



*From the Office of Genealogist and Researcher
Lorraine "Rain Cloud" Escobar, CAILS
Inam Mec Tanotc*

**Preliminary Assessment of Existing Documentation
of Patrick Orozco's Genealogy**

January 4, 2000
By Lorraine Escobar, CAILS
Revised June 29, 2000

Introduction

In my experience, as the tribal genealogist for Ohlone/Costanoan-Esselen Nation, as an invited participant in the personal research for Andrea Bassetti (second cousin to Patrick Orozco), and various other lineages, I have conducted extensive research of many California Indian and non-Indian families. As a result, I do maintain an extensive genealogical library. Further, I am in a unique position to comment, and to provide evidence and verification, on the alleged Indian connections as claimed by Patrick Orozco. Therefore:

In the interests of protecting the rights of those documented Ohlone/Costanoan Indians who can validate their ancestry within the geographical Ohlone/Costanoan territory, I submit the following preliminary assessment, of existing documentation pertinent to the genealogy of Patrick Orozco, to whomever these facts may concern. The goal of this preliminary assessment is to reveal the facts as they exist and to provide substantiation of specifically referenced documentation pertinent to these facts. As a result, this report demonstrates that the Indian lineages, that Patrick Orozco has alleged thus far, have no legal basis. As such, this report is not intended to provide recommendations for further research.

Provided sufficient funding is place for such a purpose, a full legal genealogical report, complete with additional citations and all other supporting documentation, can be requested from the author.

Alleged Indian Ancestors of Patrick Orozco

Juana Maria de Jesus Vasquez (Chaboya) vs Juana Chaboya

In June 1989, Glory Anne Laffey and Edith Smith prepared "The Genealogy of Patrick Orozco" for the Prometheus Development Company. Within this report, Smith reports:

**34 E. 5th Street, Morgan Hill, California 95037
408/779-9103**

*"If Narcissa Geneve had Indian ancestry, it was through her mother Juana Chaboya."*¹

Further, Smith also included a partial transcription of a marriage record for Narcissa Geneve's parents, Alexander Geneve and Juana Chaboya, at St. Joseph's Church, which occurred in 1850.

*"St. Joseph's Church, South River St. Building, San Jose, CA: Book I, Marriages, 1849-1900: Geneve, Don Alexandre, (Frances), soltero, con Dona Juana Chaboya, 12 January 1850, in the Parish of San Jose..."*²
[Emphasis is author's]

On April 17, 1995, the *Santa Cruz Sentinel* had reported that the mother of Narcissa Geneve, "**Juana Chaboya**," was the descendant of Santa Clara Mission Indians, Pedro Pablo and Maria Pelagia, through their daughter, Maria Leocadia, and their granddaughter, **Mariana de Jesus Vasquez**:

*"1835: Juana Chaboya, daughter of Mariana Vazquez and Jose de la Cruz Chaboya, born. 1850: Juana Chaboya marries Frenchman at Mission Santa Clara. They have daughter, Narcissa Geneva..."*³
[Emphasis is author's]

In a subsequent report, entitled, "Maria Leocadia," Linda Yemane notes:

*"Juana Maria de Jesus Chaboya is said to have married Alexandre Geneve in 1850 in Santa Clara. I have not yet located this marriage record."*⁴ [Emphasis is author's]

While Yemane acknowledged that she had not verified this particular marriage, she noted that the tracing process was "incomplete" and commented that "mission records can be used to document family lineages." While these statements are true, the alleged connection between the Juana Chaboya, who married Alexander Geneve, and the Juana Maria de Jesus Chaboya-Vasquez, the daughter of Mariana de Jesus Vasquez and Jose de la Cruz Chaboya, had not yet been verified. Although Yemane evidently verified the baptism record for **Juana Maria de Jesus Chaboya-Vasquez**, she mistakenly assumed

¹ "The Genealogy of Patrick Orozco," prepared by Glory Anne Laffey, MA, Historian & Edith Smith, MA, Archaeological Resource Management, Robert Cartier, Ph.D., Principal, 496 N. Fifth Street, San Jose, CA 95112, June 1989, page 14; photocopy enclosed.

² Ibid, page V(?) -15; photocopy enclosed.

³ "How two tribes came together," *Santa Cruz Sentinel*, April 17, 1995, page A-16; photocopy provided.

⁴ A sub-report entitled "Maria Leocadia" by Linda Yemane, page 61, published in the "Ethnohistoric Genealogical Study, Tasman Corridor, Light Rail Project" report for Santa Clara County, CA; Woodward Clyde Consultants, prepared on behalf of the Santa Clara County Transportation Agency; photocopy faxed, and provided, from Office of Alan Leventhal, Department of Social Sciences, San Jose State University, San Jose, CA.

that this individual was the same as *Juana Chaboya (Genave)*.⁵ I conducted further research and the findings are related below.

While Smith cited the marriage as having taken place at St. Joseph's Church, in San Jose, the *Sentinel* article claimed the marriage took place in Mission Santa Clara. By following the Mission Santa Clara lead, I discovered the following marriage record at Mission Santa Clara:

"#3094, Christano Cota & Juana Maria Chavolla
On May 21, 1853, ... I married Chrisanto Cota, single,to Juana Maria Chavolla, single, 17 years old, legitimate daughter of Jose de la Cruz Chovalla deceased, and [Mari]Anna Vasquez of this parish of Santa Clara."⁶

Clearly, this marriage record identifies the bride, as the daughter of Jose de la Cruz Chaboya and Mariana [Anna] Vasquez, who was baptized as Juana Maria de Jesus Chaboya, at Mission Santa Clara, in 1835.⁷ The two most important components of this record is that she was referenced as a *soltera*⁸, a single woman, not having been married before, and that her parents are clearly referenced.

While I have not verified the San Jose marriage record that was cited by Smith, I do not doubt that it exists. Even though the names of the bride's parents are missing from Smith's transcription, it is probable that the parents' names are also missing from the original document. While the additional information may be helpful, it is not necessary to the analysis of the existence of the two marriages and the alleged connection between Juana Chaboya (Genave) and Mariana de Jesus Vasquez (Chaboya), the daughter of Maria Leocadia. The analysis thus follows:

This San Jose marriage took place in 1850 while the Santa Clara marriage took place in 1853. If the bride in each of these marriages were the same person, the second marriage, in 1853, would not have included the verbiage, *soltera* [single]. Minimally, had her first husband died, she would have been indicated as a *viuda* [widow]. This appearance of this type of verbiage, *viuda*, would be typical had

⁵ Evidently, this mistake was twice made, see "I'm an Indian, But Who Am I," by; Patrick Orozco, as published in the *Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology*, Vol. 17, No. 1, 1995, page 25; photocopy provided.

⁶ Marriage #3094, for Crisanto Cota & Juana Maria Chavolla, Mission Santa Clara, Marriage Register, entered 21 May 1853; Microfilm publication, Box F869.S47 S 26, V. 4, Oradre Library, Microfilm Reading Room, Santa Clara University (SCU), Santa Clara, California; photocopy provided.

⁷ Baptism #8725, for Juana Maria de Jesus Chavolla, Mission Santa Clara, Baptism Register, entered 9 Mar 1835; Microfilm publication, Box F869.S47 S 26, V. 1, SCU; photocopy provided.

⁸ *Soltera* is the Spanish word for single. Secondly, the term, being of a feminine form, indicates reference to a female.

the bride been married previously. However, the Santa Clara marriage lacks such verbiage.

Further, the Santa Clara marriage clearly identifies the parents of the bride. This fact solidly identifies this **Juana Maria Chaboya** (in the Santa Clara marriage) as the same **Juana Maria de Jesus Chaboya**, granddaughter of Maria Leocadia, an Indian from Mission Santa Clara. The very existence, and facts contained therein, of this Santa Clara marriage clearly indicate that **Juana Chaboya**, who married Alexander Genave at St Joseph's Church, *is not the same person as Juana Maria Chaboya*, who married Christano Cota at Mission Santa Clara. This Santa Clara record casts sufficient doubt on this particular link and therefore invalidates any claim made on this particular Indian ancestry.

Leandra Soto

In the same report, "The Genealogy of Patrick Orozco," Smith reports:

*"Documentation is sketchy on Leandro's ancestry and research continues on this line. Family tradition relates that Maria Viviana Soto (Torres), Dr. Alfred Kroeber's informant for Rumsen Indian myths in 1902, was Leandro's sister."*⁹

In place of the void offered in this report, on this lineage, I can offer additional information that illuminates the lineage of Leandro Soto and negates the latter statement regarding the alleged relationship between Leandro Soto and Maria Viviana Soto (Torres), Kroeber's Indian informant.

Leandra Soto was baptized at Mission Dolores (San Francisco) on April 7, 1828.¹⁰ Leandro Soto was also confirmed, in the Catholic faith, at Mission San Carlos Borromeo de Carmelo, on May 21, 1836.¹¹ Both records indicate that she was the daughter of Jose Ygnacio Soto and Maria Silveria de Jesus Lara. Neither record indicated any Indian affiliation.

According to a variety of other records, Jose Ygnacio Soto was from Loreto, in Baja California, and was a soldier at the Monterey Presidio. Maria Silveria de Jesus Lara was baptized at Mission San Carlos Borromeo de San and listed as the daughter of Jose Loreto Lara, a soldier at the Monterey Presidio, and of Maria Rosa "Zabalsa" was noted as being from Mission San Antonio. However the baptism of their daughter, Maria del Refugia Lara,¹² clearly indicates that the

⁹ Same as Footnote #1.

¹⁰ Baptism entry #407, for Leandro Soto, Mission Dolores (San Francisco), Baptism Register, entered 7 Apr 1828, Genealogical Society of Utah (GSU) Microfilm Publication #944282, 30 E. North Temple St. Salt Lake City, Utah 84150.

¹¹ Confirmation record for Maria Leandro Soto, Mission San Carlos Borromeo de Carmelo, Confirmation Register, entered 21 May 1836, GSU Microfilm Publication #913163.

¹² Baptism #2679, for Maria del Refugia Lara, entered 26 Oct 1807, GSU Microfilm Publication #913159.

reference to Mission San Antonio was referring to "Antigua" California (otherwise known as Baja, a part of Mexico). Therefore, any claim to an Indian heritage on this lineage should also be disregarded.

Dr. Alfred Kroeber's Indian informant can be readily identified as Bibiana Mucjai, the daughter of Salvador Mucjai and Inez Lopopoche, Indians at Mission San Carlos Borromeo de Carmelo. She was baptized at this same mission and was listed as the daughter of the aforementioned Indians.¹³ Her early union with Jose Joaquin de la Torre, resulting in several children, earned her the surname of Torres. Her sister, Isabel Ramona Mucjai, was the mother of Tomas Torres, which also establishes her as the aunt of Tomas Torres, J.P. Harrington's Indian informant. Bibiana was also labeled as "Soto" in some of the baptisms of her children, by another union, and by her son, by yet another union, Salvador Espinosa. Salvador even referred to his grandparents, Salvador and Inez, as "Soto."¹⁴ After having studied the Mission San Carlos records, I found ample evidence that it was common for many Indians to take on Spanish surnames as a means of survival in a severe caste society.

Therefore, by virtue of the multitude of evidence I have gathered regarding the Mucjai family, as the tribal genealogist of Ohlone/Costanoan Esselen Nation, I can absolutely verify that there is no blood connection whatsoever between Leandra Soto and "Maria Viviana Soto." Any inference that there exists any type of blood relation between these two individuals should be totally disregarded.

Again, in the same report, "The Genealogy of Patrick Orozco," Smith reports:

"Frank Rios... it appears that members of his mother's family [Leandra Soto] were contributors to ethnographic studies by Dr. Kroeber and J. P. Harrington on Rumsen culture and language."¹⁵ [Emphasis is author's]

Considering the aforementioned clarifications, this erroneous assumption should also be disregarded.

Jose Francisco Rios

Smith correctly identifies Jose Francisco Rios as the son of Francisco (Santos) Rios and Leandra Soto, in the same genealogy report. However, the *Sentinal* article takes this connection one step further:

¹³ Baptism entry #3312, for Bibiana Mucjai, Mission San Carlos Borromeo de Carmelo, Baptism Register, entered 2 Dec 1823, GSU Microfilm Publication #913159.

¹⁴ Upon request, supporting documentation or citation, for these stated facts, will be provided.

¹⁵ "The Genealogy of Patrick Orozco," prepared by Glory Anne Laffey, MA, Historian & Edith Smith, MA, June 1989, page 15; photocopy enclosed.

*"1880's: Rumsen people, from Monterey, and Mutsun people from San Juan Bautista, come together in the Pajaro Valley with the marriage of Daniela Lugo and Francisco Rios of Monterey."*¹⁶

Of course, the "Mutsun" association is already negated with the preceding section that addresses the mistaken identity of the two women with similar names - **Juana Chaboya**. As for the inference of the "Rumsen people, from Monterey," it is also unsubstantiated and deserves further scrutiny.

The baptism record of Jose Francisco Rios (submitted with Smith's report) lacks any indication that either parent was Indian.¹⁷ Further, of the ten children identified for Francisco Rios and Leandra Soto, nine were baptized in the Mission San Carlos Borromeo de Carmelo. None, of those nine baptism records, present any indication of an Indian, let alone Rumsen, affiliation.¹⁸ Further, none of those records confirm the alternate name, of Santos, for Francisco Rios.

In the pursuit of complete objectivity, an analysis of the mission padres' record keeping practices is pertinent to the analysis of the facts. While it might be inferred that the padres no longer kept track of who was an Indian at that point in time, such an inference would be an erroneous assumption. In the month following the baptism, of Jose Francisco Rios, another baptism entry was recorded wherein the parents were indicated as **Neofitos** [neophytes]; a term meaning converted Indians.¹⁹

Smith also transcribed an 1880 census record, for Monterey County, wherein this Rios family was listed as Indians. It has been my experience that this type of labeling is often in error or may be in reference to a nationality that is derived from another region. For example, Bibiana Mucjai, although documented as a full-blooded Indian, was marked as "White" in the 1852 California State Census.²⁰ Another example is that of Tranquilino Miranda.²¹ He was marked as "Indian" in the 1880 census, as well as being born in California. However, additional evidence - the 1860 & 1870 censuses, and the Great Voting Register for Monterey County, for the years of 1884 through 1896 - clearly indicate that he was born in Mexico. Lastly, Indians were not given the right to vote during that period. Although Tranquilino Miranda could have been an Indian from Mexico, the additional evidence, from the Great Voting Register, clearly exposes the error in that 1880 census. In conclusion of this point, the Bureau of Acknowledge and

¹⁶ Same as Footnote #3.

¹⁷ Baptism entry for Jose Francisco Rios, Mission San Carlos Borromeo de Carmelo, Baptism Register, entered 17 Jan 1864; GSU Microfilm Publication #913160; photocopy provided.

¹⁸ Upon request, supporting documentation or citation, for these stated facts, will be provided.

¹⁹ Baptism entry for Jesus Oleto, Mission San Carlos Borromeo de Carmelo, Baptism Register, entered 15 Feb 1864; GSU Microfilm Publication #913160; Photocopy provided

²⁰ Upon request, supporting documentation or citation, for these stated facts, will be provided.

²¹ Ibid.

Research, a branch of the Department of the Interior, does not accept government census records alone as proof of Indian heritage.

Further, Smith mentioned a possibility of a connection with an Indian, by the name of "Francisco (Santos) Rios" who died in 1885 but also indicated that any connection would be unlikely. She indicated that this "Francisco Santos Rios" would have to have been 14 at the time of fathering Frank Rios. (This assumes a birth year of 1850 for that individual, the father). Considering that the birth year of the eldest child of Francisco Rios and Leandra Soto was 1847, this definitely eliminates the latter Indian "Francisco Santos Rios" as a possibility.

Lastly, Smith recommended further investigation into another family allegedly created by Francisco Santos Rios. In summation, she wrote, "Further research is indicated in this area." It is my opinion that such a search is neither relevant nor necessary in view of the additional information already provided, in the 1870 Federal census, for Monterey County: This 1870 census lists Francisco Rios, 45 years old, with his wife, Leandra Soto, 40 years old, and four of their children.²² In this particular census, not only is he marked as "W" (for White), he is marked as being a "*citizen*," a status not bestowed upon Native Americans in that era.

While I do not propose that this single census be the sole foundation for dismissing any Native American heritage for Francisco Rios, that type of conclusion remains as unlikely when it is combined with other mounting pieces of evidence. One such piece of evidence is the baptism record of one Jose Francisco Rios, born in 1824, at the San Diego Presidio. The assumed birth year of the Francisco Rios, listed in the 1870 census, and the birth year of Jose Francisco Rios, born in San Diego, are close enough to substantiate that this connection is a more reliable conclusion. If this is a correct match, the lineages of this individual clearly lead to Mexico and are completely documented.²³ However, without further evidence of Francisco Rios' parents (for example, a marriage record between Francisco Rios and Leandra Soto that states the names of his parents or his origin), this connection remains in the realm of "probable" rather than absolute.

Therefore, in view of the available evidence and lack of any other supporting evidence to this claim, any claims based on the aforementioned assumption should also be disregarded.

Mary Dixon "Mamita"

²² 1870 Federal US Census, Schedule 1, Inhabitants in City of Monterey, Monterey Township, in the County of Monterey, State of California, pages 360 A&B (13-14), NA(SF)NA; photocopy provided.

²³ Upon request, supporting documentation or citation, for these stated facts, will be provided.

Independent research, conducted by Andrea Bassetti (Mary Dixon's great granddaughter) and myself, has revealed that Mary Dixon is the daughter of Petra Carpeño and David Dixon.²⁴ Further, this research has revealed legal evidence that Petra Carpeño (also known as Torango) was the daughter of Dolores Carpeño and Maria del Rosario Cano.²⁵

To date, the only evidence that exists to support the claim of an Indian identity for Petra Carpeño is the 1928 BIA Application #8136 for Eduard Romandia²⁶, a half-brother of Mary Dixon, and a undated note created by J.P. Harrington during an interview with Simplicio Pico.²⁷ This particular application claims Indian ancestry through both Eduard's parents - Petra and Jesus Romandia. However, only Petra's lineage can be considered in this report due to the fact that Eduard Romandia is directly related to Patrick Orozco only through Eduard's mother, Petra, and not Eduard's father, Jesus Romandia.

The 1928 application is not considered legal documentation. This is because the BAR considers the provided testimony as self-identification, and rightly so, that required no additional supporting legal evidence. However, the BAR does concede that it can be used to provide additional support for establishing genealogical linkages provided it does not conflict with other legal documentation.

As for this note, Arthur Harrington, who worked with his uncle, J.P. Harrington, personally presented it to Andrea Bassetti. According to Bassetti, Arthur had found this note, in his garage with other papers generated by his uncle. To date, there is no date on this note and I could not, presently, trace its origins to the microfilmed publications of the same work. Despite the lack of ability to retrace the origin of this note, it is the only reference that confirms an origin of Mission San Buena Ventura as stated on Eduard Romandia's 1928 BIA application. This note is transcribed below:

"from J. P. Harrington interview with Simplicio Pico...

At F. San Jose, Watsonville, Monterey there were several **Vensureños** -- old women. Met a Catarina at San Jose town, (older woman) **A Maria from San Jose town. Rafaela at Watsonville, Maria married to one Dolores Tolango of Sonora at Watsonville. She had a family & Maria at Monterrey married to Dolores _____, of Lower California.**

Another V. woman married in Watsonville to Manuel Manso. He had a

²⁴ Ibid.

²⁵ Baptism entry #5456, for Maria Petra Carpen, Mission San Carlos Borromeo de Carmelo, Baptism Register, entered 20 May 1855; GSU Microfilm Publication #913160.

²⁶ 1928 BIA Application #8136, for Eduard Romandia, I-31 Microfilm Series, Box 24, Pacific Region (SF) National Archives, 1000 Commodore Way, San Bruno, CA 94066.

²⁷ Original note in possession of Andrea Bassetti, contact information withheld until express permission is given by possessor; Photocopy provided.

son named Manulito and a daughter Magdalena. Manuel & wife were both from V. and married at V. before they went there. Manuel was full blood & wife was - talked fluently." [Emphasis is author's]

Census and mission evidence clearly substantiates the connection from Mary Dixon to her mother, Petra Carpeño. It also substantiates that Maria del Rosario Cano and Dolores *Carpeño* were the parents of Petra Carpeño. (Dolores Carpeño was born in Mexico according to the 1860 census.) Although some of the legal evidence provides a surname of Carpeño, there is also a census reference and some documented history that provide the name of *Torango* for this same family.²⁸ However, the text of this note suggests that they were two different families.

Despite this difference, because the Indian lineage is claimed through Petra's mother, Maria del Rosario Cano, both Bassetti and I have been investigating Mission San Buenaventura registers and have not yet found a baptism that matches that of Maria del Rosario Cano. However, Bassetti did find a death record for Maria Cano Torango. This record clearly states that she was a native of Mexico.²⁹ Although a death record can be utilized to provide additional information as to a person's origin, it is much farther removed from the actual birth event to be considered final. None the less, this is the only mission documentation we have discovered for Maria del Rosario Cano-Torango. Therefore, if weight is to be given to this death record at all, to this legal document, this record negates any claim of California Indian lineage through this person, Maria del Rosario Cano.

In face of the lack of legal evidence, there remains only a self-testimony to this Indian lineage that cannot presently be substantiated by any other discovered legal documentation, to date. Therefore, any claims of Indian ancestry through this lineage should also be disregarded unless otherwise validated by further research and the production of legal documentation.

Conclusion

Although there are other inferences that there are other Indian lineages, as reported in both the *Sentinal* article and "The Genealogy of Patrick Orozco" such as Jose Jesus Lugo, "a man of Indian stock," it is prudent to be reminded of the deficit of supporting documentation for this allegation. Smith wrote:

*"No information is presently known about the parentage of Daniella's father, Jose Jesus Lugo... As this is **probably** a Native American line,*

²⁸ Upon request, supporting documentation or citation, for these stated facts, will be provided.

²⁹ Death entry for Maria Cano Torango, Mission San Carlos Borromeo de Carmelo, Death Register, entered 18 Apr 1901, GSU Microfilm Publication #913162; photocopy provided.

