NEW ETHNOLOGY FROM OLD SOURCES: 
INDIGENOUS WARFARE IN PENINSULAR BAJA CALIFORNIA

W. MICHAEL MATHE

Given its relative geographic isolation and hostile environment, the peninsula of Baja California has been the subject of an unusually large historiographic production. Most of these works are well-known to researchers of the region: diaries and reports of maritime explorers (Ulloa, Alarcón, Vizcaino, Cardona, Ortega, et al.) dating from the early sixteenth to late seventeenth centuries; and accounts produced by Jesuit missionaries (Salvatierra, Ugarte, Venegas, Barco, Baegert, et al.) from the late seventeenth to the late eighteenth centuries. Both of these sources provide extensive ethnological information and much of the ethnography of Baja California has been derived from them. However, one aspect of daily life among the Indians of the peninsula, warfare, has, until now, been overlooked. A careful combing of these old sources has revealed extraordinary, detailed information regarding a constant threat to life in Baja California.

Unfortunately, the mark of Cain appears to be universal among humankind as is manifested by war, the general term for mass homicide, and Baja California is no exception. The southernmost region was occupied from south to north by three separate linguistic groups: Pericú from Cabo San Lucas in 23° 53’ to approximately 24° 50’ on the Gulf of California, along with corresponding islands, and 23° 30’ north latitude on the Pacific coast; Guaycura from 23° 30’ north latitude on the Pacific coast to approximately 25° 30’ on the Pacific and 24° 50’ north latitude on the coast of the Gulf of California; and Cochimi from approximately 25° 30’ to 30° 25’ north latitude.

The Pericú, Guaycura, and Cochimi shared virtually indistinguishable material cultures, as Paleolithic, seminomadic, hunter-foragers gathered in small bands, rarely exceeding 20 members of extended families. The study of warfare, within and between these three groups, has been largely neglected by historians, ethnographers, and archaeologists. Perhaps this is a result of general attributions of peaceful conduct brought about by the Pax Jesuitica during the early mission period, an erroneous concept that low population density would prevent violent conflict, initiation of active academic study of the region following the horrors of World War II, or fantasy that intercultural warfare among Indians does not conform with contemporary politically correct concepts of idyllic aboriginal America, or a combination of these factors. Be that as it may, there is abundant ethnographic evidence to demonstrate the existence of regular, continuous warfare among peninsular groups, and it would be ingenuous to suggest that their constant bearing of arms was solely for the purpose of hunting, or that the laying down of these arms as a sign of peace was not demonstrative of the reverse, their taking them up of them as a sign of belligerency.

Although vague, concepts of origin among the Cochimi and Guaycura involved warfare. Jesuit fathers Miguel Venegas, protohistorian of the Californias (Venegas 1979:1:70-72, 102-104), Miguel del Barco, missionary among the Cochimi at San Francisco Javier Viggé-Biaundó (Barco 1973:211-213), and Johann Jakob Baegert, missionary among the Guaycura at San Luis Gonzaga, (Baegert 1952:57-58) all reported on their bellicose origin myths.

During the lengthy period of initial contact, 1533-1697, early Spanish explorers and colonizers, and their monarchs held deep curiosity regarding indigenous peoples, their physical makeup, and social and material culture, so these brief contacts with groups of Pericú, Guaycura, and Cochimi provide substantial insight into coastal peninsular cultures prior to permanent Spanish colonization. Although ethnographic descriptions of the Pericú of the Bahía de La Paz by Fernando Cortés between 1535 and 1537 have not come to light, those made of the Cochimi and Guaycura on the coasts of the Gulf of California and Pacific by his lieutenant, Francisco de Ulloa, in 1539-1540 were published by Giovanni Battista Ramusio in volume three of his Delle navigazioni et viaggi (1556) and later translated to English in The Principal Navigations Voyages Traffiques & Discoveries of the English Nation of Richard Hakluyt (1600). Sailing from Acapulco in July 1539, Ulloa reached the Bahía de La Paz in late August, recrossed the Gulf of California, proceeded northward along the western littoral of Sinaloa in September, and returning westward, sailed through the islands of the eastern littoral of the peninsula northward to the head of the gulf. From there the expedition headed southward to the Bahía de La Paz in October and leaving the bay later that month, rounded Cabo San Lucas, headed northward along the Pacific coast in early November, reached Bahía Magdalena, and continued to Isla de Cedros in mid-January 1540. Following further exploration to the north of Isla de...
Cedros, the expedition turned southward in late March 1540, and reached the Bahía de La Paz in May.

Over a half century passed before new ethnographic observations were recorded for Baja California. Between August and November 1596, Sebastián Vizcaíno attempted settlement of the bay he named La Paz, and explored the gulf coast from Cabo San Lucas to Bahía San Carlos. In September he observed the Perícu at Cabo San Lucas and La Paz, and in October the Guaycura to the north of the bay. Although his 1596 venture failed, Vizcaíno returned to Baja California in 1602 to carry out the definitive demarcation of the Pacific coast from Cabo San Lucas as far north as possible. Reaching Cabo San Lucas in early June, he and his second cosmographer, Discalced Carmelite Fray Antonio de la Ascensión, recorded information regarding the Perícu, and between July and November, regarding the Guaycura at Bahía Magdalena, and the Cochimí at Abreojos and northward to Cabo Bajo.

As successor to pearl fishing rights in the Gulf of California, Nicolás de Cardona made a short, unsuccessful voyage from Cabo San Lucas to the head of the gulf, and southward along the Sonora and Sinaloa littoral in 1615, recording his observations of Perícu at the Bahía de La Paz. Following several failed attempts by Cardona to return, the pearl fishing monopoly was granted to Francisco de Ortega who, on his first voyage to the gulf in 1632, was accompanied by Father Diego de la Nava, chaplain. Between early May and late June, Nava made detailed observations of the Perícu at La Paz, and from September 1633 to April 1634, Ortega made a second voyage of reconnaissance in the Gulf of California, sailing directly to the Bahía de La Paz, Isla San Pedro, and Isla Espíritu Santo. Of particular importance were Ortega’s recording of the funerary practices of the Perícu at La Paz and linguistic similarity of groups at Cabo San Lucas, La Paz, and the islands of Cerralvo, Espíritu Santo, and San José.

Following the failed third voyage of Ortega to the peninsula in 1636, succession to the pearl fishing monopoly was passed to Pedro Porter y Casanate, who, while building ships on the coast of Sinaloa, was ordered to warn the Manila ships of pending danger from piracy. Thus, between January and March 1644, his captain, Alonso González Barriga, remained at Cabo San Lucas where information regarding the Perícu was recorded. Porter was forced to withdraw from exploration of the Gulf of California in 1648, and two decades passed before the monopoly for pearlring was granted to Francisco de Lucenilla who spent the period from May to July 1668 exploring the peninsula where minor observations of the Perícu were made by his chaplain, Franciscan Fray Juan Caballero Carranco, at Cabo San Lucas, Bahía de las Palmas, and Espíritu Santo.

Due to repeated failures of pearlring expeditions to achieve settlement on the peninsula, that task was turned over to the religious of the Society of Jesus. The first attempt at establishing a mission in the Californias was made by fathers Eusebio Francisco Kino and Juan Bautista Copart on an expedition led by Isidro de Atondo y Antillón in 1683. After a disastrous attempt to found a mission at La Paz, that of San Bruno was established among the Cochimí in October of that year. Prior to abandonment of the enterprise in 1685, Atondo and Kino had explored the surrounding countryside near La Paz and San Bruno, where important ethnographic observations were made.


The Perícu were the subject of extensive description in that their region was the most frequently visited by Spanish navigators. At Cabo San Lucas and La Paz in 1596, Vizcaíno (Mathes 1965:135-139), in 1602 at Cabo San Lucas, Fray Antonio de la Ascensión (Mathes 1965:166), at La Paz in 1615, Cardona (Mathes 1970:214), Francisco de Ortega’s pilot, Esteban Carbonel de Valenzuela, in 1632 at Cabo San Lucas, Bahía de las Palmas, and La Paz (Mathes 1970:229-233), Ortega at La Paz in 1633 and 1634 (Mathes 1970:236, 241), Ortega’s chaplain, Diego de la Nava, at Cabo San Lucas and La Paz in 1632 (Mathes 1970:223-224), Alonso González Barriga, captain for Pedro Porter y Casante, at Cabo San Lucas in 1644 (Mathes 1970:248-249), and in 1668, Franciscan Fray Juan Caballero Carranco, chaplain to Lucenilla, at Bahía de las Palmas and La Paz (Mathes 1970:259, 264) all described the armament, constant carrying of arms, bellicose nature, assumption of impending combat, and, frequently, the combat tactics of the Perícu internally as well as against the Spanish.

Notwithstanding a peaceful approach the initial attempt of the Society of Jesus to establish a mission at La Paz, Kino wrote to Father Juan Martínez, S.J., on 20 April 1683 that “The Indians approached with much shouting, armed with bow and arrows, daubed with paint as a sign of war, defensive at least, and making gestures for us to leave” (Burrus 1954:27-29). Subsequent testimony by Atondo and Kino in 1683 seconded the descriptions of their predecessors and detailed combat over possession of a water source...

Much of the information relative to the Guaycura is related to their conflict with the Pericú, and early direct observations are scant, clearly due to their bellicosity toward any strangers, indigenous or Spanish. In 1596, at Bahía San Carlos Vizcaíno described their bellicosity, arms, presumption of combat, and unprovoked attack against his expedition (Mathes 1965:140-141), and in 1602 at Bahía Magdalena he provided details of their armament as did his second cosmographer, Fray Antonio de la Asención (Mathes 1965:147-148, 174). In 1615, Nicolás de Cardona at Bahía de San Carlos described similar hostility as had Vizcaíno and reported the keeping of five Christian heads from the earlier event (Mathes 1970:215-216).

The northernmost peninsular group, the Cochimí, was among the first described in detail following contact. Near Isla Danzantes, and on the Pacific coast north of Cabo San Lucas, near Bahía Magdalena, at Punta Abreojos, Isla de Cedros, and to the north in 1539, Francisco Preciado of the Ulloa expedition described armament, ceremonies, body painting, and tactics (Mathes 1992:18, 30-36, 41-46, 55-57, 60-61, 78-79, 82-85, 87, 89).

In 1602, Fray Antonio de la Asención, while taking on water at Isla de Cedros (Mathes 1965:191), Ortega, in the Gulf of California at Isla Danzantes, in 1633 (Mathes 1970:239), and Father Eusebio Francisco Kino near Comondú in 1683 (Burrus 1954:73) reported on the bellicose nature of the Cochimí and their constant armament.

Following a century and a half of irregular contact, the founding of Nuestra Señora de Loreto by Juan María de Salvatierra, S.J. in 1697 initiated permanent settlement of the Californias through missions established by the Order of Jesus (1697-1767), and continued by the Order of Saint Francis (1768-1773) and Order of Preachers (1773-1855). European diseases, particularly following the Pericú rebellion of 1734-1737, brought decline in mission populations, and following Mexican independence in 1821, the mission system collapsed. Shortcomings notwithstanding, the permanency of the missions provided ample opportunity for collection of ethnographic data on the coasts as well as in the interior from Cabo San Lucas to San Diego Bay, by both observation and the use of informants, and permitted an integrated overall, rather than localized, view of Baja California culture.

Of particular importance in this area by virtue of their academic background, high level of scientific interest, and requisites for written reports, Jesuit missionaries provided information in varying degrees of scope and detail within a European-Christian framework. Jesuits such as fathers Juan María de Salvatierra, Juan de Ugarte, Clemente Guillén, Sigismundo Taraval, Fernando Consag, and Wenceslaus Linck supplied data regarding specific groups in letters and diaries, and the earliest printed ethnographic notes appeared in Informe del estado de la nueva christiandad de California…. of Father Francisco María Piccolo (1962), father minister to the Cochimí at San Francisco Javier Viggé-Bia undó from 1699 to 1702.

By the beginning of the eighteenth century, the Jesuits had established two missions, and by 1709, an additional three were in operation. In that year the first non-Spanish ethnographic reports were made by English privateers Edward Cooke and Woodes Rogers with Duke and Dutchess anchored at Cabo San Lucas, where they awaited the arrival of the Manila galleon from November to early January 1710. Cooke and Rogers gave detailed descriptions of the Pericú in Edward Cooke, A Voyage to the South Sea and Round the World, Perform’d in the Years 1708, 1709, 1710, and 1711, by the Ships Duke and Dutchess of Bristol (1712) and Woodes Rogers, A Cruising Voyage Round the World: First to the South-Seas… begun in 1708, and finished in 1711 1712). Another, unsuccessful English privateer, George Shelvocke, succeeded Cooke and Rogers at Cabo San Lucas in August 1721. His ethnographic descriptions, recorded in George Shelvocke, A Voyage Round the World by the Way of the Great South Sea Perform’d in the Years 1719, 20, 21, 22, in the Speedwell of London (1726), generally followed those of Woodes Rogers. These English accounts are extracted in Thomas F. Andrews, English Privateers at Cabo San Lucas (1979).

Information provided by missionaries through the circulation of questionnaires in Baja California, the use of Society archives, and published sources was employed by Father Miguel Venegas who was charged with preparation of a chronicle of the Californias. Venegas’ original manuscript, “Empresas Apostolicas de los PP. Missioneros de la Compañía de Jesús, de la Provincia de Nueva-España obradas en la Conquista de Californias…”, finished in 1739, was subsequently revised, augmented, and published in three volumes in 1757 by the Spanish Jesuit savant, Andrés Marcos Burriel (1719-1762), as Noticia de la California, y de su conquista temporal, y espiritual hasta el tiempo presente (Venegas 1979), containing the first published general ethnology of the Pericú, Guaycura, and Cochimí.

Similarly of extraordinary importance were writings of former missionaries derived from first hand observation, produced in exile following expulsion of the Society of Jesus from Spanish domains in 1767. Johann Jakob Baegert (1952), father minister among the Guaycura at San Luis Gonzaga from 1750 to 1767, in letters to his brother, published in 1772 as Nachrichten von der Amerikanischen halbinsel Californien…. interspersed ethnography with commentary, and critiqued aspects of the work of Woodes Rogers and the French edition of Venegas-Burriel. Miguel
del Barco, missionary to the Cochimí at San Francisco Javier Viggé-Biaundó from 1739 to 1767, primarily aimed his work at correcting and augmenting that of Venegas-Burriel, but also added commentary on mission culture. Barco’s work remained in manuscript in the Biblioteca Nazionale, Florence, until 1793 when it was transcribed and published by Miguel León-Portilla. These three sources were essentially those used in subsequent secondary histories written in exile by Mexican Jesuits Francisco Xavier Alegre, Andrés Cavo, and Francisco Xavier Clavijero.

The diary of his travels from Cabo San Lucas to San Diego from July 1791 to November 1792 produced by surgeon José Longinos Martínez (1994) as a part of the expedition to New Spain organized by the Jardín Botánico in Madrid in 1788, also provided ethnographic data, much of which also reflects almost a century of direct contact with European civilization. Subsequent to Longinos, however, observations by Spanish and Mexican missionaries, travelers, and officials on the peninsula prior to the mid-nineteenth century provided virtually no ethnographic data.

From Nuestra Señora de Loreto between 1697 and 1699 Salvatierra wrote extensively of the bellicosity and tactics of the Cochimí (Salvatierra 1997a:108, 113-116; 1997b: 121-125, 150), and Venegas summarized these conflicts during the arrival of the missionaries (Venegas 1979:2:19, 22-33, 38-42). In his Report and Succinct Relation of the New Conversion of California (Informe y Relación Sencilla que de la Nueva Conversion, Estado y Progresos de la California Hizo y Presentó á la Real Audiencia de Guadalaxara, por su orden el Padre Francisco Maria Picolo de la Compañía de Jesús) of 1702, Salvatierra’s co-religious Francisco María Piccolo reported of the Cochimí that “They always go about with arms in their hands, these are a Bow and Arrow and Dart, either to carry out hunting or to defend themselves from their enemies, because some rancherías are opposed to others” (Piccolo 1962:64). The early conflicts at San Francisco Javier Viggé were related (Venegas 1979:2:122-123), as were difficulties with the Cochimí encountered in exploration from Santa Rosalía de Mulegé in 1709 by Piccolo (Piccolo 1962:164), who also reported hostility to the north of Mulegé in 1716 (Burrus 1984:84, 87), and in the same year Venegas chronicled the hostility of the Guaycura in the area of La Paz (Venegas 1979:2:227-229, 323-325, 373-375, 383-385). En route overland from Ligüí to participate in the founding of the La Paz mission in 1720, Father Clemente Guillén, near Apaté reported the hostility and tactics of the Guaycura (Bravo et al. 1989:90; Lazcano 2000:101), as did Father Jaime Bravo at La Paz in the same year (Bravo et al. 1989:44-45, 58, 62, 65). Brief contact at Cabo San Lucas by English privateers Edward Cooke and Woods Rogers in 1709-1710, and George Shelvocke in 1721 provided details regarding Pericú armament (Andrews 1979:40, 68, 99-100).

After the founding of La Paz, in August 1721, Father Ignacio María Nápoli, near the site of Santiago, reported the strong enmity between the Pericú and the Guaycura (Nápoli 1970:53, 60-61, 66, 69; Río 2000:53-59, 66-64), and in September 1725 from Loreto Clemente Guillén somberly reported on the problems of hostilities to viceroy Marqués de Casafuerte (Burrus 1984:98-100).

Pressure of evangelization and Guaycura superiority under the Pax Jesuitica produced open rebellion among the Pericú requiring entry of Spanish troops and three years to quell. Father Sigismundo Taraval at Todos Santos received the report of the uprising in October 1734 and detailed weaponry and tactics during the conflict (Taraval 1996:63, 76, 82-83, 118-119, 124-125, 138-139, 172), Father Provincial Gaspar Rodero, S.J. reported the damage to the California missions following the revolt to King Felipe V in 1737 (Burrus 1984:190,194-196), and Baergt also chronicled the war (Baergt 1952:151-154). In spite of the total defeat of the Pericú, hostility and rebellion persisted, and at San José de Comondu in 1738, Bernardo Rodríguez de Larrea was called for aid and the tactics of conflict between Europeans and Indians was noted in detail (Barco 1973:242).

As Jesuit missions slowly advanced beyond San Ignacio Cadacaamán, while exploring to the Colorado River in 1746 Father Francisco Consag, S.J., described the bellicosity of the Cochimí at Bahía de los Ángeles and at Bahía de San Luis Gonzaga (Venegas 1979:3:155-156, 170-171), and five years later in 1751, near Calmali and north of Laguna Manuela reported on the tactics of the Cochimí as well as the possible penetration of northern Yuman weaponry among the Cochimí (Lazcano 2000:161, 169, 175, 180). Fifteen years later, exploring to the north of Santa Gertrudis in 1766, Father Wenceslaus Linck, reported on conflict among the Cochimí at San Juan de Dios east of San Fernando (Lazcano 2000:219), and Father Miguel del Barco chronicled the northern advance during the final years of the Jesuit presence on the peninsula with frequent mentions of weapons and tactics used in internal conflict among the Cochimí (Barco 1973:307-309, 349-351).

Jesuit chroniclers, in addition to specific relations, also provided general descriptions of weapons, causes, conduct, and results of warfare among peninsular groups. Father Miguel Venegas explored the subject succinctly:

Peace was interrupted all the time with wars, groups, prejudices, and rancor of some nations and rancherías against others. The motives of these dissensions could not be for domination and possession of land; they were ordinarily to revenge damage done by one individual to others, or more frequently when some went to fish or collect fruit where they were most accustomed and had rights than the others. The method of revenge was for the offended person to
make a threat to the offender, and if it could not be made on his person, to do so to one of his relatives or persons of his ranchería. From this point all took the cause to be their own and if they did not think they were enough, the call for aid from the rancherías that were their friends to go against the enemy together. The method of declaring war was, with great noise, to gather a large supply of cane and flints for their arrows, and seek that, by various trails, that their actions would reach the ears of their enemy, attempting to intimidate them to defeat them. When the decisive encounter of the battle arrived, the presented themselves in as a confusing troop, with great shouting and yelling, without any form of military order. Thus they confronted one another in disorderly platoons until they came within arrow shot, and then the fight began. They only kept some order in moving the squads around to the front of the army, when the first retired, because of exhaustion or due to a lack of arrows. The latter were made of cane, with pointed stones as a point, but they did not poison them, nor is there known to be found in all the land a poisonous plant that could serve such a purpose. When they closed in combat they used, to would close in, some short lances or darts of branches, with the points sharpened and fire hardened, which at times had no less effect nor were less certain than steel. Finally won, not those who had more skill or more force but those who remained stronger against their own fear or were able to instill it in the enemy. Thus grew and became general the rancor, the prejudices, and the wars, and as each occurred, one or the other declined with reciprocal deaths. Thus it has been seen, principally in the rancherías of the south, that many of them have been declining through mutual hatred and revenge. Those of Loreto and the North also had them, but not to such excess. Those of the North, particularly, since they are of a more noble character and a brighter capacity, also are more peaceful and sociable, and with spirit more docile toward reason, less stubborn, and less vengeful [Venegas 1979:1:80-81, 96-98].

From exile in Bologna, Miguel del Barco drew upon his observations as a missionary:

They enjoy themselves and dance… for the victories over their enemies… For these parties they usually invite one or another ranchería and they also frequently challenge them to wrestle and run, to demonstrate force and skill with bow and arrow, and in these and other entertaining games, they passed many times days and nights, weeks and months in time of peace. But peace was interrupted every time by wars, groups, feelings and rancor between one group or ranchería against another. The motives of these dissentions, not being due to dominion or possession of lands, were usually to avenge aggression made by one individual to another, or more often by some going to fish or gather fruits where others had a greater custom than right to go. The method of revenge was for the offended to demonstrate hostility toward the offender; and if he could not do so against his person, to do so against some relative or his ranchería. Then it followed that all would take up the cause as theirs, and if they did not think there were enough of them, they called for aid from friendly rancherías, so that all would come together against the others. The method of making war public was, with great show, to equip with arrows and points for them, on various trails, so that the noises would reach their contraries, and pretending to conquer them by intimidation. When the decisive moment of battle arrived, the disorderly troop presented itself with great noise and shouting, without any form of military order. Thus disorganized platoons confronted one another until they came within arrow range, and then the combat began. They only kept order in rounding up the squads to take the point of the army, when the first retired because they were tired or out of arrows. When the combat order became close they used, to injure in close, some small darts or lances of branches with the points sharpened and fire hardened, which at times had no less effect nor less certainty than steel. Others also used darts. And in the north, toward 31 degrees, it was found that they used various types of arms to wound in close combat, one was in the shape of a well pulley a palm in diameter, with a little groove in the center, and with its tip, a palm and a half long, all of one piece. Another was like a quarry pick, with one end a pick and on the other a small cutting blade; the handle for maneuvering this arm came out of the center, and everything, with its handle, was also of one piece. Another was like a small, curved sword. Finally, in these battles, the winner was not the one with the greatest skill or greater force and valor, but he who kept himself strong against his own fear, or was able to engender it in the enemy. Thus the rancor, partialities, and wars grew and became general, so that in time, one or another became less due to reciprocal deaths. Thus it has been seen, principally in the southern rancherías, many of which have consumed themselves through mutual hatred and revenge. Also those of Loreto and the north had them, although not with such excess. Especially those of the north, since they are of a more noble spirit and brighter capacity, also are more peaceful and sociable, and with spirit more docile toward reason, less stubborn and less vengeful.
The bows of the Californians are not as they are frequently drawn in the hands of Americans or as is seen in the had of a Californian among the figures in the border of the map of this peninsula, place in the front of this work in the first edition: that is, a bow with curvature in the center, that makes it form two bows or semi-bows. This type of bow has never been seen among Californians. They only use a simple bow which has no mid-point or semicircle, but is a shallow bow bent in the shape of the arches of church choirs and perhaps even more shallow than these. To make them they take a length of solid wood and fire harden it to shape it well and give greater consistency to the wood. Then they clean it and leave it about three fingers or somewhat more in thickness in the middle; they narrow it little by little toward the ends, equally on one and the other side, so that the points are the thickness of a finger or less. To one of them they strongly attach the string made from deer nerves or gut, and as thick as three harp strings together; and heating the wood again, they bend it a little so that it takes the shape of a bow that it should have; then they fix the other end with the string very taught, thus leaving the bow formed. Some groups used them longer than others; the smaller ones are of six or seven palms long, from point to point in diameter, and the largest are of eight or nine palms. The arrows are a vara in length. A third of the length toward the point is a thin length of hardwood of little weight; the remaining two-thirds are of cane or reedgrass, thin as the index or little finger of the hand. Into the final joint of the reedgrass the hardwood is tightly inserted, after polishing it, and for greater strength they glue these two materials with tar, and over all, with thin, flattened nerves they wind tightly the part where the reedgrass ends and the hardwood begins so that they cover the uneven joint. This gives it strength and it facilitates it when the hardwood has been shot into a body the reedgrass can also enter without difficulty. The hardwood is thinned a little at the point but they do not leave it very pointed so that it will not break easily or if they do not want it to enter the body where it is shot; even thus, it goes through a medium-think board. In addition to this, so that the arrow will fly for a long distance and straight to the target, they put over the reedgrass, at the opposite end from the point, three feathers, or better said, three half hawk feathers that are the best for this. They divide these feathers lengthwise and put three halves around the reedgrass, equidistant one from the other in the form of a triangle, each one being a matter of five fingers in length; they are glued with tar and nerves against the same reedgrass. These are the common and ordinary arrows that are used by the Indians for all hunting and for entertainment shooting at a target. But for war, or to hunt deer or other large animals, although the aforesaid work well, they usually add a flint in the shape of a lancet to the point so that it makes a larger wound and cannot come loose from the injured body. This flint is fixed to the point of the arrow shaft with nerves, as everything else has been stated [Barco, 1973:175, 192-195].

Also in exile, in Mannheim, Baegert recalled:

Bows and arrows are the only things that have survived and have been retained by all the California Indians because they need these weapons for their protection and to obtain their food. The bows of the natives are more than six feet high, slightly curved, and are commonly made from the root of the wild willow. They are round, about five fingers thick in the center, and become gradually thinner and pointed at both ends. The bowstring or cord is made of strips of animal gut. The arrows are of common reed straightened by the heat of fire and are more than six spans long. At the lower end, they have a notch to catch the string, and three or four feathers as long as a finger, which do not project very much and are let into slits made for that purpose. At the other end of the shaft, a pointed piece of heavy wood is inserted, a span and a half long, bearing at its tip a piece of flint, triangular in shape, almost resembling a snake tongue, and serrated at the edge like a saw. They practice with bow and arrow from early childhood. Consequently, many good marksmen are found among them. All science, work, and occupation of the male Indian, therefore, consist of making bows and arrows. The men always carry these weapons with them wherever they go. Yet a gunshot makes them forget their bows and arrows, and half a dozen soldiers are capable of keeping several hundred Indians in check [Baegert 1952:64-65, 82-83].

The final note on peninsular warfare during the mission period was made by José Longinos Martinez during his journey from Cabo San Lucas to San Ignacio in 1791:

All of the Indians of this part of California have only used the arrow with greatest skill for hunting and fighting in their wars. The shape of the arrow, which is the only arm that they use, varies little among the Indians of Old California; only the point, which they make of such stone or flint as they find to be the hardest, consistent, and attractive, is the manner in which they are differentiated [Longinos 1994:161-163].

In addition to written accounts, contemporary illustrations relating to warfare in peninsular California although few, are not absent. In 1632, Nicolás de Cardona illustrated his report of his encounter at Bahía San Carlos...
cases of homicide (Tirsch 1972:92-93).

More detailed illustrations of weapons and warfare were painted by Father Ignaz Tirsch, S.J., missionary at Santiago from 1736 to 1768. “Ein Heid un heidin Kommen aus der wüldüss mit ihren Töchterlein, und söhnlein in die Mission umb sich zu Bekehren zu lassen” (“Out of the wilderness a heathen and his wife are coming with their daughters and son to the Mission to be converted”) depicts an armed man (Tirsch 1972:88-89), and “Wie Ein wilder Indianer drey Indianerinnen mit Pfeilen Erschiest weill sie ihm Ettliche Schlächte früchtlein dar Von getragen” (“How a wild Indian shoots three Indian women with arrows because they took away some of his bad fruit”), clearly illustrates a case of homicide (Tirsch 1972:92-93).

**Conclusions**

Abundant ethnohistorical evidence (as yet only adequately supported by archaeology) exists to demonstrate that peninsular Californians regardless of age or sex lived in perpetual threat of attack and spontaneous involvement in warfare, a state common in harsh regions where competition for the few available resources is high. The Pericú, Guaycura, and Cochimi fall well within the general definition of warfare as conducted in hunter-gatherer/forager societies organized in small bands of up to 20 and, for ceremonial purposes, larger bands of 100 to 200, individuals (Keeley 1996). All groups were materially equal, and war was most frequently waged for access to, and temporary possession of, food (game, fish, shellfish, and edible plants, fruits, and seeds) and fresh water, although revenge for prior defeat, rape, and carrying off women, probably to achieve exogamy, was also a cause. Little security, vigilance, or intelligence of enemy presence was practiced, and frequently there was spontaneous combat at borders between perceived hunting-foraging territories.

The use of surprise, stealth, ambush, dawn attack on encampments, with shouting of threats, insults, and blowing of whistles upon attack to invoke fear, was usually met with flight and/or retreat to avoid injury or death, an option possible due to low population density, vastness of the countryside, and few possessions to salvage. Warriors were voluntary, not organized as a group, inexperienced and untrained, although loosely led by a captain who had somewhat more experience than others. Their weapons were of a projectile design (arrows, darts from atlatl, spears, stones, and slings), fired from a distance in the open, without plan or strategy; logistics were absent, so battles were short by plan, fought without closure, and were generally ambushes with relatively low casualties in numbers but possibly high in percentages. When there were survivors or refugees who were unable to escape, these were absorbed by the enemy group, with no captives, slaves, or loot taken, since there was no need for additional persons, for they were a liability to sustain, and there was very little to loot. There is no evidence of the taking of war trophies, with the exception of Spanish skulls mentioned by Cardona, nor of cannibalism. Peace existed through isolation and adequate sustenance, and common language and culture was not a deterrent to conflict.

Warfare against Spanish explorers, soldiers, and missionaries was conducted within the same framework as against other indigenous groups, and initially was the result of fear of the loss of sustenance. The inequality of force against members of an Iron age, sedentary, agrarian state with a professional military force equipped with horses, individual firearms, edged weapons, light artillery, and sailing ships, would appear to make any warfare completely futile. Such was the case in Spanish settlements and missions where defensive trenches and palisades were constructed and access to supplies, equipment, and personnel enabled them to sustain battle and employ artillery with shot and volley fire from individual weapons. Nevertheless, the Spanish were generally routed in combat in the open where horses were easily frightened, wounded, or killed and the time required for reloading firearms generally resulted in the use of bayonets and swords, shock weapons requiring closure in battle. Further, the Spanish were lesser in numbers and their presence was evident. Although Spaniards enjoyed adequate logistics to sustain battle to permit retreat, indigenous groups were in a position to employ espionage, surprise, stealth, and feigned friendship by laying down arms, drawing in the Spanish force, and infiltrating or surrounding it. They possessed knowledge of the terrain, mobility, and bows, arrows, and spears equal to bayonets and swords, and although their lack of logistics required sudden and rapid attack that they were unable to sustain, because their numbers were unknown, by shouting and maneuvering they were able to appear numerous.

Following the Pericú uprising, hostilities against the Spanish diminished rapidly due to increasing development of the mission system and the clear intention of Spanish permanence on the peninsula. By 1767, the year in which the Society of Jesus was expelled from Spanish dominions, the Pericú, Guaycura, and Cochimi populations between Cabo San Lucas and Santa María de los Angeles (29° 45’) were effectively absorbed into the missions, with virtually no Indians living outside of their jurisdictions. This enabled the **Pax Jesuitica** by providing adequate sustenance and supervised comportment under European and Christian regulations, ending, as such, the causes for intercine war and ultimately, for war against the Spanish.
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