonial and Mexican periods in California, by providing critical biographical details about the ways López de Carrillo challenged gender politics. She did this by building a sense of community with the Southern Pomo, establishing herself as a ranchera in a patriarchal-dominated industry and space, and maintaining control of Rancho Cabeza de Santa Rosa, land granted to her in 1838. It also reveals additional insights about the Sonoma area history, including the vehement relations that were anything but amicable between the Indigenous tribes and the Euro-Americans and Mexicanas/os colonizing the area. The essay thus reveals a dual history of colonization (by gender and genocide) of the region that has been marred by its obscurity in the historical record.*

Key Words: *California, Chicana, gender, indigenous, settler colonialism, Vallejo*

Though most people are familiar with images of vineyards spread across the rolling hills of northern California, they are much less acquainted with the regions' original inhabitants: three Indigenous tribes—the Miwok, Pomo, and Wintun—and later, a slew of Europeans seeking economic wealth (including the Spanish), and Mexicanas/os who acquired land via grants in and around the region. This brief

acknowledgement of the peoples indigenous to the region does little justice in retelling the complexity of contact, conquest, and the role of laboring bodies that more accurately defines the history of colonialism, settlement, and dispossession in the West and Southwest. Alongside the erasure of indigenous presence in the region, women's accounts are similarly elided in the historical record of this period. This essay draws on both of these hidden stories to (re) tell a small portion of northern California's past.

One of the women whose story is central to the settlement of the region is María Ygnacia López de Carrillo, a member of one of the earliest Mexicana/o families in northern California and mother-in-law to a prominent Californio, General Mariano Guadalupe Vallejo, a military commander, político, and *ranchero* who led a garrison to Sonoma in 1833 and “established the pueblo of Sonoma two years later” (LeBaron et.al. 1985, 2); he served as delegate to the Constitutional Convention in 1849; and he was a short-term senator in the Sonoma District (1849–1851) (Sánchez and Pita 2001, 71). Because of his significance in California historical accounts, Vallejo is a well-known figure. Doña María Ygnacia López de Carrillo, on the other hand, is known by a select group of California residents as the “Mother of Santa Rosa”²; however, in the historical record, she remains virtually unknown. López de Carrillo built a sense of community with neighboring Indigenous tribes and specifically, the Southern Pomo. She established herself as a *ranchera* in a patriarchal-dominated industry and space, and she maintained control of Rancho Cabeza de Santa Rosa, land granted to her in 1838. I argue that *her* story reveals a hidden gendered and settler colonial northern California landscape and history. In addition to providing critical biographical details about López de Carrillo and the ways she challenged gender politics, this essay further acknowledges the way that European and Mexican peoples contributed to the settler colonial history of northern California when they

displaced the Pomo, and contributed to what critical Indigenous studies scholar and historian Roxanne Dunbar-Ortiz calls “an institution or system [that] requires violence or the threat of violence to attain its goals” (2014, 8). Considered in this way, this essay reveals a dual history of colonization (by gender and genocide) of the region that has been marred by its obscurity in the historical record.

The matriarch of the Carrillo family, María Ygnacia López de Carrillo used her understanding of place to develop herself as an independent gendered subject in a developing capitalist-driven market in the early nineteenth century—a significant enactment of power for a widowed mother of twelve children. This research contributes to the growing scholarship of Chicana historians who similarly examine the intersectionalities of gender and power in the Spanish colonial and Mexican periods in California.³ It also reveals additional insights about the Sonoma area’s history, including the vehement relations that were anything but amicable between the Indigenous tribes and the Euro-Americans and Mexicanas/os colonizing the area. The story revealed in this essay about the Vallejos and López de Carillo is part of a larger settler colonial history of northern California that is not as frequently discussed as a significant part of California’s Spanish and Mexican past.

Settler Colonialism via the Vallejos and Its Impacts on the Pomo

Domination over territorial rights has dictated the global history of colonization for centuries. In North America, the ideological concept of Manifest Destiny encouraged takeover of land and of people indigenous to those lands in violent ways that led to the rise of what has become the US empire. Indigenous peoples of California experienced a system of colonization that exemplifies what historian Patrick Wolfe (2006) describes as a structure of “settler colonialism [that] destroys to replace” (388). Though

many histories of the US Southwest and West tend to focus on the period 1846–1848 and the start of the Mexican American War, I want to draw attention to the period prior to that, when northern California, in particular, was being colonized by Spanish and other European groups. The Indigenous peoples of that region who were subjected to conditions of colonization had their lives morphed in significant ways that essentially attempted to obliterate their existence by the influx of Spanish conquerors and Russian soldiers, followed by Mexican military officials who were tasked with colonizing the area after Mexico declared its independence from Spain in 1821. Though the impacts of North American colonization efforts were mandated under the guise of treaties between Indigenous and Europeans in which sovereignty of Indigenous nations was to be respected,⁴ the truth is, as Indigenous studies scholar Jodi Byrd reminds us, that in our national historical narrative we conveniently forget that “the colonization of indigenous peoples and lands [was done] by [brutal] force” (2011, xx).

The Pomo had been in what we now identify as Sonoma, Lake, Mendocino, and part of Glenn Counties in California for thousands of years before European contact. Indigenous studies and literary scholar Greg Sarris, a descendant of the Coast Miwok and Southern Pomo, states, “Myth, as well as archaeological record, indicates that many of these Indigenous tribes of Marin and Sonoma Counties have been present for well over ten thousand years, others for four thousand years” (2006, 18). The historical record shows that the first contact between the Indigenous peoples of the region, including the Pomo, and non-Indigenous peoples dates back to 1579,⁵ which indicates that contact with the Indigenous peoples of northern California has extended across generations that continue to feel the consequences of this brutal history. Lucy Young, a descendant of the Lassik/Wintun peoples for example, recounts her grandfather’s memories in “The Coming of the Whites,” ([1981]

1993): “My grandpa say (sic): ‘White Rabbit’—he mean (sic) white people—‘gonta (sic) devour our grass, our seed, our living. We won’t have nothing more, this world.”⁶ The impending destruction and disruption of Indigenous lives and livelihood was all but inevitable once Europeans and Indigenous peoples came in contact.

As early as the seventeenth century, the Spanish landed their ships on the California coast. During the Spanish period (1776–1821), the Spanish Empire sought claims to California to gain a strong position and colonial power against Britain. As European goods began being shipped for trade in the late 1700s from the San Francisco mission presidio, settlement in the area increased and the Spanish began seeking Pomo converts. In addition to building a number of presidios and defensive forts, over the years the Spanish also built missions, which were eventually secularized and turned over to the Mexican government. In 1817 Mission San Rafael was established by the Spanish, followed by Mission San Francisco de Solano and Mission Sonoma; thereby Spain added most of Alta California to its empire. These mission-building projects required Pomo labor; as a result, the Indigenous peoples were seized from as far north as Santa Rosa (Southern Pomo territory). Sarris affirms, “The Spanish, a colonizing force composed of priests and soldiers, enslaved us, forcing us to work on their large mission plantations” (2006, 18). This history reveals that European (in this case, Spanish) settler colonialism in northern California, as in other areas, imposed structures that worked to eliminate Indigenous populations.

The Spanish firmly established their presence in the region and badly mistreated the Pomo. As was common in accounts about North American Indigenous populations, the Spanish chronicled their encounters with the Pomo in such a way that deemed them “savage” and in need of conversion to

the Catholic faith. Chicana historian Linda Heidenreich's work is particularly useful and important here, in that she reminds us that the majority of sources through which we learn about encounters between the Indigenous populations and the Europeans were not provided by Indigenous peoples themselves; thus, our historical knowledge remains limited as we recount the past.⁷ We must also acknowledge that the Pomo were resistant and were deemed "more intelligent" and "more difficult to convert"; in response, extreme violence was used against them by Spanish colonizers.⁸

During the period when the San Rafael, San Francisco, and Sonoma missions were established (1817-1823), Spain lost control of the region when its colony of Mexico initiated a war for its independence in 1821. Following what turned out to be a successful revolt against the Spanish Empire, California became part of the Mexican Republic in 1822. Mexican land grants were established on Pomo territory and military control of the region led to further colonization efforts, with even greater disruption for the Pomo, who were subject to "constant raiding for capture and sale" (Bean and Theodoratus 1978, 299). Greg Sarris states that the Mission in San Rafael, built in 1823, originally served as a hospital for native peoples who were sick and dying.⁹ Established under the guise of aiding the Indigenous population of the region, the missions were in reality spaces in which death was inevitable. The Coast Miwok and Southern Pomo were keenly aware of the underlying causes for their subjection to the missions, and some refrained from going back to their communities for fear of spreading the diseases brought by Europeans that had placed them there in the first place.¹⁰ The Pomo did not accept these dominating groups willingly; they countered the colonization and conversion efforts.

In addition to the Spanish, other European colonization efforts were imposed on Southern Pomo territory in Sonoma County, in and around what became

Santa Rosa, from the east side of the Russian River to central Pomo territory.¹¹ In the early nineteenth century, as Russian and Aleut sea and otter hunters made their way to Bodega Bay, Indigenous peoples faced an uncertain future. Called the “undersea” people because their boats emerged out of the horizon as though they were coming up from under the sea” (Patterson 1998, 7), the Russians settled and hunted along the Sonoma and Mendocino coast. With the founding of Fort Ross in 1812,¹² Russian settlers made contact with the local Pomo and Coast Miwok peoples. Their initial encounter is said to have been peaceful, as it was a relationship based on trade and labor;¹³ in reality, however, histories of settler colonialism are never peaceful nor equal in their outcome.

Before the Russians abandoned Fort Ross in 1842 and returned to their home country, the Kashaya (Pomo) people “were forced into slavery by the Russians to assist them in growing crops to send to their Alaskan colonies” (Morgan 2001, 13). In addition to leaving the Pomo with the smallpox epidemic that decimated over half of their population, the Russians also used Pomo children as slaves, alongside Pomo women, whom they also often raped.¹⁴ The Pomo were subjected to multiple colonizing efforts in addition to those executed by the Russians, including Spanish, Mexican, and later, Anglo American colonization.

The history of settler colonialism in northern California, better categorized as forceful colonization, was tied directly to the Vallejo family. Mariano Guadalupe Vallejo is, perhaps, the most widely recognized individual with whom the broader public associates the colonization of northern California. He was also the largest landowner in the area, after he amassed a substantial amount of property throughout northern California through colonization of Indigenous peoples and land. The positions held by Vallejo indicate his significance in the region and the emphasis placed on his knowledge of colonization in the area confirm this opinion.¹⁵ He was also tied to a vastly

violent history of contact with the Indigenous peoples along the northern California coast.

In 1834, Vallejo moved his garrison north to the Sonoma area, and by 1838, Mexicans had seized all Southern and Central Pomo territory. For the Southern Pomo, encounters with Mexicans during slave raids, missionizing efforts, disease, and dispossession led to the decimation of their population by 1838, when “over ninety percent of the remaining Miwok and southern Pomo” were killed (Sarris 1993, 9). The Vallejo brothers, Mariano and his younger brother Salvador, were central to the colonization of and violence against the Pomo people. Mariano Vallejo assumed military authority over Sonoma Mission, including the Pomo who lived there. Scholars state that he “maintained a friendly relationship with them while they in turn provided a labor force and served as a visible deterrent to others of the region who actively resented the foreign intrusions” (Johnson 1978, 351), but really, he dispossessed the peoples indigenous to the region and created a peon system through their labor. Sarris reminds us that Vallejo “established the rancho system” through which “one of the most elaborate slaves (sic) trading systems” was established “in the new world” (Sarris, 2010).¹⁶ Vallejo thus gained economic prominence and power only after he led brutal military campaigns against the Indigenous populations.¹⁷ Linda Heidenreich similarly suggests that the militarized society that governed colonizing efforts at this time benefitted the settler-colonizers whose efforts “served the state,” which meant in turn that their “service to the state benefitted themselves” (2007, 42). In addition to his invasion of Pomo land, in 1834 Vallejo attacked and murdered hundreds of Satiyomi (Wappo) tribesmen and captured 300. These active efforts against the Indigenous peoples of northern California reveal that Mariano Vallejo, by all accounts, was a slaveholder and eradicator of native peoples in Sonoma County who benefitted greatly from settler colonialism.

Encounters by his brother, Salvador Vallejo, with the Pomo and other Indigenous populations similarly reveal levels of harsh severity in his treatment of the native peoples of the land. The younger Vallejo forced the Eastern Pomo off their land when “he began to run cattle in Big Valley in the 1840s” (McLendon and Oswalt 1978, 287). In 1841, Salvador, who owned a large ranch in Clear Lake Valley, sent for Eastern and Southeastern Pomo whom he thought would help him harvest grain at his property in the Napa Valley. The Pomo refused, so “he sent a small detachment of Mexican troops who ultimately massacred the men of an island village in their sweathouse” (McLendon and Lowy 1978, 318–319). Settler colonial accounts, such as the one recounted by Richard Henry Dana, Jr., descendant of a prominent colonial family, in his famous travel narrative, *Two Years Before the Mast* (1840) state, “Don Guadalupe Vallejo [...] was suspected of being favorably inclined to foreigners” (as quoted in Padilla, 54). However, the historical record tells us that Vallejo and his brother disregarded the peoples native to the land. As these brief accounts reveal, the Vallejo brothers had a violent relationship with the Indigenous people with whom they came in contact throughout California.¹⁸ General Mariano Vallejo later played a significant role in the uprising prompted by the 1846 Bear Flag Revolt, in which American settlers revolted against the Mexican government, and the idea of Manifest Destiny and westward expansion became a goal for the colonizers because they were interested in seizing the land and taking advantage of California’s economic potential. The history of the Vallejo brothers in settler colonist efforts throughout northern California is significant for better understanding the often contentious relationships between the original inhabitants of the land and the European and Mexican colonizers who sought to eradicate them and dispossess them of their land.

At this critical point in history, I am interested in understanding northern California, the Vallejo family, and Southern Pomo history from a different

and equally significant perspective. In this essay, I call attention to others attached to that chronicle: María Ygnacia López de Carrillo, mother-in-law to both Vallejo brothers. The Southern Pomo, who were a significant part of López de Carrillo's life, must also be acknowledged within the historical narrative, because it is upon their land and labor that her livelihood relied. In the sections that follow, I detail López de Carrillo's life story to demonstrate how she challenged gender politics of the time because of the agency she held as a Mexican woman and because of her relationship with the Southern Pomo, which differed markedly from the relationships between her sons-in-law and the Indigenous peoples of California. Though her story has been hidden in the historical record, it renders visible the gendered and settler colonial landscape of nineteenth-century northern California.

“La Mamá de Santa Rosa”

Francisca Benicia (Carrillo) Vallejo, married to Mariano, and María Luz (Carrillo) Vallejo, married to Salvador, are recognizable names within California history. María Ygnacia López de Carrillo's name, however, has not been as widely recognized in this history. It was not until I read a biography about the Carrillo family (McGinty 1957) that the name María Ygnacia López de Carrillo was revealed to me as one of the women in northern California who labored and settled in the area alongside Mariano Vallejo. In addition to being a Californiana landowner and mother-in-law to the brothers Vallejo, López de Carrillo undertook a significant journey to establish her own and her family's place in early nineteenth-century Santa Rosa, California. As in so many cases, women's history is typically relegated to the margins of dominant accounts, so it is not necessarily surprising that we know so little about her.

As Chicana historians Antonia Casteñeda,¹⁹ Linda Heidenreich,²⁰ Bárbara Reyes,²¹ Miroslava Chávez-García,²² and Margie Brown-Coronel,²³ and Chicana literary scholar Rosaura Sánchez have revealed, Californianas were

central to the history of settlement across the region. More important, each of the Chicana scholars noted here have made clear, as Castañeda reminds us, that unequal gender hierarchies are central to the enactment and maintenance of colonialist and imperial power structures.²⁴ This gendered imperialist project aligns with the colonization of Indigenous peoples and traditions, many of which were “centered on and controlled by women” (Castañeda 1997, 234). Castañeda and Reyes document the ways in which Spanish, Mexican, mestiza, and Indigenous women of the colonial era navigated their ways through the patriarchal family, the social and cultural constructions of femininity, public and private spaces, the church, and the state to assert their agency and to reposition themselves within their societies and to engender politics and power structures in what had been a predominantly male-centered culture and political system.

Like many of the Amerindian women “recruited by the colonial state to colonize Alta California” in the late 1700s (Castañeda 1997, 238), María Ygnacia López de Carrillo was solicited by Mariano Vallejo²⁵ to help him colonize northern California. Historian and conservationist Madie Brown Emparán documents this enlistment slightly different, as she notes in her extensive history of the Vallejo family that López de Carrillo petitioned Vallejo “for a grant of land in the pastoral valley of Santa Rosa” on January 19, 1838 (1968, 229). These differing historical accounts point to the scrutiny with which we must approach records of the past. In particular, these accounts must accurately reflect the subjectivities and agency, of lack thereof, of women of their time periods. What is most pertinent is López de Carrillo’s biography and the ways in which her story and her tenure as a property owner in northern California contribute to her history in the region and to her relationship with the Southern Pomo.

María Ygnacia López de Carrillo was born on January 31, 1793, at the San Diego Presidio. She married a soldier, Joaquin Victor Carrillo, in 1809 when she was only sixteen years old. Joaquin Carrillo was the descendent of a noble family in Old Spain and also fancied himself a musician. He first “came to California in about 1800, where his family settled in the Franciscan mission, San Diego de Alcalá,” (McGinty 1957, 127). During their approximately three decades of marriage, María Ygnacia birthed thirteen children; twelve of whom survived into adulthood. The family lived in the Presidio and in what is now known as Old Town San Diego. The home in which the family resided in San Diego was built between 1810 and 1820 by Captain Don Francisco Ruiz, Comandante of the Presidio, cousin to Joaquin, and godfather to three of the Carrillo children (California Mission Studies Assn. Newsletter, July 1993). Historian Glenn Burch further states, “In March 1835 Captain Ruiz made a gift of his orchard, which evidently adjoined the house [within which the Carrillo family resided]” (California Mission Studies Assn. Newsletter, July 1993). Joaquín had apparently been trying to sell the property; however, “the transfer document for the orchard fails to mention the house and specifically states that Carrillo is ‘...without being able on any pretext to sell, encumber, nor mortgage it; since it should...remain in trust in favor of [Ruiz’s] three godchildren’” (California Mission Studies Assn. Newsletter, July 1993). From Burch’s research, we gain a great sense of López de Carrillo’s character. Burch says in response to her husband’s action to sell the home and the orchard, “Doña María had appealed to the governor to protect the rights of her children” by writing a letter asking him to secure her children’s inheritance (California Mission Studies Assn. Newsletter, July 1993). As a result of her letter, the governor forbade the sale of the orchard (along with the sale of the house). We can only imagine the dilemma this may have posed within the household, and especially between husband and wife. Through

this act, López de Carrillo defied her husband's rule and instead, sought to protect her children's interests.²⁶ Further, her actions challenged "typical constructs of feminine strength" and we can see how, within her family space, "restructuring [the power dynamic] produced disjunctures and out of these fissures [a] new construction of feminine identity arose" (Sánchez 1995, 195).

To further demonstrate the fortitude of the Carrillo women, a legal document dated March 1851 and housed in the Vallejo Family Papers at the Bancroft Library, reveals that López de Carrillo's daughter, Benicia, granted the power of attorney for the San Diego property passed down by Captain Ruiz to her and two of her siblings, to her sister, Josefa (Carrillo) Fitch. Though sixteen years had passed and their mother had also passed on by then, the sisters maintained their mother's wish to keep the property in the family and specifically, under the management of the women in the family.²⁷ The record of López de Carrillo's presence in southern and then northern California provides important insight into the gendered terrain of settlement in California and, as Castañeda reminds us, of the ways women like her "assertively figured themselves as agents in the social world they inhabited" (1997, 251). This story reveals that López de Carrillo instilled in her daughters the insight that they, too, needed to assert their agency to maintain control over their inheritance.

López de Carrillo led by example as she was forced to navigate her own and her children's lives after her husband Joaquin died in San Diego in 1836. The widow, only 43 years old at the time, had three daughters who were married by then, but she still had in her home five unmarried sons and four unmarried daughters. The monetary support from the family's garden and the infamous Ruiz orchard in San Diego most likely did not provide enough income for the family to survive; it did, however, provide her with the skills she needed

to grow crops and to become a ranchera when she would move further north. I argue that López de Carrillo's motivations for moving north were not necessarily tied to her desire to maintain her family name and prestige as part of "The Carrillos of San Diego," who "left indelible imprints on the heritage of the Golden State" (McGinty 1975, 128). Her motivation was not tied to her membership in what would become a well-known political family in California (she was the aunt of soon-to-be California Governor Pío Pico and she did not rely on his assistance to help her and her family follow El Camino Real north from San Diego). She instead chose to move the family on her own to what would become Santa Rosa, California. As was common in many accounts about women in the nineteenth century, López de Carrillo's decision to move north could have stemmed from being part of a social group considered "gente de razón," literally translated as "people of reason," but which meant to imply elite status. In other words, women of her generation were often positioned as solely reinforcing a discriminating hierarchy. Those who have studied the Vallejo family history and López de Carrillo's history are at odds about whether she moved to northern California at the invitation of her son-in-law, General Mariano Vallejo, by then married to her daughter, Francisca Benicia, or if she came on her own desire. According to the authors of *Santa Rosa: A Nineteenth Century Town* (1985), Vallejo encouraged López de Carrillo to move north "to help him colonize the coastal valleys between the pueblo of Sonoma and the Russian outpost at Fort Ross" (2). The Mexican government tasked General Vallejo with secularizing the Sonoma Mission in 1835, to settle and to claim the land in its name, and to prevent Russian encroachment. The alternative narrative is that López de Carrillo petitioned Vallejo for a grant of land in Santa Rosa in January of 1838 and in September 1841, the acting governor, Don Manuel Jimeno, confirmed the grant.²⁸ Based on the historical record, the second account is more probable

and acknowledges the agency held by López de Carrillo, as will be discussed further below.

As an area on the coast that provided the prospect of success due to its fertile lands, the terrain surrounding Sonoma offered much opportunity for López de Carrillo and her children. With nine unmarried children still living with her, this move was in part a matter of survival for her; simply put, Mexican society was still dominated by male heads of households. As a result, in 1837, she and her family left San Diego and headed north. One of the most detailed accounts of López de Carrillo's move to northern California was developed by Gaye LeBaron, the well-known columnist for *The Press Democrat*, a newspaper published in Santa Rosa, California, and her co-authors, Dee Blackman, Joann Mitchell, and Harvey Hansen. In their account, they note López de Carrillo "Carr[ied] her family's possessions on a pack mule" and "she traveled 700 miles in an ox-drawn *carretta* [italics original] to build an adobe house and create a working rancho on the Indian frontier" (1985, 2). The rancho would come to be known as "La Cabeza de Santa Rosa." In her extensive study of the Vallejo family, Madie Brown Emparán notes that López de Carrillo selected the site on which the home would be built, along the Santa Rosa Creek. Construction of the home was completed by López de Carrillo's sons, her son-in-law, Salvador Vallejo, and Southern Pomo peoples.²⁹

Land records at the Bancroft Library at the University of California, Berkeley, provide additional information about López de Carrillo's life, and are both ironic and telling. The archive includes information about her land, her claim, and the attempt by Mariano Vallejo to erase her from the historical record. To begin, an 1853 deposition given by Salvador Vallejo to the office of the Board of Commissioners in California, offers a handful of clues about her life. In this set of records, the younger Vallejo testified on behalf of López de

Carrillo's son, Julio Carrillo, when he attempted to maintain ownership of his mother's land after her passing. As noted above and as I verified during my research at the Bancroft Library, the expediente submitted by López de Carrillo to the Comandante General de la Alta California confirms that she petitioned him for the land upon which the Carrillo Adobe was built in 1838 (Salvador Vallejo Deposition).³⁰ In his testimony, Vallejo states that he had known the rancho named Cabeza de Santa Rosa for "about seventeen years" and "Indians have lived upon it since [he had] known it" (Salvador Vallejo Deposition)³¹. The deposition underscores the fact that the land upon which López de Carrillo settled was Pomo land. We are left to imagine the complexity of the relationship between López de Carrillo and the Southern Pomo who, in addition to being dispossessed of their land, worked on the rancho once it was established.

In his July 4, 1876 "Historical Address" delivered at the Santa Rosa Centennial as part of the American centennial celebration, Mariano Vallejo states that when he arrived in the Santa Rosa Valley, he was "surrounded and hard pressed by hostile and valiant Indian tribes" (1876, 23). This claim serves to justify his colonization efforts, but what is also important about this "historical address" is the fact that Vallejo eliminates his mother-in-law completely from the historical record when he notes:

Between 1835 and 1840 the following persons, all having families, established themselves in this [Santa Rosa] valley

Mariano G. Vallejo	Juan Miranda
Salvador Vallejo	Gregoria (sic) Briones
Julio Carrillo	Joaquin Carrillo
Rafael Garcia	Ramon Carrillo

Cayetano Juarez	Domingo Sueno
Fernando Felix	Pablo Pacheco
Ignacio Pacheco	Bartolo Bohorques
Nazario Borreyera	Francisco Duarte
Manuel Vaca	Juan Padilla
Felipe Peña	Marcos Juarez
Lazaro Peña	and
Francisco Borreyera	Rosalino Olivera (1876, 23–24)

Though he names her sons, Julio, Joaquin, and Ramón, he does not acknowledge the fact that María Ygnacia López de Carrillo was the legal owner of the property, which was well documented by the deposition given by his brother in the land records now held in the Sonoma County Clerk's Office,³² and by the adobe home that she had built for her family. Though the adobe structure commissioned by López de Carrillo still exists today, her presence in the historical record remains hidden.

Select information about López de Carrillo is peppered in the archival documents; however, the lack of information on her is reminiscent of the points made by the historian Camilla Townsend in *Malintzín's Choices* (2006). Townsend explains how in conceptualizing the life and choices made by Malintzín, or Malinche, the Nahuatl interpreter, lover, and guide to Spanish explorer Hernán Cortes, no evidence exists to determine with certainty the thoughts and feelings Malinche must have experienced during her initial meeting and encounters with the Spanish. The position within which Townsend and other historians like her find themselves is a dangerous one because the consequence is the possibility of misrepresentation within historical accounts. In her research, Townsend was forced to rely on ethnographic evidence about the Nahuatl and the Spanish, which as Linda

Heidenreich reminds us, is a limitation faced by historians. In writing this essay, I was confronted with this issue, as I was forced to use the historical details included in accounts by European explorers and traders, the Vallejo brothers, and other contemporary historians and scholars to better understand the “founding” of Santa Rosa and the character of López de Carrillo. I also used these accounts to reveal details about López de Carrillo’s relationship with the Southern Pomo, whom she presumably knew well because of their extensive work for her and their residence at Rancho Cabeza de Santa Rosa. Piecing together this story of gender and dispossession has been challenging and serves as a reminder that “the erasure of subaltern histories, then, is not incidental but a fundamental part of colonizing processes” (Heidenreich 2007, 16). Documenting López de Carrillo’s history in the region contributes to our understanding of settler colonialism *and* a gendered terrain in northern California in the early to mid-nineteenth century—two types of colonial history that, over time, have rendered subjugated peoples invisible.

López de Carrillo’s biography not only better informs our understanding of settler colonialism, but also provides an example of the ways in which women of her generation challenged the politics of gender in their societies, which leads contemporary scholars like me to think more critically about the ways in which we assign signification to gender discourses, as Rosaura Sánchez calls for in her work on the Californio testimonios of the 1800s (1995, 188–191). Similarly, in their study of early California through the eyes of women in the period 1815–1848, Rose Marie Beebe and Robert M. Senkewicz (2006) use testimonios provided by Californianas to Hubert Howe Bancroft and his assistants as Bancroft pieced together his extensive *History of California* project. As Beebe and Senkewicz and Genaro Padilla (1993) have noted, only a select group of Californianas’ testimonios were included in the project. It is evident that Bancroft devalued their voices since, as Padilla

points out, Bancroft's chapter, "'Woman and her Sphere' relies almost entirely on documentary evidence (judicial and state papers) written by men" (1993, 112). The testimonios provided by Californianas in this period that have been examined by Sánchez, Beebe, Senkewicz, and Padilla are integral for better understanding colonial and California history from a gendered perspective. Unfortunately, López de Carrillo did not leave a testimonio from which we can draw conclusions about her life. In the absence of her testimonio, I was faced with the very conundrum Padilla explained above as I was forced to turn back to the 1853 deposition of her son-in-law, Salvador Vallejo, who provided much insight into her character. Unlike his brother, in the historical record he indicates that *she* and her sons built a large adobe house on the land known as Rancho Cabeza de Santa Rosa. Salvador married López de Carrillo's third daughter, María de la Luz Carrillo (Luz), after meeting her when his brother Mariano asked him to escort Francisca Benicia, Mariano's new wife, from San Diego to Sonoma. When the Carrillo family moved to Santa Rosa in 1837, the younger Vallejo encountered Luz again when he came from Sonoma to help Luz's brothers build their mother's home, in which the family would live (McGinty 1957, 140).

According to Vallejo's deposition, "She [López de Carrillo] cultivated from two to three hundred acres of land on the place, had vineyards, fruit trees, and a stock of cattle and horses on it" (Salvador Vallejo Deposition). Though we are left to wonder whether the levels of production were sufficient to generate enough capital for a lucrative business in an area ripe with potential, the spirit of *comunidad* yielded by López de Carrillo proved to be more valuable to her, her family, and the Southern Pomo who worked at the rancho. Heidenreich's research on Californiana María Higuera Juárez, who was married to an army officer who worked under Mariano Vallejo and whose story is similar to López de Carrillo's, is useful here to make clear the relationship between the

Indigenous peoples of the region and those who were settler colonizers. Juárez, whose family settled in southern Napa because of Vallejo's intervention on their behalf, built their rancho on land that belonged to the Wappo- and Patwin-speaking peoples. Once the family disrupted their ways of life, the Indigenous peoples worked for the family, thus the relationship was not only "complex," but it was also "exploitative" (Heidenreich 2007, 100). Rosaura Sánchez echoes this point when she describes how ranchos worked as spaces through which caste systems were based on the "patriarchal model" of elite wealthy hacendados (1995, 190). Similar to Juárez, López de Carrillo thus resided within this complex space when she and her family established her rancho on Indigenous land and she employed Southern Pomo to assist her in maintaining that land. Salvador Vallejo's deposition indicates that she grew a number of different crops and held cattle there. In part, this record reveals her integrity, strength, and work ethic. As a widowed woman, we can imagine that López de Carrillo labored on her land to provide for her children a space within which they could grow, develop an attachment to the land, and to understand the importance of the sustenance it offered them.

The points made by Salvador Vallejo in his deposition were also echoed by William Heath Davis, a merchant and trader from Boston who is credited as being one of the founders of "New Town" in San Diego, and who frequently visited the Carrillo rancho. He said, "Doña María Ygnacia was ambitious, and cultivated large fields of wheat, barley, oats, corn, beans, peas, lantejas, and vegetables of every variety" (2015, 25). In many ways, the way in which Davis characterizes López de Carrillo emphasizes, as Rosaura Sánchez notes, the ways "foreigners are attracted to California women and identify with them because they are seen to be industrious and pragmatic, 'masculine' like themselves" (1995, 198). But I want to think beyond the way this gender discourse reinforces a male gaze and instead suggest that Davis' (2015) narrative about the crops she planted

demonstrate López de Carrillo's understanding of the land on which she settled. Madie Brown Emparán notes, "Senora (sic) Carrillo was active for a decade, riding her range and personally supervising the ranch" (1968, 229). Her active presence on the rancho challenges the socially constructed roles for women in this period and instead positions her in a social space that "defies the exact boundaries between male and female spheres" (Reyes 2009, 7).

The Vallejo deposition and the Davis travelogue provide some details about what may have consumed her daily routine and what she was like in character; yet we still have very little historical evidence to understand fully the life of López de Carrillo. Her story is yet another example of the ways in which women's histories have been elided or relegated to the margins of historical accounts. Although López de Carrillo is known by some historians and her relatives as the "Mother of Santa Rosa," there is a particular irony about the (lack of) preservation of her history in northern California. The absence of archival material on her is similar to the narratives that are reiterated by numerous Chicana historians and scholars across disciplines who continue to piece together our long history in the Greater Southwest, such as Linda Heidenreich, who reminds us that we "need to look for sources where there appear to be none" (2011, 3) and Bárbara Reyes, who argues that case studies are "rich sources for reconstructing dailiness in the nineteenth century" because they "provide us a grounded, nuanced, and an intimate window onto larger processes" (2009, 13). For many women of López de Carrillo's generation, their stories are told only as clues buried within others' narratives and, specifically, males' stories. For Indigenous peoples, their stories were not told at all, except through a dominant lens that positioned them as inferior. Only as revisionist histories have surfaced over the years have we learned more detailed information about those whose lives have been omitted and hidden away in the margins and footnotes, historical documents, and narratives.

One such narrative to which I was forced to turn to learn more about López de Carrillo was a memoir penned by Victor Janssens (Don Agustín Janssens), a member of the Padrés expedition of colonists in California who notes that he visited the Carrillo home (then still in San Diego), where he met “Doña María Ignacia, wife of Señor Carrillo, [who] treated us in such a kind manner that we could almost look on her as a mother” (1953, 20).³³ He goes on to describe how López de Carrillo and a young widow whom she and her husband had taken in treated him and his men with such respect, “It is impossible to find words of gratitude to describe the generous conduct of these ladies of Señor Carrillo. To have offered them money would have seemed an offense to them” (1953, 21). Janssens’ account of López de Carrillo reinforces the male gaze and a gendered discourse about women that positions her as a “nurturing woman” whose function within his story is one within the “domestic economy” and as a “subordinate subject” (Sánchez 1995, 190). However, we know based on the archival documents noted here that she also challenged “patriarchal norms and acted outside the cultural constructions of femininity” expected of women at this time (Castañeda 1997, 245).

Alma McDaniel Carrillo and Eleanora Carrillo de Haney, great-granddaughters of López de Carrillo, make clear that their great-grandmother was *the* most significant figure in establishing what became Santa Rosa, California, which challenges the ways the Vallejo men have solely been given credit for the settlement and colonization of northern California and the way Vallejo made clear in his “Historical Address” that this was a story *from* and *about* men. Rather than focusing their Carrillo family history on the males, McDaniel Carrillo and Carrillo de Haney attempt to “put that (en)gendered subordination into question” (Sánchez 1995, 190) when they suggest that “the Señora [Carrillo] helped survey her grant and rode behind to toss weeds, rocks, flowers and soil into the air. She

happily felt the possession of this fertile valley and mountains was a beautiful new life for her family and herself. She was the real ‘Mother of Santa Rosa’” (1983, 18). In the way that it is told, this rendering of López de Carrillo as a proud landowner who enthusiastically tailed the surveyors sprinkling “weeds, rocks, flowers, and soil into the air” generates a nostalgic image of her that detracts from her position of authority on the rancho *and* it ignores the peoples indigenous to the land prior to López de Carrillo’s arrival. I would instead suggest that rather than depoliticizing her role and what it meant—that she was the “Mother of Santa Rosa”—we recognize the determination it took her as she traversed hundreds of miles to raise her family and help settle and colonize the area near Sonoma *and* acknowledge that her family benefitted from the displacement of the Southern Pomo. Acknowledging these two important sides of the story calls attention to the multiple levels of dispossession and the settler colonialism that occurred in northern California in the early to mid-nineteenth century.

In many ways, the archival documents and stories about López de Carrillo suggest two competing stories: one that romanticizes her experiences and character, and the other that demonstrates her strength. As in so many histories of women at this time, we are almost left with no trace of her life in her own words. Because of this absence, people like author Mary Cooney have imagined what her life was like. Cooney penned a biographical novel about López de Carrillo in 2011 in which she blends fact with fiction as she imagines the daily experiences of López de Carrillo from birth until death. As a young child, Cooney says, “Maria Ygnacia would grow up with the missions that were beginning to connect the great territory of Alta California” and “the youngest of many children, she [María] and her siblings probably played with the Indian children and learned to speak their language” (9). Cooney’s imagining of López de Carrillo conversing with the local Indigenous children

is reminiscent of other accounts about her life that suggest she learned the language of the Southern Pomo when she settled in Santa Rosa.³⁴

A woman of great character and conviction, López de Carrillo made her place and her name there, taking charge of her family's well-being and establishing herself as the head ranchera at Cabeza de Santa Rosa. In his account about his travels to California, William Heath Davis (2015) noted,

Doña María Ygnacia had several hundred gentile Indians living on her rancho not very far from the family residence. I asked the good Señora once if she was not afraid for the safety of her family, with so many unchristianized Indians among her household. She said that she had the perfect confidence in her raw help because she treated them so well, giving them abundant food, beef, *frijol* and corn. She also learned their dialect and managed them with a uniform system in their labor and otherwise. (25)

For Davis, López de Carrillo's treatment of and respect for her Pomo workers challenged his own beliefs, and, most likely, the beliefs of others around her who saw them as inferior. As noted earlier, her sons-in-law, the Vallejo brothers, were known for their brutal treatment of the Indigenous peoples they encountered while colonizing northern California. We get a different picture of Californians and their treatment of the Indigenous peoples with whom they came in contact. Many scholars, for instance, have noted how Rosalía Vallejo de Leese (Mariano and Salvador's sister) prevented what would have presumably been the rape of her seventeen-year-old Indigenous servant by Captain John C. Frémont during the time of the Bear Flag Revolt, when he requested Vallejo de Leese send her to him.³⁵ Similarly, Heidenreich writes of María Higuera Juárez's relationship with her Indigenous servants, whom

“she worked alongside” cooking, cleaning, and gathering herbs; her children also played alongside Ulacas (2007, 98–100). Though we cannot ignore the fact that there existed still uneven social and political positions within these relationships between Californianas and the Indigenous peoples who worked for them, these brief, yet telling histories about López de Carrillo, like Vallejo de Leese and Juárez, suggest that she did not share the same sentiments as her sons-in-law and other settler-colonizer men about those who helped keep her rancho going.

Davis’ (2015) statement also emphasizes that López de Carrillo regarded the Southern Pomo as deserving of her respect. Perhaps, she saw herself as someone who could relate to their position of subjugation, a point hinted at in Cooney’s fictional text when she imagines the challenges López de Carrillo faced when running her rancho on her own. In one scene in the novel where fall brings the smell of harvest time, López de Carrillo says, “Thank you anyway, dear son-in-law [Mariano Vallejo], but I think I would prefer to do it myself [run the rancho]” (2011, 83). Unconvinced, Vallejo begs his mother-in-law to let him or his brother help. Cooney continues, “Doña Maria looked at her son-in-law with some bitterness. This conversation was getting very old. They had been having it for six months. He seemed to think she was incapable of thinking, planning, supervising, and taking care of herself! As if she hadn’t been doing it for years! Silly man” (2011, 83). In this scene and in others following it, Cooney reminds her reader that López de Carrillo was fully capable of establishing and running her rancho on her own. The scene is also a reminder of the reality of her place within nineteenth-century California—a position Mariano Vallejo disregards completely in the historical record.

A single document in the Fitch Family Papers at the Bancroft Library finally renders López de Carrillo clearly visible in the archive: a letter from her

to her son-in-law, Henry Delano Fitch, who was married to her daughter Josefa and is considered the earliest settler in San Diego. The letter dated October 2, 1839, praises Fitch for watching over her rancho in her absence. She tells him, “Muy soñ y de mi aprecio por diferentes conductos hé recibido varias cartas en la q. me comunica el estado de mi casa huerta y su familia: agradeciendo mucho lo presente q. me tiene en la memoria.” (I am very appreciative of the various cards I’ve received in which you communicated to me the economic and social well-being/state of my house and orchard and the family; I appreciate being thought of, or considered). Though she provides no indication of where she is, she writes to Fitch, who is in Sonoma, though because he traveled frequently for his many positions, it is unclear where in Sonoma (County) he was at the time. In the latter part of the letter she tells Fitch, “Igualmente me hara (sic) U. el favor de decirle a Timotea q. ya no me pague nada y U. rompa el poder q. le dejé” (Likewise do me the favor of telling Timotea that he/she will no longer pay me anything and you will forgive the debt owed). This letter could be read solely as a thank you to her son-in-law and as evidence of the sentiments López de Carrillo has for her family; she asks Fitch to give her regards to the family, and especially her daughters Josefa and Benicia, the Fitch children, and her son-in-law, Mariano Vallejo. More importantly, however, this letter reveals her status in 1839—she owns property replete with orchards and olive trees, among other things, and she is a businesswoman, demonstrated when she indicates to Fitch that she wants to erase the debt of someone who owes her money. We can assume that she has traveled away from Rancho Cabeza de Santa Rosa and has entrusted Fitch to oversee her rancho, or at least to communicate to her the condition and workings of the ranch in her absence. I read this letter from López de Carrillo as a discourse of gender that reveals an “oppositional feminist” position, where she at once claims her role as the matriarch of the

family, yet she challenges traditional conceptions of women as docile and tied only to the domestic sphere (Sánchez 1995, 190).

Though we still know little about her, we get a glimpse of the sentiments she feels for her family and we can better understand the independence, work ethic, and business sense she possessed. These characteristics are echoed more than once in accounts written about her. LeBaron et. al., note, “Doña María designed the family home herself...” and “...ruled as matriarch of the valley in this Mexican period in Santa Rosa’s history” (1985, 4). Davis also confirms these facts in his account when he says, “Rancho Santa Rosa, owned by Doña María Ygnacia López de Carrillo, [had] about three thousand head of cattle and twelve to fifteen hundred horses and some sheep” (2015, 32). Salvador Vallejo’s deposition, noted earlier, also confirms the vastness of the ranch and her holdings. Though this may have been surprising to Mariano Vallejo, López de Carrillo’s story reveals as Sánchez has noted in her studies of Californianas, that she exerted “feminine agency,” one that complicates the idea of the “domestic economy” in that it repositions women outside of the traditional domestic sphere (1995, 193). López de Carrillo attempted to make life for herself and her children a good one when she moved the family to northern California. Though she was drawn to the region as part of a family of settler-colonizers, the historical record reveals that she maintained a relationship with the Southern Pomo that acknowledged their labor on what became her land. Her participation in settler colonialism also renders visible the complexity of navigating a gendered identity in the early to mid-nineteenth century that requires further attention by historians and gender studies scholars.

Restructuring Our Present

My quest to locate material on López de Carrillo and the Pomo is evidence of the erasure in our national history of women and Indigenous peoples.

Many of the stories told about her provide only minute details about her role as “The Mother of Santa Rosa.” Though her position within California history is known, it is recognized mainly by those who study northern California history or to those who know of Mariano Vallejo. One of the only markers of her presence in Santa Rosa is the Carrillo Adobe, López de Carrillo’s former home and the first residence built in Santa Rosa. When López de Carrillo and then her children passed away or sold their shares of the property, the residence and land were purchased by the Catholic Church and the home’s future has been in an indeterminate state since. Over the years, various efforts have been made to preserve the adobe home as a state landmark; however, those efforts have proved somewhat fruitless, as the adobe sits amidst overgrown weeds and is surrounded by a chain link fence that keeps the home hidden from public view, much like the memory of its original inhabitant and those of the Southern Pomo who labored in and around the residence.

We know even less about the Southern Pomo who were displaced because of Spanish colonization, including the appropriation of their land by López de Carrillo and her family. The Pomo population, estimated to have been around 15,000 at the time of European contact in the early nineteenth century experienced “the onslaught of epidemic disease and the genocidal policies brought by the continuing influx of settlers into the Pomo homelands” (Patterson 1998, 11). Though they have been subjected to the harshest and most haphazard series of federal policies, the Pomo have worked for their cultural survival. Greg Sarris states that for his people, one of the greatest losses “is a profound connection to place . . . History offers no exception to that rule” (2006, 17). The Pomo’s history emphasizes the fact that the United States must “come to terms with its past” as a “means of survival and liberation” for those impacted by this brutal colonial history (Dunbar-Ortiz 2014, 235).

The experiences of López de Carrillo and the Pomo peoples are by no means the same; however, their stories underscore the long history of subordination, genocide, settler colonialism, and gender inequality that has contributed to our understanding of the past and the impacts of those histories on our identities in the present. In order to heal from the legacy of colonialism, we must continue our work to reclaim and make known our histories as mujeres, as Chicana and Indigenous peoples, and as people who matter in the national narrative.

References

- Bancroft, Hubert Howe. 1884–1889. *History of California*. 7 vols. San Francisco: The History Company.
- Bean, Lowell John, and Dorothea Theodoratus. 1978. “Western Pomo and Northeastern Pomo.” In *The Handbook of North American Indians, Volume 8: California*, edited by Robert F. Heizer, 289–305. Washington: Smithsonian Institution.
- Beebe, Rose Marie, and Robert Senkewicz. 2006. *Testimonios: Early California through the Eyes of Women, 1815–1848*. Berkeley: Heyday Books.
- Brown-Coronel, Margie. 2011. “Beyond the Rancho: Four Generations of del Valle Women in southern California, 1830–1940.” PhD diss., University of California, Irvine.
- Byrd, Jodi. 2011. *The Transit of Empire: Indigenous Critiques of Colonialism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Burch, Glenn. 1993. “Doña María of Two Adobes.” *California Mission Studies Association Newsletter* (July issue).
- Carrillo, Alma McDaniel, and Eleanora Carrillo de Haney. 1983. *The Carrillo Family in Sonoma County: History and Memories*. Privately printed.
- Casas, María Raquel. 2006. “Rosalía Vallejo.” In *Latinas in the United States: A Historical Encyclopedia*, edited by Vicki L. Ruíz and Virginia Sánchez Korrol, 785. Indianapolis: University of Indiana Press.
- Castañeda, Antonia. 1997. “Engendering the History of Alta California, 1769–1848: Gender, Sexuality, and the Family.” *California History* 76 (2/3): 230–59.
- Castillo, Edward D. 1978. “The Impact of Euro-American Exploration and Settlement.” In *The Handbook of North American Indians, Volume 8: California*, edited by Robert F. Heizer, 99–127. Washington: Smithsonian Institution.
- Chávez-García, Miroslava. 2006. *Negotiating Conquest: Gender and Power in California, 1770s to 1880s*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

- Cooney, Mary. 2011. *Maria Carrillo, Daughter of California*. Fairfield: James Stevenson Publisher.
- Court of Private Land Claims. "Land Case 124 ND: Documents Pertaining to Land Adjudication Proceedings, Rancho Cabeza de Santa Rosa." Bancroft Library: University of California, Berkeley.
- Dana Jr., Richard Henry. 1840. *Two Years Before the Mast*, quoted in Genaro M. Padilla, *My History, Not Yours: The Formation of Mexican American Autobiography*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1993, 54.
- Davis, William Heath. 2015. *Seventy-Five Years in California: A History of Events and 19th Century Life*. Washington: Westphalia Press.
- Dunbar-Ortiz, Roxanne. 2014. *An Indigenous Peoples' History of the United States*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Empanan, Madie Brown. 1968. *The Vallejos of California*. San Francisco: University of San Francisco.
- Fitch Family Papers. BANC MSS C-B 357 (film). The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.
- Heidenreich, Linda. 2011. "I Do Not Like the White Man... He is a Liar and a Thief": Testimonios and the Politics of Resistance." In *California Women and Politics: From the Gold Rush to the Great Depression*, edited by Robert W. Cherny, Mary Ann Irwin, and Ann Marie Wilson, 1–26. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- . 2007. *This Land Was Mexican Once: Histories of Resistance from Northern California*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Heidenreich, Linda, and Antonia Castañeda, eds. 2014. *Three Decades of Engendering History: Selected Works of Antonia I. Castañeda*. Denton: University of North Texas Press.
- Heizer, Robert F., ed. 1978. *The Handbook of North American Indians, Volume 8: California*. Washington: Smithsonian Institution.
- Janssens, Don Agustín. 1953. In *The Life and Adventures in California of Don Agustín Janssens, 1834–1856*, edited by William H. Ellison and Francis Price. San Marino: The Huntington Library.
- Johnson, Patti J. 1978. "Patwin." In *The Handbook of North American Indians, Volume 8: California*, edited by Robert F. Heizer, 350–60. Washington: Smithsonian Institution.
- LeBaron, Gaye, Dee Blackman, Joann Mitchell, and Harvey Hansen. 1985. *Santa Rosa: A Nineteenth Century Town*. Santa Rosa: Historia, LTD.
- McGinty, Brian. 1957. "The Carrillos of San Diego: A Historic Spanish Family of California." *The Historical Society of Southern California Quarterly*, 39 (2): 127–48.
- McLendon, Sally, and Robert L. Oswalt. 1978. "Pomo: Introduction." In *The Handbook of North American Indians, Volume 8: California*, edited by Robert F. Heizer, 274–88. Washington: Smithsonian Institution.

- McLendon, Sally, and Michael J. Lowy. 1978. "Eastern Pomo and Southeastern Pomo." In *The Handbook of North American Indians, Volume 8: California*, edited by Robert F. Heizer, 306–23. Washington: Smithsonian Institution.
- Morgan, Heidi F. 2001. "Sources of Empowerment for Native American Women: Pomo Women's Critical Reflections." PhD diss., University of San Francisco.
- Padilla, Genaro M. 1993. *My History, Not Yours: The Formation of Mexican American Autobiography*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Patterson, Victoria. 1998. "Change and Continuity: Transformations of Pomo Life." *Expedition* 40 (1): 3–14.
- Reyes, Bárbara O. 2009. *Private Women, Public Lives: Gender and the Missions of the Californias*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Sánchez, Rosaura. 1995. *Telling Identities: The Californio testimonios*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Sánchez, Rosaura, and Beatrice Pita, eds. 2001. *Conflicts of Interest: The Letters of María Amparo Ruiz de Burton*. Houston: Arte Público Press.
- Sarris, Greg. 2010. "Untitled" (lecture, Pomo Honoring Month [Pomo Heritage Week]. Sebastopol Youth Annex, October 2010). *Pomo Honor*, "Sources." Accessed May 1, 2018. <http://www.pomo-honor.org/Sources.html>.
- . 2006. "Culture and Memory: What Has Been Lost? What Can Be Recovered?" *News from Native California* 19 (3): 16–20.
- . 1993. *Keeping Slug Woman Alive: A Holistic Approach to American Indian Texts*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Smith, Chris. 2012. "History Trashed at Carrillo Adobe." *The Press Democrat*, February 9. Accessed January 9, 2018. <http://www.pressdemocrat.com/news/2305651-181/history-trashed-at-carrillo-adobe?gallery=2352900&artslide=0&csba=AAS>.
- Sonoma County Land Records. "Index to Deeds, Grantees, Vol. 1, 1835–1861, Sonoma County." Sonoma County Clerk-Recorder, Santa Rosa, CA.
- Sturtevant, William C., ed. 1978. *Handbook of North American Indians*. Washington: Smithsonian Institution.
- Townsend, Camilla. 2006. *Malintzin's Choices: An Indian Woman in the Conquest of Mexico*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- Vallejo Family Papers, BANC MSS C-B 441. The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.
- Vallejo Family Papers: Additions, BANC MSS 76/79 c. The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.

- Vallejo, Salvador. Deposition. Documents Pertaining to the Adjudication of Private Land Claims in California, circa 1852–1892, BANC MSS Land Case Files 1852–1892; BANC MSS C-A 300 FILM. The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley
- Young, Lucy. 1993. “The Coming of the Whites.” In *The Way We Lived*, edited by Malcolm Margolin, 158–159. Berkeley: Heyday Books.
- Wolfe, Patrick. 2006. “Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native.” *Journal of Genocide Research*, 8 (4): 387–409.

Notes

¹ This essay developed from a paper I delivered at the 2017 Mujeres Activas en Letras y Cambio Social (MALCS) Summer Institute, “Hidden Sonoma: Laboring Bodies and Silenced Voices.” I am especially grateful to MALCS members who attended the panel and for the invaluable feedback I received from the anonymous reviewers of this essay.

² In their privately printed family history *The Carrillo Family in Sonoma County: History and Memories* (1983), López de Carrillo’s great-granddaughters, Alma McDaniel Carrillo and Eleanor Carrillo de Haney, identify their great-grandmother as the “Mother of Santa Rosa” as they describe how, as one of the first women to settle and claim land on her own in the Santa Rosa region, López de Carrillo participated in surveying her land grant. They go on to describe how their great-grandmother felt a strong connection to her land where she would raise her family and they thus lovingly give her the name, the “Mother of Santa Rosa” (1983, 18). Later accounts written by journalist Gaye LeBaron and California historians, Dee Blackman, Joann Mitchell, and Harvey Hansen (see *Santa Rosa: A Nineteenth Century Town* [1985], also acknowledge López de Carrillo as having “ruled as the matriarch of her valley in this [nineteenth century] Mexican period of Santa Rosa’s history” [4]).

³ Chicana historians Antonia Castañeda, Barbara O. Reyes, Linda Heidenreich, Miroslava Chávez-García, Deena J. González, and Margie Brown-Coronel, among others, have addressed the intersection of gender, history, and sexuality in their work on California history.

⁴ Wolfe (2006) states, “treaties between Indian and European nations [that] were premised on a sovereignty that reflected Indians’ capacity to permute local alliance networks among the rival Spanish, British, French, Dutch, Swedish and Russian presences” (391).

⁵ Bean and Theodoratus (1978) indicate that “Sir Francis Drake briefly visited the Pomo’s southern neighbors, the Coast Miwok” around 1579 (299). See also Barrett 1908, 28.

⁶ See Young, 1993, 159, for the poem in its entirety.

⁷ See Heidenreich, 2007, 35.

⁸ See Young, 1993, 299.

⁹ See Sarris, 2010.

¹⁰ Ibid., n.p.

¹¹ McLendon and Oswalt 1978, 279.

¹² Patterson 1998, 7, notes that Fort Ross was founded in 1811.

¹³ Bean and Theodoratus (1978) state, "In accordance with their policy of nonintervention and cooperation with the natives, the Russians contracted with the Pomo for use of an area about one by two miles in extent. An agricultural colony was established at Fort Ross, and over 100 local Pomoans were employed as agricultural laborers" (299).

¹⁴ See Morgan, 2001, 13-14.

¹⁵ For additional information see Bancroft, *History of California*, all volumes, and Genaro M. Padilla (1993).

¹⁶ For a full transcript of Sarris' speech, see <http://www.pomo-honor.org/Greg%20Sarris%202010%20Talk.html> and <http://greg-sarris.com/creative-work/articles-speeches/greg-sarris-speech-pomo-heritage-week/>.

¹⁷ For additional information, see Castillo 1978, 106.

¹⁸ Heidenreich (2011) notes that around 1870, "the United States Army slaughtered more than five hundred Pomo men, women, and children" (5), which confirms that violence against the Pomo continued for decades after the Vallejos' encounters with them.

¹⁹ See Castañeda (1997), "Engendering the History of Alta California, 1769–1848," for more information on sex and gender relations in colonial California; and *Three Decades of Engendering History: Selected Works of Antonia I. Castañeda* (2014), edited by Linda Heidenreich and Antonia Castañeda, for more information about the lifework of Castañeda through which she emphasizes the importance of gender and specifically, Chicanas, as important historical characters.

²⁰ See Heidenreich (2007) "*This Land was Mexican Once*": *Histories of Resistance from Northern California*, for more information about the ways Indigenous peoples and women of the Napa Valley challenged what we know as northern California history and Western modes of telling history; and "'I Do Not Like the White Man...He is a Liar and a Thief': Testimonios and the Politics of Resistance" (2011), for more information about how Californiana and Indigenous women understood historical events in the nineteenth century.

²¹ See Reyes (2009), *Private Women, Public Lives; Gender and the Missions of the Californias*, for more information about how Indigenous peoples and Mexicanas were impacted by the mission systems and colonization efforts in Alta and Baja, California.

²² See Chávez-García (2006), *Negotiating Conquest: Gender and Power in California, 1770s to 1880s*, for more information about the ways in which Mexicanas and Indigenous women challenged colonial, patriarchal and cultural control and practices.

²³ See Brown-Coronel (2011), "Beyond the Ranch: Four Generations of del Valle Women in southern California, 1830–1940" for more information on the ways Californianas throughout the

nineteenth and twentieth centuries served as central figures in the “social and cultural terrain of southern California” (3).

²⁴ See Castañeda (1997), “Engendering the History of Alta California, 1769–1848,” 230.

²⁵ LeBaron et. al. (1985), state, “Doña María Carrillo [...] was one of several members of the Vallejo and Carrillo families charged with the task of establishing ranchos on the fertile land near the Russian farms to further discourage further encroachment by the Czar’s representatives in North America” (2).

²⁶ In her chapter on María Higuera Juárez, Linda Heidenreich (2007) similarly reveals how women of Juárez’s and López de Carrillo’s generations “knew how to defend [themselves], [their] children, and the family property” (93).

²⁷ For more information, see Vallejo family papers, BANC MSS C-B 441, Box 7, Folder 7:1, The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.

²⁸ See Madie Brown Empanan (1968), *The Vallejos of California*, 229.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 229.

³⁰ For more information, see Salvador Vallejo deposition, 124, ND page 6, 15.28.40.

³¹ For more information, see Salvador Vallejo deposition, 124, ND page 6, 15.18.42.

³² For more information, see “Index to Deeds, Grantees, Vol. 1, 1835–1861, Sonoma County.”

³³ Janssens provided a detailed account of his adventures and experiences that spans from 1834 to the years after the signing of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo (1848) to Thomas Savage, assistant to historian Hubert Howe Bancroft in 1878. The manuscript was translated and edited by William H. Ellison and Francis Price and published by the Huntington Library in 1953.

³⁴ In her research on María Higuera Juárez, Heidenreich similarly notes, “The Juárez children grew up speaking Spanish and Uluca,” and the “Patwin-speaking children, at this time, were multilingual” (2007, 100).

³⁵ For more information, see María Raquel Casas (2006) “Rosalia Vallejo,” in *Latinas in the United States: A Historical Encyclopedia*, (785); Heidenreich (2007) *This Land Was Mexican Once*, (88); Padilla, *My History, Not Yours* (1993), (148).