



Title	Reclamation Road: A Microhistory of Massacre Memory in Clear Lake, California
Authors(s)	Garsha, Jeremiah
Publication date	2015-10
Publication information	Garsha, Jeremiah. "Reclamation Road: A Microhistory of Massacre Memory in Clear Lake, California." International Association of Genocide Scholars, October 2015. https://doi.org/10.5038/1911-9933.9.2.1292 .
Publisher	International Association of Genocide Scholars
Item record/more information	http://hdl.handle.net/10197/27890
Publisher's version (DOI)	10.5038/1911-9933.9.2.1292

Downloaded 2026-05-02 03:02:41

The UCD community has made this article openly available. Please share how this access benefits you. Your story matters! (@ucd_oa)



© Some rights reserved. For more information

10-2015

'Reclamation Road': A Microhistory of Massacre Memory in Clear Lake, California

Jeremiah J. Garsha
University of Cambridge

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarcommons.usf.edu/gsp>

Recommended Citation

Garsha, Jeremiah J. (2015) "'Reclamation Road': A Microhistory of Massacre Memory in Clear Lake, California," *Genocide Studies and Prevention: An International Journal*: Vol. 9: Iss. 2: 61-75.

DOI:

<http://dx.doi.org/10.5038/1911-9933.9.2.1292>

Available at: <https://scholarcommons.usf.edu/gsp/vol9/iss2/8>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Open Access Journals at Scholar Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in *Genocide Studies and Prevention: An International Journal* by an authorized editor of Scholar Commons. For more information, please contact scholarcommons@usf.edu.

'Reclamation Road': A Microhistory of Massacre Memory in Clear Lake, California

Acknowledgements

The author is grateful to the two anonymous reviewers who strengthened this paper with their careful reading and accurate critiques, to Benjamin Madley who offered valuable feedback on an earlier draft of this paper, and to Jamie Lynnae for her nuanced edits and suggestions.

'Reclamation Road': A Microhistory of Massacre Memory in Clear Lake, California

Jeremiah J. Garsha

University of Cambridge
Cambridge, United Kingdom

Abstract: This article is a microhistory of not only the massacre of the indigenous Pomo people in Clear Lake, California, but also the memorialization of this event. It is an examination of two plaques marking the site of the Bloody Island massacre, exploring how memorial representations produce and silence historical memory of genocide under emerging and shifting historical narratives. A 1942 plaque is contextualized to show the co-option of the Pomo and massacre memory by an Anglo-American organization dedicated to settler memory. A 2005 plaque is read as a decentering of this narrative, guiding the viewer through a new hierarchy of memory and events. Overall this article unpacks the strategies of preservation, transformation, and reconciliation of genocide as it relates to the construction and shifts in emerging historical narratives, underscoring the interplay of physical locations in the construction of remembering and forgetting atrocious history.

Keywords: Pomo, Bloody Island, California, genocide, massacre, American Indian, Native Sons of the Golden West, Clear Lake, violence, memory, memorials, settler colonialism, history

Introduction

As you drive south down Highway 20 in Lake County, California, USA, you will pass Pomo Pumps filling station, replete with a Drive-Thru Smoke Shop. On your left will be the glittering lights of the Robinson Rancheria Casino, a ubiquitous indicator that you are now on reservation land, despite the dearth of other markers. A distracted driver would easily miss the turnoff to Reclamation Road, where a 1942 plaque attached to a small rock sits next to a cluster of mailboxes and residential driveways. It is nearly impossible, however, to not notice the signs for California Landmark 427, a memorial erected in 2005 commemorating the Bloody Island massacre. There is even a paved turnout area and included placards about the local wildlife. Yet, even from this vantage point, only the most astute observer would be able to locate *Bo-no-po-ti* (literally Old Island), the physical site of the 15 May 1850 massacre of the Pomo people. Here the United States Calvary murdered an estimated 75-150 Pomo people, the majority of whom were women and children. Operating under the erroneous belief that these victims had murdered two notoriously brutal white settlers, the US Calvary attacked this traditional gathering site with artillery, riflemen, and bayonets, turning Old Island into Bloody Island.

A focused study of the Bloody Island massacre imparts a powerful lesson on the discourse of genocide remembrance. In the Foucauldian sense of the *ontology of the present*, this article views public history as wrought with presentism.¹ As historian Ari Kelman clearly puts it, memorial sites "inflect how history is recalled", where contemporary viewers and memorial framers cast their views of the past "toward the present and the future."² Memorials set in stone a hierarchy of a narrative.³ Around sites of violence, newer memorial structures subvert the heterogeneous versions of the past in order to create a single unifying history.⁴ In memorializing history, a single narrative, albeit one that aims to remember the often-historically silenced victims, dominates visual memory in bloodstained landscapes, creating problematic issues of forgetting in their remembering.⁵ Bloody Island, however, is a unique site of two visual narratives. Two memorial plaques, erected in 1942 and 2005, exist side-by-side, occupying nearly the same space for very different purposes. These two narrative structures each frame the massacre for varying ideological and political purposes held by differing stakeholders. The memorials each use the massacre site to root their depictions of history into a textual creation.

The dueling narratives constructed around this one violent event are both unique to *Bo-no-po-ti* and California settler history, yet connected to the active memorial ground surrounding global indigenous slaughter under colonial expansion. Established narratives are decentered at

Clear Lake, where the two plaques coexist, yet each posits very different accounts of history. The preservation and evolution of each of these plaques, however, contributes to our understanding of why a detailed examination of localized genocide memorial sites is critical to regional and global history. The inclusion of different historical accounts underscores the evolving interplay and reshaping of genocide preservation, memorialization, and narrative construction. These historic landmarks remember and silence events, where the 2005 Pomo-sponsored plaque subverts the 1942 Anglo-American placed marker. Yet, the 1942 plaque, while extremely problematic in its foundation and depiction of the massacre, has not been removed, but rather preserved and, as this article shows, reshaped in its reclamation. A new historical narrative emerges from the implied dialogue between two different massacre markers. In leaving the 1942 plaque physically intact, the two memorials create a polyphonic version of the past, honoring and commemorating slaughtered Native peoples in a mosaic of memorial practices. A microhistory of this site and these plaques therefore creates a highly localized account of reconciliation and remembrance with global memorialization implications.

The Bloody Island Massacre

Bo-no-po-ti was a traditional Pomo gathering site. Also known as *Badon-napo-ti* (Island Village), hundreds of indigenous Pomo people in the Clear Lake region converged on the island every spring for the annual fish spawn. In the first years of the nineteenth century, it was estimated that the Northern California Pomo population was between 10,000 and 18,000, with 3,000 Pomo residing within the Clear Lake basin itself.⁶ Russian settlement at Fort Ross in 1812 brought about the first of many exploitative Euro-American encounters and in 1817 the San Rafael Mission was established with the aim of making Christian converts out of the nearby Pomo people. The mission was aided by Luis Arguello, later the first provisional governor of California, who, with a contingent of Spanish soldiers, led many expeditions into Pomo territorial lands in order to bring the Pomo further into the mission system of subjugation. When California became part of the Mexican Republic in 1822, large tracts of Pomo land were designated for settlement. The encroachment of settlers also unleashed epidemics of disease, including a massive malaria outbreak in 1832, the spread of measles from Fort Ross in 1847, and a smallpox epidemic brought about by the surge of prospectors during the gold rush of 1848. By 1850, the local aboriginal population of the Northern Pomo, having either fled due to American and European settlement or succumbed to disease, was estimated as fewer than 400.⁷

This small number of remaining Pomo in Lake County continued to clash with settlers while having their basic rights further eroded. Following the defeat of Mexico in the Mexican-American War (1846-1848), California was annexed by the expanding United States. Prior to 1846, indigenous Californians were considered Mexican citizens. The 1848 *Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo*, which ceded California to the United States, included clauses under Article VIII and IX that allowed Mexican inhabitants in California to either maintain their "title and rights" as Mexican citizens or "elect to become citizens of the United States."⁸ The rights of indigenous Californians are not explicated addressed in this treaty, however under Article XI the treaty noted that "the sacredness of this [treaty's] obligation shall never be lost...when providing for the removal of the Indians from any portion of the said territories, or for its being settled by citizens of the United States."⁹ Furthermore, references to "savage tribes" in Articles IV and XII underscore that citizenship protection would not be extended to the indigenous Californians.¹⁰ The California Constitutional Convention of 1849 deferred discussion of rights for indigenous people to the State Legislature, scheduled to meet after Congress approved the statehood of California. In 1850, the first State Legislature met and immediately denied indigenous Californians voting rights, and further legislated "that no Indian could serve as a witness for or against any white," thus excluding indigenous Americans from the recourses of the judicial system.¹¹ It has been argued, moreover, that the April 1850 *Act for the Government and Protection of Indians* was a thinly disguised authorization for white citizens to hold non-citizen Indians as slaves, implicitly sanctioning the kidnapping of thousands of indigenous children.¹²

The Bloody Island massacre was the tragic result of Pomo mistreatment at the hands of white settlers. In 1847, two American settlers, Charles Stone and Andrew Kelsey purchased a large cattle

ranch from Mexican Captain Salvador Vallejo, and with it his Pomo *vaqueros* (cowboys).¹³ As the first white settlers in Clear Lake, today the site of the cattle ranch is a town called Kelseyville, named after Andrew Kelsey. Stone and Kelsey were notoriously brutal and violent men. The Pomo were worked as slave laborers on the ranch, paid with rations of only four cups of wheat per day.¹⁴ Furthermore, the Pomo were forbidden to hunt or fish on any of Kelsey and Stone's land, and thus unable to supplement their meager food supply. When gold fever struck in 1848, Kelsey and Stone conscripted fifty of their laborers to work in the Sacramento gold fields. Beyond the brutal conditions of gold mining and the general mistreatment by Stone and Kelsey, it is reported that Andrew Kelsey abandoned the mining endeavor and sold the Pomo workers' food and supplies to a nearby mining outpost. Bereft of supplies, 48 of the 50 Pomo laborers starved to death on their return march to Clear Lake.¹⁵

Impoverished and malnourished, the indigenous workers on Kelsey and Stone's cattle ranch were routinely beaten and tortured. Even among other violent settlers, Kelsey and Stone were known for their viciousness toward aboriginals. According to journalist Gaye LeBaron, "even California's earliest historian, H. H. Bancroft, who had a propensity to glorify the American pioneers, has written that Kelsey and Stone were 'rough men, often in trouble with the authorities, and were men who scorned to use conciliatory methods with [to deal with, in the words of Andrew Kelsey] 'Injuns and such varmint'." Bancroft goes on to write that "Kelsey and Stone were both killed, as well they deserved to be." Yet, while Kelsey and Stone may have been disliked by their contemporaries, their murder at the hands of indigenous actors was nevertheless viewed as a great threat to settler society. It was the retaliation to the deaths of Kelsey and Stone that triggered the Bloody Island massacre.

According to official reports filed just after the Bloody Island massacre, the antecedents stem from Kelsey and Stone's mistreatment of their Pomo workers. Sometime in January 1850, it was alleged that a young Pomo worker "threatened the wife [of Andrew Kelsey], for which he received 100 lashes."¹⁸ Indigenous Pomo oral traditions maintains the boy was actually sent by his ailing aunt to request additional wheat.¹⁹ Irrespective of the charge, the excessive punishment was a common practice, not only on Stone and Kelsey's ranch but also throughout Lake County. Reports of Pomo workers dying from injuries sustained during lashes are enshrined in Pomo oral history. According to William Raganal Benson, a Pomo elder and Tribal historian born twelve years after the massacre, it was common to see:

such a whipping and [the] tying [of] their hands together with rope. The rope [was] then thrown over a limb of a tree and then drawn up until the Indians['] toes barely touched the ground and [they] let them hang there for hours...Such punishment occurred two or three times a week and many [an] old man and woman [weakened from starvation] died from fear.²⁰

In the official Indian Affairs' report, an hour after this particular Pomo youth had received 100 lashes, Andrew Kelsey's brother, Benjamin, returned to the scene and shot the boy in the head, which caused the Pomo to flee the ranch, only to return later with weapons in order to avenge his death.²¹ Absent from the official reports is the fact that Kelsey and Stone had also taken local Pomo Chief Augustine's wife as a sex slave.²² While Stone and Kelsey were away, Augustine's wife sabotaged their stored weapons' cartridges. When her people came to liberate her and retaliate against their mistreatment, Stone and Kelsey's tampered guns misfired and they were left defenseless. Andrew Kelsey was shot with multiple arrows; Charles Stone fled out a window, but was quickly chased down and murdered on the riverbank.²³

The decision to murder Kelsey and Stone was sparked by a combination of mistreatments, including by the death of the workers forced to mine for gold and wander back after Kelsey sold their rations, the whipping and murder of a Pomo boy, the abduction of Chief Augustine's wife, and a culmination of years of beatings and starvation. After the uprising, the death of Kelsey and Stone ushered in a retaliatory massacre, led not by civilians and local militias, but rather at the hands of the United States Government.

Following the murders of Kelsey and Stone, the Pomo workers fled the cattle ranch. It is alleged that Chief Augustine sought refuge on *Bo-no-po-ti*, but there is little evidence to collaborate

this claim. Andrew Kelsey's brother, along with neighboring whites, formed a vigilante posse and waged a random campaign of violence against all Clear Lake Pomo. Even the official report admits that Benjamin Kelsey:

collected a strong force and on pretense of going to the lake and punishing the murderers but instead of which they commenced an indiscriminate slaughter of the Indians who reside on farms working for Americans and in one night slew twenty. They were prevented by the citizens from utterly annihilating them, and most of them arrested by order of the Government, but no further proceedings instituted.²⁴

It was well known at the time that Benjamin Kelsey and his gang traveled into Sonoma, Calistoga, and Napa, and murdered "innocent Indians...[who] had no hand" in the murder of Kelsey.²⁵ The posse was arrested and brought to San Francisco, however, "they were set free on habeas corpus and never brought to trial."²⁶ Official reports submitted by a U.S. Calvary officer claim that while detaining Kelsey and his party, the U.S. Army "captured 12 Indians of the Isla tribe, who live upon the lake."²⁷ The officer, upholding the paternalistic trope of the state, notes that these captives "would undoubtedly have been put to death by Kelsey's party, had not the presence of an officer restrained them."²⁸ It is from these prisoners that the Calvary allegedly learned about "two chiefs of the tribe, which lived upon Kelsey's farm, [who] were on an island in the lake."²⁹

In fact, the Pomo at *Bo-no-po-ti* never worked on Stone and Kelsey's ranch, and had nothing to do with their murders. The Calvary report detailed the invasion plan on *Bo-no-po-ti*, outlining an assault of "two parties of 30 men each" while "a party 50 strong" flanked the only retreat.³⁰ It also advised a sneak attack under the cover of darkness, in order to "surprise [the Pomo] in their Rancherias and cut them to pieces."³¹ The overwhelming force was based on the Calvary officer's supposed belief that 400-600 Pomo armed warriors were stationed on the island.³² In actuality, the island was mostly populated with women and children.

When the battle-hardened 1st Dragoons division of the U.S. Calvary assaulted the island, five months later, they encountered *zero* resistance. The government soldiers, in overwhelming numbers and with the use of heavy artillery rowed across the lake in appropriated fishing boats, decimated the trapped Pomo Indians. In his report describing the attack, Captain Nathaniel Lyon stated, "the island soon became a perfect slaughtering pen."³³ After gunning down fleeing women and children, Captain Lyon ordered his soldiers to follow the Pomo into the thick reeds surrounding the marshy waters and "pursue and destroy as far as possible."³⁴ He reported a confirmed sixty Pomo Indians killed, but had little doubt that the body count was upwards of one hundred.³⁵ He stated that there were 400 Pomo on the island and that the U.S. Calvary sustained no injuries and received ineffective return fire.³⁶

Historian Benjamin Madley has called for a careful reading of one-sided causality rates when official narratives of resistance are employed, cautioning that this often masks the true genocidal aims of government forces.³⁷ The subsequent narrative of a battle, or tropes of self-defense require a notion that the government forces faced insurmountable opposing forces, or were responding to fierce aggression with equivalent and appropriate force. While the reconnaissance reports mentioned above stated that the U.S. Calvary anticipated encountering fierce resistance from the supposed 400 warriors, it is interesting that Lyon's own official report maintains a transparent narrative of slaughter and the absence of return fire. From the inception of the massacre, the military saw no need to create a counter-narrative to justify the atrocity, suggesting their expectation that Clear Lake settlers would condone the bloodshed. At least initially, however, this was not the case.

Media Portrayal of the Massacre

Following the massacre, Old Island became known as Bloody Island in the public lexicon. Just days after the massacre, the *Alta California* newspaper reported the event with the headline, "[a] horrible slaughter of Indians."³⁸ The article reminded the reader, "the tribe that incurred this terrible punishment...has maintained, in general, undisturbed peaceful relations with the white settlers" of the area.³⁹ While it noted that the military action was a reprisal for the murder of Kelsey, the article refuted its justification when it claimed:

Last summer...a stubborn family Indian offered an indignity to the wife of Kelsey...was sentenced to receive one hundred lashes...[but] after the punishment...Kelsey laid him dead, shooting him in the presence of several gentlemen who remonstrated him on the barbarity of the deed...Kelsey was afterwards murdered...Since then repeated acts of violence have been visited upon the natives.⁴⁰

The newspaper report underscores that there was little public affinity for the Kelseys and their ilk. Furthermore, the article argued that any justified retribution for Kelsey's murder had already been dealt, thus the Pomo slaughter was simply an act of genocide guised under legal punishment. In this regard the newspaper specifically charged the U.S. Calvary, under the command of Lt. Davidson and Captain Lyon, with trying to intentionally "exterminate...the Clear Lake Indians."⁴¹ The newspaper quoted an unnamed informant, who reported "indiscriminate destructive fire upon men, women, and children". The informant said, "they fell as grass before the sweep of the scythe." The article concluded once more with the charge of genocide, claiming that the attack on Bloody Island "was [an] order of extermination fearfully obeyed."⁴²

Fascinatingly, the *Alta California* newspaper drastically reversed their account just four days later. In the subsequent article, the newspaper revealed that the unnamed informant was Captain J. H. Frisbie, "a gentleman well known and universally respected."⁴³ The article now stated that General Persifer F. Smith pronounced Captain Frisbie's "account to be false...and in the very strongest possible language...also questioned the motives for its publication."⁴⁴ By way of retraction, the *Alta California* printed the only other account "of the Clear Lake affair," though the newspaper hinted at dissent when it pointed out "from what source the information of our new contemporary was derived we are of course ignorant. It will accord much satisfaction to believe it true."⁴⁵

The reprinted account challenged the veracity of the *Alta California* article, calling the Clear Lake incident a "rumored massacre...greatly exaggerated...and wholly misrepresented."⁴⁶ In the new version:

A party of Indians...after committing many murders and other outrages...took refuge in one of the numerous islands of the Lake...Captain Lyon was ordered to proceed to Clear Lake, and to punish and dislodge the Indians from their stronghold...The men advanced in boats, (which they had transported with great labor across the mountains,) and were received with a shower of arrows. In combat many of the soldiers were seriously wounded, and a number of Indians killed. The statement that women and children were massacred is wholly unfounded...This is the true history of the horrible slaughter of the Clear Lake Indians.⁴⁷

Boyd Cothran's laudable recent work on memory, violence, and notions of innocence surrounding the Modoc War (1872-1873) tracks narrative shifts in newspaper reporting. Cothran noted that standard notions of American innocence were employed against a backdrop of Indian savagery in order to portray white victims of violence as "fundamentally innocent."⁴⁸ In the case of Kelsey and Stone, however, innocence was an impossible trope as their brutality was so well established. The new narration, therefore, relied on the notion of depicting the Pomo as imposing warriors and veterans of murderous campaigns of vaguely defined *other outrages*. This transformed the massacre site into a battlefield, where the brave Dragoons, who painstakingly carried their boats over the mountain passes, are bathed in arrows. Many American soldiers are injured, thus showing the prowess and power of their enemy, yet none are miraculously killed, thus underscoring divine intervention and the strength of these soldiers. The new narrative views the Calvary men as heroically defending themselves and settler society in a preemptive attack. The story is sold by marginalizing the actions of true slaughtered innocents yet paradoxically recasting them as powerful warriors. Thus the soldiers become defenders engaged in a struggle against an overwhelming force and champions of American innocence.⁴⁹ It is also important to see frontier newspaper reporting as influencing, and influenced by, public opinion and state control. The countering reports in the *Alta California* offer up two versions of a historical event that echoed forward for over one hundred and fifty years.

The Native Sons of the Golden West and the 1942 Memorial

The Upper Lake basin today has been drained to the point that Bloody Island now stands as a hilltop. Landmark 427, erected in 2005, makes no mention of where the island was once located. One must travel a quarter mile down a street called Reclamation Road to see the massacre site close-up. There stands a faded and contentious plaque, installed by the Native Sons of the Golden West in 1942.

Like the two newspaper reports about the Bloody Island violence, the dual massacre markers put forth two very different narratives of the past. The 1942 plaque calls the site the “scene of a battle between U.S. Soldiers under the command of Captain Lyons (sic) and Indians under Chief Augustine.” The 2005 inscription posits that it was not a battle, but rather the location where “a regiment of the 1st Dragoons of the U.S. Cavalry, Commanded by Capt. Nathaniel Lyon and Lt. J.W. Davidson, massacred nearly the entire native population of the island.” The full text of the plaque goes on to state:

Most were women and children. This act was in reprisal for the killing of Andrew Kelsey and Charles Stone who had long enslaved, brutalized, and starved indigenous people in the area. The Island, now a hill surrounded by reclaimed land, remains a sacred testament to this sacrifice of innocents.

There is a great deal to criticize regarding the 1942 plaque. Firstly, it places the massacre date on 15 April 1850, one month earlier than even the official reports note. Secondly, Captain Lyon is mistakenly referred to as Captain Lyons. Most ominously, the plaque uses the common trope that the event was a battle, much like the second report reprinted in the *Alta California* newspaper, likening the event to a balanced fight between “Cowboys and Indians.”⁵⁰



Figure 1. Bloody Island 1942 Plaque.

The Bloody Island plaque was erected on 20 May 1942, 92 years and 5 days after the Bloody Island massacre. Behind the plaque’s construction, as mentioned above, was a group known as the Native Sons of the Golden West. The Native Sons were an Anglo-American organization responsible for many of the placards and historical landmarks scattered throughout California. The group still exists today, though it is a much more whitewashed charitable organization compared to their membership when they installed this particular plaque.⁵¹

The Native Sons of the Golden West sought to preserve a specific narrative of history, with a strong emphasis on the positive role white settlers played in creating California history. The organization’s name can be unpacked to see the use of “Native” as both an approbation of

indigeneity and an ownership over California; suggesting they, not the indigenous people, are the true autochthonous "sons of the soil" in California.⁵² This patrilineal notion is reinforced by the signifier Sons which suggests a legacy and birthright, coopted and repurposed by the Native Sons organization, a group that would only accept membership from white men born in California. In this reading, Golden West posits the notion that California history did not begin until the mid-nineteenth century's gold rush. It is fitting that the birth of the Native Sons of the Golden West began in 1890 with the purchase and restoration, for historical preservation, of Sutter's Fort. The Fort reports to be the earliest non-indigenous central Californian community, and thus the birthplace of the western settler movement, and by extension the Native Sons.⁵³ It was at Sutter's Mill, also owned by the Fort founder John Sutter, where Anglo-Americans first discovered gold deposits in California, resulting in the ensuing rapid migration of settlers during the gold rush.

With an obsession of pioneer history, in 1907 the Native Sons began publishing *The Grizzly Bear*, a monthly magazine for members. Each issue featured statements and updates from the various Native Sons chapters, known as parlors, advertisements and announcements, obituaries of any pioneer settlers "who came to California prior to 1870", letters from parlor members and readers, and history writings compiled by the Native Sons of the Golden West Grand Historian. In the May 1942 issue, Grand Historian Dr. Peter T. Conmy, a librarian at Oakland Public Library, wrote for *The Grizzly Bear* the Native Sons of the Golden West's version of the Pomo massacre.

The article was written to coincide with the 18 May "Grand Parlor of the Order of the Native Sons of the Golden West," the annual main Native Sons meeting which was being held in Lake County for "the first time in the organization's sixty-four year history."⁵⁴ After a brief history on how Clear Lake had the largest population of indigenous people in California, due to an "abundance of fresh water and the attendant vegetation [which] made the locality attractive to the primitive people," Conmy anecdotally added a line about how in 1836 "some Indians...wandered down to the Sonoma Valley, committing acts of depredation."⁵⁵ To his credit, Conmy wrote with shades of veracity and sympathy toward the Pomo people. He framed Stone and Kelsey as "cruel to the Indians," who ordered "the Indians with a high hand" and shot at them "for the fun of seeing them jump."⁵⁶ Although Conmy noted that Stone and Kelsey were "the first American residents" of Lake County and that they may have been "upright...with their relations with their fellow-citizens,"⁵⁷ he was clear about the mistreatment the Pomo suffered under Stone and Kelsey, who "were beaten at the slightest provocation" and he included the fact that Chief Augustine's wife was "taken over as a concubine."⁵⁸ Nevertheless, Conmy's description of the events that led up to Stone and Kelsey's deaths added mitigating factors, such as his version that after Kelsey sold all the supplies on his failed gold mining expedition, it was a "hostile tribe of Indians" who attacked and killed many of the Pomo conscripts, while briefly admitting that "others died of starvation."⁵⁹

Curiously, in Conmy's version of events, it was not the routine years of mistreatment the Pomo endured on Stone and Kelsey's ranch, since as "unbearable as [that] situation became, the Indians continued to forebear."⁶⁰ The Native Sons consistently maintained the paradoxical approach of glorifying American Indian lifestyles and stoicism, while relegating and subverting the indigenous Californians as primitive people and not the *true* natives of the West. According to their narrative, it was the supposed inter-Indian attack on the returning forced miners that "caused the wrath of the Red Men to rise high and it was determined that the cruelties of Andy Kelsey and Stone should be no longer endured."⁶¹ Conmy's account accurately described the murders of Stone and Kelsey, but his depiction of the antecedences slightly shifted the direct blame away from the years of abuse, starvation, and torture.

From November 1939 through November 1943, *The Grizzly Bear* used the word massacre only four times in four years.⁶² Conmy's May 1942 article is one of them. It is not the Pomo, however, who were victims of a massacre. Conmy's piece employed the traditional settler rhetoric of a battle between soldiers and Indians, keeping the entire description of the Bloody Island slaughter to a brief sentence where "about a hundred Indians were killed and, thoroughly subdued" by "Lieutenant Lyons (sic)", who forced "a treaty of peace [to be] made."⁶³ There is no mention of the women and children murdered by the U.S. Calvary, nor does the article mention that the soldiers received no return fire. Where the word massacre is employed, it is in reference to Kelsey and Stone, whose deaths were "regarded as a massacre" to white settlers, which "gave rise to the sentiment among

the settlers that the region of the lakes was a truly dangerous one, and for that reason settlement was slow."⁶⁴ For the Native Sons, the historic tragedy of Bloody Island is that it slowed down the migration of white pioneers.

The other three utterances of term massacre were also not employed regarding the murder of indigenous Americans. In the June 1941 issue, Dr. Peter T. Conmy once again used it, this time to describe the 1871 "Chinese massacre" by a mob of anti-Chinese "enraged citizens looking for a Chinese criminal in...Nigger Alley, and unable to find him, seized and lynched some eighteen innocent Chinese."⁶⁵ The next two occurrences are used to frame the ideological underpinnings of the Native Sons during this era. In one instance the "Pearl Harbor massacre" is alluded to in order to remind readers that the Japanese, and by extension American born children of Japanese descent, were "as a people, as public enemies, cunning, clever...unworthy of any confidence or trust."⁶⁶ The author underscored the central tenant of Native Sons thought, that Anglo-Californians are the native-born inheritors of the American past. Interestingly, in his attempt to other the Japanese, author J.E. Gardner moved beyond the notion of rooted birthrights. He wrote that Japanese-Americans, were born in the United States by an "accident of birth" and racialized his assertion that Japanese-Americans, "in [their] very blood [hold] so fanatical a devotion to [their] god-emperor that [they] will literally stop at nothing to accomplish [their] ends" and that "we do not want in our community any persons of that breed, no matter where born."⁶⁷ To Native Sons gripped in wartime fever, the California-born Americans of Japanese parents were a threat to the entrenched racial hierarchy and color line the Native Sons of the Golden West sought to glorify.

In a *Grizzly Bear* article titled "Let Us Not Be Bequeath A Canker We Should Have Removed — The Japs", Dr. W.R. Livingston exemplified the prevailing post-Pearl Harbor American vitriol, and the Native Sons' political position. "If Japan emerges victorious", he wrote, "it could well mean, before the lapse of a century, a Mougol (sic) would be found again ravaging Europe" which would lead to "the extermination of the White race. A Mongol ravage is not a pretty picture. Genghis Khan massacred whole populations in city after city of Persia, and even sent back detachments to slay any refugees".⁶⁸ The article, published in March 1942 and filled with racist calls for Japanese interment under misguided historical propaganda, included a note from the author sent to the Native Sons that expressed the "hope that the portion [of his article] relating to Japs in defense areas may be obsolete by the publication date."⁶⁹ Indeed, it nearly was.

The date of Bloody Island plaque's installation is incredibly telling. The plaque was erected 20 May 1942; exactly three months and one day after President Franklin D. Roosevelt issued his infamous Executive Order 9066, the authorization to intern over 100,000 Japanese-Americans. By the time the Native Sons had commemorated the plaque in May, the entire western seaboard had been declared a military evacuation zone for all Japanese and Japanese-Americans. The timing of this particular plaque, dedicated to a historical event nearly a century removed, is highly suspect and cannot be separated from the main political and ideological motivations of the Native Sons, which had far less to do with historical preservation and much more to do with present tension.

While the Native Sons of the Golden West may have glorified the notion of the Wild West and invested money and time in erecting historical markers of California's pioneer days, at its core the group was dedicatedly anti-Japanese. The most prominent member of the group was Earl Warren, future chief justice of the Supreme Court. When the Bloody Island plaque was commissioned, however, Warren was the Attorney General of California. In this role, Warren was the leading voice behind the forced removal of Japanese-born and Japanese-descendant Americans.

Following the 7 December 1941 attack at Pearl Harbor, American military and civil leaders feared subsequent attacks along virtually undefended West Coast. Five days later President Roosevelt issued executive order 8972, creating militarized patrols along and within national borders and empowered the Secretary of War "to take appropriate measures...deemed to be necessary and desirable" for national defense.⁷⁰ Under this, it became Attorney General Warren's task to organize California's civilian defense program. It was feared, irrationally, that Japanese Americans could form a supposed fifth column and wage a campaign of sabotage and support, should Japan successfully invade the United States. In January 1942, one month after Pearl Harbor and just five months before the creation of the Bloody Island plaque, Warren warned "the Japanese situation as it exists in this State today may well be the Achilles heel of the entire defense effort."⁷¹

According to historian Edward White, Warren was "the most visible and effective California public official advocating internment."⁷² Warren was also the most reputable and prominent member of the Native Sons of the Golden West. It was Warren who personally dedicated the 20 May 1942 unveiling of the Bloody Island plaque, attending the ceremony as both California's Attorney General and also a representative of the Native Sons' Fruitvale Parlor 252. Seven years later, as Governor, Earl Warren established the California Historical Landmarks Advisory Committee, creating a state program to organize and manage what was hitherto a privatized affair. Under his membership as a Native Son, Warren was able to witness the power plaques like the 1942 Bloody Island marker created in controlling narratives of the past for present, and often political purposes. It is very likely that the Native Son's particular branding of history and nativism played a prominent role in Warren's outlook and decision to create the Landmarks Committee.⁷³

Beyond the decision to intern American citizens, the Native Sons of the Golden West were also involved in a legal battle to strip away the basic voting rights of Japanese-Americans. After the installation of the Bloody Island marker, the Native Sons capitalized on the anti-Japanese sentiment with a legal challenge to overturn the 1898 Supreme Court decision in *United States v. Wong Kim Ark*, which affirmed that any native-born American, irrespective of race or ethnicity, was an American citizen.⁷⁴ It is fitting that the Native Sons of the Golden West erected a memorial to the *Bloody Island "battle"* during this legal battle, since the massacre occurred the same year as the passage of the 1850 *Act for the Government and Protection of Indians*, which denied the Pomo citizenship rights.

While the 1942 Bloody Island marker is seemingly apolitical, the impetus behind its construction cannot be separated from the actions of the Native Sons of the Golden West. The fact that while the plaque commemoration was under way, Native Son and former California Attorney General Ulysses S. Webb was arguing in court that "This is a white man's country...by the whites, of the whites, and for the whites" while Native Son and current California Attorney General Earl Warren was assisting with the forced internment of Japanese and Japanese-American citizens, makes the motivational intent behind the plaque construction highly suspect.⁷⁵

In preserving a false version of the Pomo Indian massacre, the Native Sons' plaque asserts Anglo-dominance over Californian history. The Pomo on Bloody Island are falsely raised up to fierce warriors who challenged the United States. The text seems to suggest that the stronger the enemy, the more victorious the winner. The sign also stands in as a message to the Japanese-Americans, arguing that the white pioneers and prospectors who conquered the indigenous warriors and settled the West were the true inheritors of California, and the writers of its History. Finally, the text of the 1942 plaque seeks to confirm the erroneous fact that Chief Augustine was on *Bo-no-po-ti*, and that the battle was a justified response connected to the murders of Kelsey and Stone. In this regard, the 1942 plaque can be read as a metaphorical embodiment of a scripted version of history first put forth by the revisionist 1 June 1850 *Alta California* article.

Reclamation

In 2002, the 1942 marker was desecrated. An unknown person poured red paint over the face of the plaque and around the rock on which it stands.⁷⁶ Today the dried red paint remains, the desecration preserved in order to resemble spilled blood covering the monument. Beginning in 1999, activists, Pomo descendants, Clear Lake residents, and the general public hold an annual sunrise "forgiveness ceremony in honor, remembrance and forgiveness, on behalf of the Pomo Indian People that perished and those that survived the Bloody Island Massacre."⁷⁷ The vigil takes place at the 1942 marker, where candles are burned and tobacco offerings are made to the Pomo ancestors whose bodies were cremated and buried, only later to be used in the construction of dams around the Upper Lake basin. Notably, the ceremonial event does not take place on the anniversary of the massacre, but rather nearest the date of 20 May, the anniversary of when the 1942 marker was installed. The inclusion of local residents, irrespective of their national origins, speaks to the aim of reconciliation. According to Clayton Duncan, the great-grandson of one of the Bloody Island survivors, "the ceremony is also to say we're sorry to our ancestors whose bones and ashes were shown such disrespect."⁷⁸ The site sits on Reclamation Road, a fitting homage to a contentious plaque, now reclaimed.

Clayton Duncan's great-grandmother was Lucy Moore, one of the very few children to survive the Bloody Island massacre. In 2000 Duncan established the Lucy Moore Foundation, created with the stated mission "to educate the public about the massacre...locate, preserve and memorialize the site of mass graves...and buy the Bloody Island" massacre site in order to "create a Lucy Moore Foundation Museum and Cultural Center."⁷⁹ The Foundation is also involved in ongoing campaigns to rename "Kelseyville", stripping away Andrew Kelsey's legacy and rewriting the memoryscape of Clear Lake.⁸⁰ In 2005, largely due to Duncan's efforts, the State Department of Parks and Recreation, working in partnership with the Lucy Moore Foundation, erected the new memorial plaque, designated *California Registered Historical Landmark No. 427*, located directly on Highway 20.

The ongoing campaign by Duncan and other Pomo activists as well as the larger community to create a cultural center, in addition to the continuing annual healing ceremonies, show that landscape around the Bloody Island massacre site is an active ground of memory, still evolving and shifting. This process of recreation and reclamation moves slowly. Similarly, while efforts to rename Kelseyville have stalled due to the lack of the requisite total number of signatures required to bring the proposal to legislation, it should be noted that Clear Lake County is sparsely populated. The movement, like the 2005 plaque, is highly localized in an area of little population density and remains an exciting site for scholarly investigation precisely because of its transformations that are currently playing out.



Figure 2. Bloody Island 2005 Plaque.

The 2005 plaque tells a much more accurate history of the massacre. The narrative is expanded to include not only the perpetrators of the massacre, Captain Lyon and Lt. Davidson, but also the backstory of Andrew Kelsey and Charles Stone, who "had long enslaved, brutalized, and starved indigenous people." Interestingly, the 2005 plaque does not replace the 1942 one, but rather stands in for a polyphonic narrative of reclamation. The text of the 2005 plaque states that "the island... [is] surrounded by reclaimed land." By moving one quarter of a mile away from the actual site, the 2005 marker is intentionally designed to be the viewer's first glimpse of the Bloody Island memorialization. In this way it posits itself as the dominant narrative, subordinating the 1942 plaque as the alternate, and incorrect, version of the past. For many tourists, the 2005 plaque is the only site they will see. The road signs only point to the new marker, and while the plaque does state that "one-fourth mile west is the island...now called Bloody Island," the directions are vague, despite the fact that hilltop is clearly visible from Highway 20. The palimpsestic rewriting of the Pomo massacre narrative allows both markers to be preserved, with a carefully guided tour through the selected versions of history.

Conclusion

Northern California, like so many colonial lands, has a deep legacy of genocide and struggles with preserving a fractured version of this history. While California was the site of numerous genocides and atrocities against the indigenous peoples, the Bloody Island massacre site is one of few memorial structures recognized by the State of California government. Plaque locations shape memorial structures by working to both remember versions of a blood-stained past while silencing the imposed meta-narratives that came before them. When studying the process of memorialization surrounding colonial massacres, a connection to the landscape is paramount. On their own, plaques and the artistic stones in which they are set are meaningless. The narratives they construct and the audiences they attempt to guide are drawn together by a deeper connection to the grounds that these memorial structures mark. The annual Bloody Island commemorations in Clear Lake take place at the 1942 marker for important reasons. I have outlined the performative aspect of reclamation the ceremonies discussed above hold, showing how community events and the vandalism of red paint has transformed and subverted the 1942 plaque away from its founders' intentions. For the Pomo activists and actors, however, that location marks a closer connection to their ancestors murdered by the U.S. Calvary. While the newer 2005 plaque reshapes the history of the massacre for the passing motorist, only by traveling down Reclamation Road and to the now hilltop that was once *Bo-no-po-ti*, and onto reservation land, can one connect to the events that transformed old island into Bloody Island. Seemingly ironically, this transformative experience comes from visiting a plaque installed by an organization dedicated to settler, Anglo-American history, arguably erected with anti-Japanese intentions.

Different generations come to terms in differing ways with historical violence in California's landscape. The reframing of a site of bloodshed from a battle to a massacre involves multiple parties creating epistemological tension with the past. The Bloody Island massacre site marks a place where scholars can map the ways individuals, organizations, and communities in the American west have both created and rejected nationalist narratives as well as the establishment of a pluralistic vision of history, selectively framed. The physical site of Bloody Island is simultaneously a memorial to the murdered, enslaved, and dispossessed first people of California, while also becoming a monument to sovereignty and anti-colonial resistance.⁸¹ The Bloody Island massacre site is uniquely remembered due to its dual plaques. Like all memorial sites, certain narratives are privileged while others are marginalized: the massacre landscape itself becomes a text of negotiation, contestation, and confirmation. By leaving the 1942 plaque intact, however, the site adds a level of perceived transparency, a place where memory and narrative have been renegotiated, while still offering a window into the attempts to justify imperial expansion and co-opt native identity.⁸²

All past events are challenged, reinterpreted, and reused for present purposes. The connections between the two Bloody Island plaques, like the connections between Anglo-Americans and Indigenous peoples, remind us of our role and responsibility to be viewers, caretakers, and creators of a shared and global historical narrative. In this regard, a thorough understanding of the localized history of the Bloody Island massacre imparts a powerful lesson for genocide scholars, activists, and the general public, enriching the discourse of violence and reconciliation in world history. Just as more scholarly attention should be devoted to the Bloody Island duality of narratives and markers, so too should a broader effort exist to create methodological and theoretical conversations between memorialization of massacres. Localized genocidal events like Bloody Island bring Clear Lake into the broader frontier wars, massacres, and narrative construction of California. Similarly, the regional history of California fits into our understanding of American expansion, which itself shares transnational connections and global memorial practices. In this way, Reclamation Road is more than a street in Clear Lake County; it is a conduit into our colonial past and to constantly evolving construction of History in the making.

Endnotes

- 1 Hubert L. Dreyfus and Paul Rabinow, "What is Maturity? Habermas and Foucault on 'What is Enlightenment?'" in *Foucault: A Critical Reader*, ed. D. C. Hoy (Oxford: Blackwell 1996), 112. See also, Michel Foucault, *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences* (London: Routledge Classics, 2002), 123; Michel Foucault, "What Our Present Is?" in *Foucault Live: Collected Interviews, 1961-1984*, ed. Sylvère Lotringer and Lysa Hochroth, trans. John Johnston (New York: Semiotext(e), 1996), 407-415; Michael S. Roth, "Foucault's 'History of the Present'", *History and Theory* 20, 1 (February 1981): 36-37.

- 2 Ari Kelman, *A Misplaced Massacre: Struggling Over the Memory of Sand Creek* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2013), 3.
- 3 I have used the phrase “set in stone” in allusion to Sanford Levinson’s *Written in Stone: Public Monuments in Changing Societies* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1998), 12.
- 4 This new version of history is later commemorated, as nostalgia for an invented past creates a binding and unifying experience for those “remembering”. Albert Grundlingh writes that commemoration “is not concerned with the ‘accuracy’ of historical renditions...Commemorations by their very nature give their own shape and form to public understanding of the past”. Albert Grundlingh, “Remembering Conflict: The Centenary Commemoration of the South African War of 1899-1902 as a Case Study” in *Historical Memory in Africa: Dealing with the Past, Reaching for the Future in an Intercultural Context*, eds. Mamadou Diawara, et al (New York: Berghahn Books, 2010), 117-118
- 5 Synthesising the theories of Baudrillard, Deleuze, and Guattari, Adrian Parr argues that trauma is given transcendent meaning by collective culture as individual memory of the past cannot “be contained... or recaptured in the context of the present”, and thus memorialisation and remembrance are collective responses to the singularity of personalised memory. Adrian Parr, *Deleuze and Memorial Culture: Desire, Singular Memory and the Politics of Trauma* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2008), 2, 185. James Young coined the theory of “unfinished memory”, arguing that monuments and memorials are reshaped by ever-evolving local traditions, ideas, and experiences. See James Young, *Texture of Memory: Holocaust Memorials and Meaning* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993), Chapter 3.
- 6 Sally McLendon and Michael J. Lowy, “Eastern Pomo and Southeastern Pomo”, in *Handbook of North American Indians Volume 8*, ed. Robert F. Heizer (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution, 1978), 306.
- 7 S.A. Barrett, *The Ethno-Geography of the Pomo and Neighboring Indians* (Berkeley: The University Press, 1908), 41-42.
- 8 *Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo*, February 2, 1848. Full text online at http://avalon.law.yale.edu/19th_century/guadhida.asp (accessed 9 April 2015); Robert F. Heizer, “Collected Documents on the Causes and Events in the Bloody Island Massacre of 1850” in *Publications of the University of California Research Facility* (Berkeley: University of California, 1973), <http://dpg.lib.berkeley.edu/webdb/anthpubs/search?all=&volumeid=59&item=1> (accessed 17 September 2012), 5.
- 9 It could be argued that as Mexican citizens, indigenous Californians would enjoy the same rights as all Mexican citizens residing in the new United States territory. In the language of the treaty, however, indigenous people are referenced as “savage tribes” occupying areas in the new territory. The implication of treaty on future indigenous rights is made quite clear by Article XI that indigenous people would not be legally classified as citizens, and “savage tribes would hereafter be under the exclusive control of the Government of the United States.” Library of Congress, “A Century of Lawmaking for a New Nation: U.S. Congressional Documents and Debates, 1774-1875”, *Treaty of Peace, Friendship, Limits, and Settlement Between the United States of America and the United Mexican States Concluded at Guadalupe Hidalgo, 2 February 1848*, 929-932. <http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/ampage?collid=lsl&fileName=009/lsl009.db&recNum=985> (accessed on 9 April 2015).
- 10 *Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo*, February 2, 1848. Full text online at http://avalon.law.yale.edu/19th_century/guadhida.asp (accessed 9 April 2015).
- 11 *Act for the Government and Protection of Indians*, Chapter 133, Cal. Stats., enacted 22 April 1850.
- 12 Heizer, *Collected Documents on the Bloody Island Massacre*, 5.
- 13 Sally McLendon and Michael J. Lowy, “Eastern Pomo and Southeastern Pomo” in *Handbook of North American Indians: California, Volume 8*, ed. William C. Sturtevant, (Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1978), 319.
- 14 “Bloody Island” in *A History of American Indians in California: Historic Sites*. National Park Service. 17 November 2004, http://www.cr.nps.gov/history/online_books/5views/5views1h8.htm (accessed 12 September 2012); L. L. Palmer, “History of Napa and Lake Counties”, (San Francisco: Slocum, Bowen and Co., 1881), 49-58, quoted in Heizer, *Collected Documents on the Bloody Island Massacre*, 24.
- 15 Pete Richerson and Scott Richerson, “Bloody Island”, in *Putah and Cache: A Thinking Mammal’s Guide to the Watershed*, ed. Amy J. Boyer, Jan Goggans, Daniel Leroy, David Robertson, and Rob Thayer, (University of California, Davis, 2001). http://bioregion.ucdavis.edu/book/10_Clear_Lake/10_17_circ_cl_bloodyi.html (accessed 12 September 2012); Palmer, *History of Napa*, 29.
- 16 Gaye LeBaron, “Bloody Island” ‘Indian Massacre of Another Kind”, in *The Press Democrat*. 22 July 1990. Located in *North Bay Digital Collections*. Sonoma State University Library. <http://northbaydigital.sonoma.edu/utills/getfile/collection/Lebaron/id/484/filename/428.pdf> (accessed on 14 September 2012).
- 17 Quoted in LeBaron, “Indian Massacre of Another Kind”.

- 18 "Letter from Peter Campbell to the U.S. Commissioner of Indian Affairs", Sonoma, 1 June 1851, in Heizer, *Collected Documents on the Bloody Island Massacre*, 17.
- 19 William Ralغان Benson, "The Wampum Gatherer's Narrative" in *Healing Badonnapoti*, 1 January 2012. <http://www.anoliscircle.com/HealingBadonnapoti.html> (accessed 15 September 2012); "Bloody Island" in *A History of American Indians*
- 20 Benson, "The Wampum Gatherer's Narrative".
- 21 "Letter from Peter Campbell" in Heizer, *Collected Documents on the Bloody Island Massacre*, 17.
- 22 Richerson and Richerson, "Bloody Island"; *The Army Surveys of Gold Rush California: Reports of the Topographical Engineers, 1849-1851*, (eds.) Gary Clayton Anderson and Laura Lee Anderson (Norman, OK: Univeristy of Oklahoma Press, 2015), 170
- 23 "Letter from Peter Campbell" in Heizer, *Collected Documents on the Bloody Island Massacre*, 17; James H. Leach "Chief Augustine's Pomo Tribe Killed Two White Men, So the Soldiers Came for Revenge" in *Wild West*, vol. 9, no. 2 (Aug 1996), 81; David William Olien, *Our Union Soldier's Four Wars, 1840-1863: The Story of Recovering One Family's Lost Billy Yank* (Bloomington, IN: Xlibris, 2013), 106.
- 24 "Letter from Peter Campbell" in Heizer, *Collected Documents on the Bloody Island Massacre*, 17.
- 25 "Letter from Peter Campbell" in Heizer, *Collected Documents on the Bloody Island Massacre*, 17.
- 26 C. A. Menefee, "Historical and Descriptive Sketch Book of Napa, Sonoma, Lake and Mendocino", (Napa: Reporter Publishing Co., 1873), 23, in Heizer, *Collected Documents on the Bloody Island Massacre*, 22.
- 27 "Report of Lt. J. W. Davidson, 6 January 1850", in Executive Documents, 31st Congress, 1st Session, Senate Document No. 53, pp. 64-66, in Heizer, *Collected Documents on the Bloody Island Massacre*, 9a.
- 28 "Report of Lt. J. W. Davidson", in Heizer, *Collected Documents on the Bloody Island Massacre*, 9a.
- 29 "Report of Lt. J. W. Davidson", in Heizer, *Collected Documents on the Bloody Island Massacre*, 9a.
- 30 "Report of Lt. J. W. Davidson", in Heizer, *Collected Documents on the Bloody Island Massacre*, 9b.
- 31 "Report of Lt. J. W. Davidson", in Heizer, *Collected Documents on the Bloody Island Massacre*, 9b.
- 32 "Report of Lt. J. W. Davidson", in Heizer, *Collected Documents on the Bloody Island Massacre*, 9b.
- 33 "Report of Brevet Captain Nathaniel Lyon, 22 May 1850" in Senate Executive Document No. 1, Part 2, 81-83, 31st Congress, 2nd Session, 1850, in Heizer, *Collected Documents on the Bloody Island Massacre*, 11.
- 34 "Report of Captain Lyon", in Heizer, *Collected Documents on the Bloody Island Massacre*, 10.
- 35 "Report of Captain Lyon", in Heizer, *Collected Documents on the Bloody Island Massacre*, 11.
- 36 "Report of Captain Lyon", in Heizer, *Collected Documents on the Bloody Island Massacre*, 11.
- 37 Benjamin Madley, "California and Oregon's Modoc Indians: How Indigenous Resistance Camouflages Genocide in Colonial Histories", (unpublished paper presented at the annual International Association of Genocide Scholars Conference, Winnipeg, 17 July 2014).
- 38 "Horrible Slaughter of Indians". *Alta California*, 28 May 1850, in Heizer, *Collected Documents on the Bloody Island Massacre*, 18.
- 39 "Horrible Slaughter of Indians", in Heizer, *Collected Documents on the Bloody Island Massacre*, 18.
- 40 "Horrible Slaughter of Indians", in Heizer, *Collected Documents on the Bloody Island Massacre*, 18.
- 41 "Horrible Slaughter of Indians", in Heizer, *Collected Documents on the Bloody Island Massacre*, 18.
- 42 "Horrible Slaughter of Indians", in Heizer, *Collected Documents on the Bloody Island Massacre*, 18.
- 43 "The Clear Lake Indians", *Alta California*, 1 June 1850, in Heizer, *Collected Documents on the Bloody Island Massacre*, 19.
- 44 "The Clear Lake Indians", in Heizer, *Collected Documents on the Bloody Island Massacre*, 19.
- 45 "The Clear Lake Indians", in Heizer, *Collected Documents on the Bloody Island Massacre*, 19.
- 46 "The Clear Lake Indians", in Heizer, *Collected Documents on the Bloody Island Massacre*, 19-20.
- 47 "The Clear Lake Indians", in Heizer, *Collected Documents on the Bloody Island Massacre*, 20.
- 48 Boyd Cothran, *Remembering the Modoc War: Redemptive Violence and the Making of American Innocence* (Chapel Hill, The University of North Carolina Press, 2014), 197
- 49 Cothran, *Remembering the Modoc*, 49.
- 50 Where the stronger an enemy is perceived to be, the greater the subsequent victory appears. I would like to thank Lyndall Ryan for drawing my attention to the widespread employment of the battle narrative surrounding colonial genocide.

- 51 The Native Sons of the Golden West Facebook page gives one the impression that the group's ethnic mix of current members is still predominantly white, while their website tends to give a more grandiose account of diversity. Both online platforms do mention the organization's darker history in their Anglo to Japanese relations, but it should be noted that their main websites overemphasizes the fact that "From its beginnings, the Native Sons have been more progressive in receiving into its membership people who typically were shut out of other organizations. For example, the Native Sons never denied membership to applicants on religious grounds". Its dominant Anglo-American membership base and viewpoint is acknowledged, but quickly explained away by the fact that the "heavily dominated...tone of Anglo-Saxon Americanism(s)...included some exclusionary membership policies" which was "normative for many of its counterpart organizations in times gone by". See "About Us". *Native Sons of the Golden West*. <http://www.nsgwca.com/about-us/> (accessed 2 November 2014).
- 52 For an analysis of indigeneity phrases, see Peter Geschiere and Stephen Jackson, "Autochthony and the Crisis of Citizenship: Democratization, Decentralization, and the Politics of Belonging", in *African Studies Review*, 49, 2 (2006), 1-7. I would also like to thank Margaret Jacobs for drawing my attention to the loaded phrase of "native" when an early draft of this article was presented at the University of Manitoba's *Colonial Genocide and Indigenous North America* workshop on 21 September 2012.
- 53 "Sutter's Fort State Historic Park". *California Department of Parks and Recreation*. http://www.parks.ca.gov/?page_id=485 (accessed 22 October 2014).
- 54 Peter T. Conmy, "Lake County: The County of Laguna de Lup Yomi", *The Grizzly Bear*, May 1942, 8.
- 55 Conmy, "Lake County", 8. A printing error in this publication causes many instances of the letter "n" being rendered as an "o". For the ease of the reader, I have corrected these mistakes in all citations hereafter.
- 56 Conmy, "Lake County", 8.
- 57 Conmy, "Lake County", 8.
- 58 Conmy, "Lake County", 8.
- 59 Conmy, "Lake County", 8.
- 60 Conmy, "Lake County", 8.
- 61 Conmy, "Lake County", 8.
- 62 The term "slaughter", similarly, only appears nine times, and five of those pertain to animals and meatpacking (e.g. "slaughterhouses"). Of the remaining four, one is a reference to Roman Emperor Nero, one is from a prayer by Pope Pius XIII, and the final two are about the "slaughter of truth" by governments fighting in a world war that is "resulting in the slaughter of millions of humankind". "Newsgraphs" *The Grizzly Bear*, May 1943, Supplement 6.
- 63 Note the misspelling of Lyon's name as "Lyons", possibly the origin of the misspelling on the plaque. Conmy, "Lake County", 8.
- 64 Conmy, "Lake County", 8.
- 65 Peter T. Conmy, "Los Angeles: City of American Progress", *The Grizzly Bear*, June 1941, 4.
- 66 J.E. Gardner, "Perhaps", *The Grizzly Bear*, May 1943, Supplement 4.
- 67 Gardner, "Perhaps", Supplement 4.
- 68 W.R. Livingston, "Let Us Not Bequeath A Canker We Should Have Removed—The Japs", *The Grizzly Bear*, March, 1942, 3. A similar printing error exists in this article, where certain letters are incorrectly used in place of the lowercase letter "n". Once more I have corrected these mistakes in all citations hereafter.
- 69 Livingston, "Let Us Not Bequeath", 3.
- 70 "Executive Order 8972 of December 12, 1941" *Selected Executive Orders on National Security*, <http://fas.org/irp/offdocs/eo/eo-8972.htm> (accessed 12 March 2015)
- 71 Edward G. White, *Earl Warren: A Public Life* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982), 69.
- 72 White, *Earl Warren*, 71.
- 73 As a high ranking member of the Native Sons, it is impossible to determine the extent Warren was shaped by the organization or shaped the organization himself.
- 74 *United States v. Wong Kim Ark* (No. 18), 169 U.S. 649, 28 March 1898. Full text of opinion and dissent found at "Legal Information Institute", *Cornell University Law School*. www.law.cornell.edu/supremecourt/text/169/649 (accessed 27 April 2015).
- 75 Quoted in Elaine Elinson and Stan Yogi, *Wherever There's A Fight: How Runaway Slaves, Suffragists, Immigrants, Strikers, and Poets Shaped Civil Liberties in California* (Berkeley: Heyday Books, 2009), 47-54.

- 76 AIM activist Russell Means most famously championed this symbolic act. In 1991 he was arrested and acquitted on First Amendment grounds for pouring red liquid on a Denver statue of Christopher Columbus. Similarly, he took part in the early Red Power movement, where, in 1970, red paint was poured over Plymouth Rock before activist occupied the Mayflower II.
- 77 "13th Annual Bloody Island Memorial". Facebook Public Event. <https://www.facebook.com/events/305548509509226/> (accessed on 08 September 2014).
- 78 Quoted in Marc Dadigan, "Pomo Indians Remember 1850 Bloody Island Massacre with Events May 18-19", 18 May 2012, in *Indian Country Today Media Network*, <http://indiancountrytodaymedianetwork.com/2012/05/18/pomo-indians-remember-1850-bloody-island-massacre-events-may-18-19-113129> (accessed on 3 November 2014).
- 79 Raphael Montoliu, "Lucy Moore Foundation seeks to create healing, understanding". 25 August 2007. *Lake County News*, http://www.lakeconews.com/index2.php?option=com_content&do_pdf=1&id=1584 (accessed on 07 October 2014).
- 80 Details of this movement can be found at: <http://www.thepetitionsite.com/1/kelseyville-ca-the-town-named-after-a-notoriously-brutal-white-man-who-abused-and-murdered-the-pomo/>. This particular online petition had until 9 March 2012 to get 10,000 signatures. It received 301 signatures.
- 81 Ari Kelman's *A Misplaced Massacre* is a perfect example of recent scholarship surrounding the making of memory in the Colorado Territory. My article has called for this kind of approach to expand further west, making a case for California in spite of the dearth of official memorials.
- 82 On a theoretical level, by framing colonial and post-colonial memorials and monuments in this way, my argument lines up with historical and anthropological examinations of colonial archives, where memory and identity are interwoven in the ways colonial societies and metropolises seek to maintain narratives that showcase the way these societies see themselves, and want to be seen. As texts, these materials can be read both with the grain in order to unpack content, but also against the grain to flesh out context and authorial intentions. See Ann Laura Stoler, "Colonial Archives and the Arts of Governance", *Archival Science* 2 (2002): 90; Joan M. Schwartz and Terry Cook, "Archives, Records, and Power: The Making of Modern Memory", *Archival Science* 2 (2002): 1.