Perhaps no decade brought about as comprehensive a transformation in Los Angeles County than the 1860s. The cattle industry, the backbone of the region’s economy since its eighteenth-century beginnings, was decimated by the decline of the Gold Rush, overstocking of herds, competition from better imported breeds of animal and the dual meteorological disaster of severe flooding in the winter of 1861-62 and a succeeding drought lasting through 1865. This economic crisis contributed, along with the glacial pace and exorbitant costs of the California Land Claims process, to the gradual dissolution of most of the large-scale Spanish and Mexican-era rancho. The ramifications extended beyond economy and land tenure as Californios, the native-born Spanish-speaking population in the region, 
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We complement Paul Spitzzeri’s detailed article on ethnic and demographic changes in Los Angeles County during the 1860’s. We found that virtually all of the changes mentioned foreshadowed the future of Los Angeles County, such as the movement from a rural to an urban society, the decline of the influence of the Californios and the precipitous decline of the Indian population.

What did all this mean? What were the political and economic implications? Where was Los Angeles County in 1900? What were the differences between Los Angeles County in 1860 and 1900? We hope this produces another article by Paul.

“When ‘Media’ Meant Newspapers,” by Abe Hoffman begs the question: Are we better off today with few newspapers than we were thirty years ago with many? Many people we know get their “news” from TV or the Internet in quick sound bites, but if we want analysis in depth, we must go to our better newspapers, which unfortunately are becoming rare.

We must end this with a story about the Los Angeles Times. According to David Halberstam’s book, The Power’s That Be, Otis Chandler and John Kennedy were at a function together in 1960 and Kennedy remarked to Chandler that he thought the Los Angeles Times was one of the four worst papers in the country. As the story goes, Otis dedicated his life from that point on to make the Los Angeles Times one of the four best newspapers in the country, which in our opinion, as long as he was publisher, it was.
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also faced the dismantling of much of the culture built around the rancho.

By the 1870s, then, with a few exceptions, the great ranches were subdivided into smaller farm parcels as agriculture (particularly grain crops, vineyards, and orange and other fruit orchards) became ascendant or, in some cases, as in 1867 with what became Compton and later in the 1870s with such locations as Artesia, Downey City, and Pomona, ranch lands became early subdivisions. One of the most notable outgrowths of this change and an illustration of the land boom after 1868 was the subdivision and sale of the vast holdings of Abel Stearns, the wealthiest citizen in the county before the economic tribulations of the sixties severely affected his estate, known as the “Stearns Rancho” and encompassing much of today’s southeastern Los Angeles and central and northern Orange counties. In the city of Los Angeles, early speculators like Robert M. Widney and Prudent Beaudry were embarking on subdivision of city lots as early as 1868.1

Meanwhile, the timing for this transition from cattle to agriculture era coincided with the conclusion of the Civil War. In turn, there was a postwar population surge that, though small in comparison to the great booms that ensued after 1885, began to process of taking the county from sparsely populated frontier area to a gradually urbanized and economically important region. This growth in population meant higher land valuation and tax receipts, greater economic production and diversity, and greater investment from wealthier capitalists from San Francisco. For example, real estate values in the county, which, by 1866, after the end of the drought, were at $2.3 million dollars (in 1856 they were at $2.5 million), climbed to $3.8 million in 1868, $5.8 million in 1869, and $7 million in 1870.2 Tax assessments in the city of Los Angeles, which were at $1.4 million in 1860-61, dropped to under $900,000 in 1864-65, but rebounded to over $2 million by 1869-70.3 Ship arrivals and tonnage at the rudimentary harbor and port at San Pedro/Wilmington grew from 101 arrivals at 14,641 import and 5002 export tons in 1865 to 203 arrivals and 20,855 import and 7050 export tons five years later.4 Several new ventures launched by the end of the decade by local entrepreneurs and capitalists like Isaias W. Hellman, Phineas Banning, ex-Governors Pio Pico and John Downey, and F. P. F. Temple, as well as Widney and Beaudry, showed that Los Angeles was a nascent city with aspirations of being the hub of the American Southwest. These include the opening of the first banks, Hayward and Company (with Downey as co-owner) and Hellman, Temple and Company, founded by Hellman, Temple, and rancher William Workman, in 1868; the drilling of California’s first oil well at Pico Canyon in 1865; the building of the city’s first three-story building, Pio Pico’s hotel, “The Pico House,” which opened in 1870; the opening of the Los Angeles Gas Works and Los Angeles Woolen Mill, both in 1868; and the completion of the Los Angeles and San Pedro Railroad in September 1869.

Finally, the city and county increasingly mitigated the vestiges of violence that peaked in the late 1850s and early 1860s as the propensity for ethnic tension, vigilantism, and banditry slowed after 1865. Though there were occasional outbursts, such as the horrific Chinese Massacre of October 1871 and the final ride of bandido Tiburcio Vasquez, who was captured in the county in the spring of 1874, the city was a far different place in 1875 than it was in 1855. While some of
this may have been due to better policing and a more efficient court system, it is likely not an accident that the reduction in major forms of violence, just as with occurrence of economic, political, and social power shifts, happened precisely as demographic changes during the 1860s brought Americans and Europeans to a numerical majority.5

The best way to see how the decade’s ethnic and racial demographic change occurred is to analyze the 1860 and 1870 federal censuses and identify where and among who these changes were most significantly manifest.

Census taking is, of course, hardly an exact science, but an important function for, among other things, determining the number of representatives a state has in Congress. In fact, the 1850 census, actually taken early in 1851, because California statehood had just come in September 1850, and done so in the throes of Gold Rush-era flux, was deemed to be so poor that the state commissioned its own census in 1852 and political considerations largely drove this decision. Consequently, a dramatic difference in returns was shown, although some of this was, undoubtedly, attributable to continued population growth. In Los Angeles County, the early 1851 federal enumeration recorded 3,530 persons, but the state census, a year-and-a-half later, totaled nearly 8,000 persons. Clearly, the population of the county did not increase nearly that much and the number of Indians tallied in the state census, 3,693, was far greater than that of the 1850 enumeration, which was only a little over 300.6

Presumably, as the furor of the Gold Rush subsided by 1860 and post-Civil War emigrants were increasingly composed of families, rather than single men, who made Los Angeles a generally permanent destination, we can assume this made the task of the census taker much easier. We could also posit that the census takers in 1860 and 1870 were better trained than their counterparts from 1850 and 1852. Still, we have to also make the assumption that some unknown percentage of county residents was missed in any census taking process. As noted above, certain pieces of information, including the age and value of the land and personal property of residents, have to be questioned. Additionally, there is the problem, especially in the case of one enumerator in the 1860 census, of misspelled names, mainly among the Spanish-speaking community. Even those familiar with Spanish-language given names and surnames will be puzzled, annoyed, and amused by the fanciful and imaginative renderings made in that enumeration.

Yet, these 1860 and 1870 censuses are the best source we have for tracking demographic change in Los Angeles in the crucial years of the 1860s. What makes these censuses more easily comparable than any other set of enumerations before 1900 is that the number of townships and their general boundaries are mainly unchanged.7 Townships were jurisdictions set up to provide for a post office and judicial apparatus, meaning a Justice of the Peace and his court and constables to patrol the area, in unincorporated areas of counties. Los Angeles was the only incorporated community in the county, which is why there is a city enumeration and a separate township in the areas around the original Spanish grant of four square leagues (approximately 18,000 acres) that comprised the city before the days of aggressive annexation that came toward the end of the century. Here is a list of the enumerated townships from 1860 and 1870 with their analogs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1860</th>
<th>1870</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Azusa</td>
<td>Azusa district in El Monte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Monte</td>
<td>El Monte/Azusa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA City</td>
<td>LA City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Township</td>
<td>LA Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Nietos</td>
<td>Los Nietos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Gabriel</td>
<td>San Gabriel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Juan</td>
<td>San Juan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Pedro</td>
<td>Wilmington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Ana</td>
<td>Anaheim (in Santa Ana)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tejon</td>
<td>Soledad</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Generally speaking, the townships were geographically organized in the following ways:

Azusa
Comprised the northern portion of the
eastern San Gabriel Valley (that is, north of today’s Interstate 10), east of the San Gabriel River and including the modern cities of Azusa, Glendora, Irwindale, northern Covina, Baldwin Park and West Covina, and areas of unincorporated Los Angeles County.

**El Monte**
Covering areas on both sides of the San Gabriel River, north from the Whittier Narrows, west from present Monterey Park, City of Commerce, and East Los Angeles, east into today’s La Puente and City of Industry and south from approximately today’s San Bernardino (I-10) Freeway, chiefly modern El Monte, South El Monte, and unincorporated county areas and flood control lands around the Whittier Narrows Dam.

**Anaheim/Santa Ana**
Specifically covering the area in and around the original 1857 subdivision of the German cooperative settlement on the Rancho Santa Ana and immediately adjacent areas.

**Los Angeles City**
The original four-square league grant created in 1781 and essentially running from present Elysian Park on the north to the Boyle Heights/East Los Angeles border on the east, south to the Rancho San Antonio (modern Bell, Cudahy, Vernon) and a western line extending near U. S. C. and up Figueroa Street.

**Los Angeles Township**
Included the areas west of the city to the ocean at Santa Monica/Pacific Palisades/Venice, north into Glendale, Burbank and the San Fernando Valley and portions of what is now East Los Angeles.

**Los Nietos**
From Whittier Narrows on the south to Whittier, La Habra, and western Orange County on the east, to eastern Long Beach on the south, and westward in present Downey, Norwalk, Bellflower to approximately where the 710 Freeway is located.

**San Gabriel**
Embracing the areas in and around the Mission San Gabriel, westward into modern Alhambra and South Pasadena, northward to the foothill communities below the San Gabriel Mountains, eastward to the San Gabriel River, and southward to approximately the 10 Freeway.

**San Jose**
The area in and around present Walnut, Pomona, Claremont, San Dimas, and La Verne from approximately the 57 Freeway on the west to the county line on the east and the San Gabriel Mountains on the north to county lines on the south.

**San Juan**
The extreme southeastern part of the county (now southeastern Orange County) in and around the Mission San Juan Capistrano and covering such modern locales as San Juan Capistrano, the misnamed Mission Viejo, Aliso Viejo, Laguna Niguel, and San Clemente.

**San Pedro/Wilmington**
Comprising most of today’s South Bay, but centered at what became Los Angeles Harbor, modern Long Beach, the Palos Verdes Peninsula and lands northward to Los Angeles city. In 1870, Compton was a district enumerated within the Wilmington township.

**Santa Ana**
Comprising most of today’s central and northern Orange County from the Puente Hills on the north and such communities as La Habra, Brea, Placentia, Yorba Linda and Anaheim Hills, to modern Santa Ana, Westminster, and Huntington Beach on the south.

**Soledad/Tejon**
Covering the vast, but very sparsely populated areas of northern Los Angeles County, north of the San Fernando Valley and covering a few settled areas such as Newhall (Santa Clarita) and the San Fernando oil district, Gorman, Lebec, and, in 1860, Fort Tejon and the Tejon Ranch, which contained a large Indian reservation in the “Sinks of Tejon.” With the formation of Kern County in 1866, however, much of the far northern areas, including the fort, were removed from Los Angeles County, though the fort’s heyday as a Civil War outpost was over and there was subsequent little effect on the county’s population. There were also small mining communities in and around the Antelope
Valley that were part of these townships.

In analyzing census enumeration work-
sheets, a tally was made to capture the
number of males and females, partly to note
gender disparity and partly to check totals
with ethnicity tabulations, and the ethnicity
of residents based on the birthplace noted
on the sheets. The ethnic terminology used
is “American” to denote a person born in
the United States who was not identified as
anything other than “white” on the sheet;
“European,” in which a European country
(or, in the case, of Germans, the smaller state
or principality that existed before German
unification in 1871, while with those listed
as French, it was clear that a great many of
them, probably a solid majority, were French
Basque with Spanish-language surnames,
but it was decided to still identify them as
“European”) was identified as the birth-
place; “Californio,” meaning a Spanish-lang-
guage surnamed person born in California;
“Mexican,” specifically meaning a Spanish-
surnamed Mexican national; “Other Latino,”
identifying a Spanish-surnamed person born
in Texas, New Mexico, Arizona or Latin
and South American countries; “Black,” spe-
cifically coded “B” or “M” for mulatto;
“Chinese,” coded “C”; and “Indian,” coded
“I” and mostly born in California, with some
from other American states and Mexico.
Unfortunately, while Indians were enumer-
ated in specific households in the respec-
tive townships in the 1860 census, ten years
later they were lumped together so that
those presumably living within Los Angeles
city limits were placed at the end of that
enumeration, while all other Indians resid-
ing in the county were placed in the Los
Angeles township, with the exception of one
Indian enumerated at San Juan. In many
cases, an American was a child of European-
born residents, so we cannot say whether
these first-generation Americans were more
culturally one or the other. Similarly, if
a Spanish-language surnamed person had
parents born in Mexico or another Latin
country but were born in California, they
are listed as Californio. In unusual cases,
a person might have been born in Syria,
Turkey, the West Indies, “Jerusalem”, or
other places, and an effort was made to iden-
tify them as near to another ethnic termi-
nology as possible, but the numbers, a few
dozen perhaps out of 26,500 names in both
censuses, were so few, it would not affect the
percentages in the least. It was also decided
to try and enumerate how many racially or,
really, ethnically-mixed children there were.
Most of these were products of an American
or European father with a Californio or
Mexican mother, though there were some
other variations, including a fair number of
children from French Basque fathers with
Spanish-language surnames having children
with Californio or Mexican mothers.

There were two cases in the 1870 cen-
sus, in which there were smaller districts,
Azusa within the El Monte township and
Compton within the Wilmington township,
enumerated and, while these were accord-
ingly separated in individual worksheets,
they are in a footnote for the general town-
ship tables below. Also, it should be noted
that, while 1860 tabulations correspond with
the official census numbers listed in a variety
of sources, such as Pitt and Pitt’s encyclope-
dia of Los Angeles, the 1870 enumerations
vary slightly to the negative (twenty persons
among the Los Angeles city population and
seventy-nine among the county population),
but without any real effect on the results. Another minor error was noticed: in the 1870
census, the family of Jesse Yarnell, a newspa-
per publisher, was enumerated twice, once
in the Los Angeles township and once in the
city. Likewise, ex-Governor Pio Pico was
enumerated at his Rancho Paso de Bartolo
home, now Pio Pico State Historic Park, and
then again in Los Angeles, presumably in
his new Pico House hotel. This partially
explains the minor difference in enumeration
totals from the official census, which would
have left these duplications in the tally. Basic
spreadsheets show tabulations for gender
and ethnicity in the various townships:

Overall in the county, the popula-
tion increase during the 1860s was 34.5%,
although, as said above, we can be reason-
ably certain that there was a decline in the
first half of the decade before a post-Civil
War immigration surge ensued. It is
worth noting that, according to some estimates, the boom continued to the extent that, in 1875, the county was estimated to have some 30,000 residents, more than double the official 1870 census total, while the city may have reached as high as 15,000 or more. The Los Angeles city population change was slightly lower than that for the county, with a 30% gain recorded and the variation in the surrounding townships is striking.

For example, Santa Ana/Anaheim grew by 91%, the Los Angeles township surrounding the city witnessed a 124% increase in population, Los Nietos mushroomed by 157%, and the San Pedro/Wilmington area boomed by 162%. Much of this growth can undoubtedly be attributed to the post-Civil War immigration and real estate boom, during which former ranchos were subdivided into valuable small farms, readily occupied and husbanded by émigrés from the devastated south. There were some declines in population. At San Juan, the attrition totaled nearly a third and was a quarter at San Gabriel, while the change at Soledad/Tejon measured 71% in the negative. Much of this was due to the 90% population decline in the county’s Indian population and in their presence in 1860 at the former missions and the Tejon reservation, the latter being incorporated into Kern County in 1866. This latter change also meant the loss of Fort Tejon and other sparsely-populated sections of northern Los Angeles County. There were also small attrition rates at El Monte/Azusa and San Jose.

In the distribution of ethnic groups, there are also some notable transformations. The Spanish-surnamed population grew at a rate of about 12% during the 1860s, but there were two areas that grew significantly: the township of Los Angeles and the harbor area at San Pedro/Wilmington, although the numbers at the latter were small compared to the doubling of population in the former. It is possible that, while the Los Angeles city population of Spanish-surnamed residents grew only modestly, at 7%, that there were many from outlying areas, which saw sometimes significant decreases, mainly around 20%, who gravitated to the township around the city, and others who moved to the harbor region at San Pedro/Wilmington. Of the outlying townships, only Santa Ana/Anaheim, at 6%, and Soledad/Tejon, constituting only eight persons, saw any growth at all. How much of this change is attributable to the decline of Californio-owned ranchos is tan-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Township</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Amer</th>
<th>Euro</th>
<th>Californio</th>
<th>Mexican</th>
<th>Ltno</th>
<th>Blk</th>
<th>Chine</th>
<th>Indian</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Mix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Azusa</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Monte</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>1004</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.A. city</td>
<td>2591</td>
<td>1794</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>1502</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>4385</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.A. town</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>1231</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Nietos</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Gabriel</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Juan</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Pedro</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Ana</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tejon</td>
<td>817</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>920</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>6881</td>
<td>4452</td>
<td>2204</td>
<td>1156</td>
<td>3846</td>
<td>1876</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>11333</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: 1860 Federal Census population of Los Angeles County by Township
talizingly elusive.

Meanwhile, in the European and American population, there was a significant change, with two-and-a-half times the numbers present in 1870 that there were a decade before. Most notable is that, while the city of Los Angeles saw the greatest net increase of persons and did barely become, at 50.4%, the majority ethnic group in the town, the township of Los Nietos had an amazing transformation. Only two dozen Americans and Europeans resided in the area in 1860, but over 1,000 of them settled there by ten years later. Again, we can assume that the vast majority of these persons came after 1865 and a glance at enumeration sheets shows that the lion’s share of these new arrivals consisted of Southerners. Given that the township had fertile farm lands from the former ranchos held by the Nieto heirs and ex-Governor Pio Pico and that, in the El Nino winter of 1867-68, the San Gabriel River changed course and, instead of veering westward to empty into the Los Angeles River, it took a southward course to overtake the Coyote Creek coming from present northern Orange County, one can readily see the possibilities new settling farmers saw in using the river for irrigating small farms and orchards.13 By 1870, shipping at Anaheim Landing, where the San Gabriel emptied into the ocean also provided the farmers of the Los Nietos township ready access to shipping of their products.

Similarly, there were significant increases in the American and European populations in Santa Ana/Anaheim, where the large ranchos held by Abel Stearns were

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Township</th>
<th>1860</th>
<th>1870</th>
<th>net diff.</th>
<th>% chg.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>El Monte/Azusa</td>
<td>1367</td>
<td>1254</td>
<td>-113</td>
<td>-8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles city</td>
<td>4385</td>
<td>5708</td>
<td>1323</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>1231</td>
<td>2757</td>
<td>1526</td>
<td>124.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Nietos</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>1544</td>
<td>949</td>
<td>156.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Gabriel</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>-150</td>
<td>-25.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>-29</td>
<td>-6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Juan</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>-216</td>
<td>-32.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Ana/Anaheim</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>1445</td>
<td>689</td>
<td>91.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Pedro/Wilmington</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>942</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>162.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soledad/Tejon</td>
<td>920</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>-655</td>
<td>-71.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11333</td>
<td>15230</td>
<td>3907</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
subdivided for sale in the late 1860s and where fertile soil attracted other newly-arriving farmers. From under 100 persons, the township increased by nearly 900 more at the end of the decade. A small portion of the change is also due to the growth of the settlement of Anaheim. Founded by German viticulturists in 1857, the township

new district of Compton attracted enough settlement to merit a post office and a separate listing on the enumeration sheets of the June and July 1870 census. 14

At San Juan and San Jose, though the numbers were much smaller, there were major influxes of American and Europeans settlers, as well. In the case of San Jose, Louis Phillips, who purchased Ricardo Vejar’s southern half of the Rancho San Jose, encouraged members of her family and other El Monteans to establish a settlement, which took the name of Spadra, after hotel proprietor William W. Rubottom’s hometown of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Township</th>
<th>1860</th>
<th>1870</th>
<th>net diff.</th>
<th>% chg.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>El Monte/Azusa</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles city</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>862</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Nietos</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Gabriel</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Juan</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Ana/Anaheim</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Pedro/Wilmington</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>87.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soledad/Tejon</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5857</td>
<td>6547</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: American/European Population Change by Township

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Township</th>
<th>1860</th>
<th>1870</th>
<th>net diff.</th>
<th>% chg.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>El Monte/Azusa</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles city</td>
<td>1571</td>
<td>2878</td>
<td>1307</td>
<td>83.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>1135</td>
<td>897</td>
<td>376.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Nietos</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1140</td>
<td>1116</td>
<td>4650.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Gabriel</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>605.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Juan</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>615.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Ana/Anaheim</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>874</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>829.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Pedro/Wilmington</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>575.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soledad/Tejon</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>-250</td>
<td>-62.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3360</td>
<td>8127</td>
<td>4767</td>
<td>141.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Spadra Bluffs, Arkansas. In 1867, Rubottom joined F. P. F. Temple in creating a cut-off road from Los Angeles to San Bernardino that took a southerly path through such ranchoes as San Antonio, Temple’s La Merced, the La Puente, owned by Temple’s father-in-law, William Workman and partner John Rowland, and the San Jose. Within a few years, there was a postoffice, cemetery (which still exists in present Pomona), school, and a depot for the new eastern branch of the Southern Pacific Railroad, though the town was gradually enveloped into the new town site of Pomona, established in 1875.

Lastly, while there were modest gains in El Monte, remembering that at least some of the American and European residents of this township left to settle in Spadra after 1866, and in San Gabriel, where, presumably, there were more farmers entering the area as ranchoes within the township’s boundaries were subdivided.

Because of their small numbers and low percentage of the population, blacks, Chinese, and Indians are represented together and, for the former two groups, it seemed helpful to note that these populations were overwhelmingly represented in the Los Angeles city population. Also, while the black community only grew very slightly, reminding that emancipation from slavery did not at all mean the ability to emigrate long distances, the Chinese population received a significant boost by 1870. Much of this growth is likely attributable to the importation of laborers to build the Los Angeles and San Pedro railroad in 1868-69, after these workers completed their work on the Central Pacific portion of the transcontinental railroad. Notably, the growing presence of Chinese led to greatly exacerbated tensions in the Plaza area of Los Angeles, culminating in October 1871 in the notorious massacre of nineteen Chinese by a mixed mob of Californios, Mexicans, Americans, and Europeans. Notably, the Chinese population not only stayed in the city, but their numbers grew throughout the decade, particularly as railroad projects, including the building of Southern Pacific Railroad lines from 1873 and the 1875 construction of the Los Angeles and Independence Railroad. As regards the Indian population, the 89% drop in their numbers is both sad and unsurprising. As noted above, the 1860 enumeration listed them in the locations in which they lived, but the returns ten years later showed county Indians enumerated in segregated pages in the Los Angeles city and township districts. One major factor in their decline was, undoubtedly, epidemics of diseases, such as the smallpox outbreak of 1863. Another significant factor would have been the relocation (forced and voluntary) of some Indians out of the county and the reapportionment of the Tejon reservation from Los Angeles County to Kern County in 1866.

In the literature that covers the Los Angeles County area during the 1860s, there is mention made of demographic change, notably in the fact that, in the 1870 census, Americans and Europeans outnumbered Spanish-surnamed residents for the first time.

Table 6: Black, Chinese, & Indian Population Change by Township

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>1860</th>
<th>1870</th>
<th>net diff.</th>
<th>% chg.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>1337.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>-1800</td>
<td>-89.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2116</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>-1560</td>
<td>-73.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacks in LA</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacks elsewhere</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese in LA</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>1176.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese elsewhere</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1966.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>1337.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

time and reflecting, therefore, the growing Americanization of the region. Yet, we can see from the analysis of county census returns that the greatest degree of growth in the American and European population was not in the city of Los Angeles, which only accounted for slightly more than a quarter of the increase and only the sixth highest percentage change of ten county districts. Rather much higher percentages of growth was found in the Los Angeles township surrounding the city, in the township of Los Nietos, in today’s southeastern section of the county, where almost as many Americans and Europeans moved to as did in the city of Los Angeles; in the Anaheim/Santa Ana township, now central Orange County; and in the San Pedro/Wilmington area near the county’s main port of call. With the probable exception of the latter, the areas that showed the greatest influx of Americans and Europeans were fertile farming areas newly opened up to purchase and settlement after the demise of the large-scale Spanish and Mexican-era cattle ranchos.

With regard to the Spanish-surnamed population of the county, there was not a population decline, but rather a modest increase of about 12%. While the percentage of growth in the city of Los Angeles was small, only about 7%, there was, significantly, a doubling of those who resided in the township surrounding the city. It is not immediately obvious why this phenomenon occurred. There may have been something of a “brown flight” away from the city to nearby farms and settlements. Perhaps Spanish-surnamed persons from outlying districts, especially as ranchos were lost, sold, and subdivided, moved into the Los Angeles township, given that their numbers in five of the ten districts dropped, ranging from losses of 17% to 28%. Outside of Los Angeles township, the only area that saw a notable increase was San Pedro/Wilmington, an area that was growing with the expansion of the harbor and transport (chiefly, the Los Angeles and San Pedro Railroad) facilities there. It is hard, however, to argue from the numbers that there was a wholesale replacement of Spanish-surnamed persons by Americans and Europeans anywhere in the county, with the notable exception of Los Nietos. There, the number of Spanish-surnamed persons...
surnamed residents dropped by about 100 persons, while more than 1,000 Americans and Europeans, many from the American South, who would appear to have come in the aftermath of the devastation of the Civil War, flooded into the township.

For each district, it is interesting to note the decade’s demographic transformations. In El Monte/Azusa, Americans and Europeans in 1860 comprised a majority of 55% compared to 36% Spanish-surnamed and a little less than 10% Indian, most of these confined to the area around the original site of the Mission San Gabriel, and known as Mission Vieja, in present South El Monte or at Henry Dalton’s Rancho de Azusa. Ten years later, the American and European majority was just above two-thirds, while the Spanish-surnamed constituted a little over 30%. Any Indians still remaining at Mission Vieja or at Azusa were, of course, lumped into the general accounting in 1870.15

In Los Angeles city, the numerical majority of Americans and Europeans comprised about 440 persons, while in the surrounding Los Angeles township, Spanish-surnamed persons had a slightly smaller majority of 377. There were also 150 more Chinese in Los Angeles city, almost all of whom resided in the declining Calle de los Negros area east of the old Plaza and who were the targets, barely a year after the 1870 census, of one of the worst race-related riots and lynchings in America.

At San Gabriel, the Spanish-surnamed majority of 44% of all residents in 1860 was transformed into a 55% majority of Americans and Europeans. This was greatly affected, though, by the absence of Mission Indians recorded specifically in the township in 1870, whereas ten years before they constituted almost 30% of the populace. Similarly, at San Juan, another township with a significant Indian population associated with a mission, a third of its residents were Indian in 1860, so the majority of the Spanish-surnamed population in 1860 of 64% was transformed to almost 80% ten years later.

At San Jose, there was a heavy majority of Spanish-surnamed residents in 1860, amounting to 78%, but this numerical dominance dropped about ten percent in ten years, as more Americans and Europeans moved into the township, mainly in the settlement of Spadra.

In Santa Ana/Anaheim, the number of Spanish-surnamed residents was only slightly higher in 1870 than in the previous census, while Americans and Europeans rocketed from just under 100 to almost 900. Therefore, a 70% majority of Spanish-surnamed residents in 1860, with the small German settlement of Anaheim comprising the vast majority of the American and European population, was transformed into a 60% majority of Americans and Europeans in 1870, many of these, presumably, occupying farm plots carved from former ranchos.

At San Pedro/Wilmington in 1860 46% of the population were Spanish-surnamed, a quarter were American and European, 26% were Indian, and there were five blacks and two Chinese. Ten years later, the Spanish-surnamed population was 32%, the American and European majority was 65%, and there were five blacks and eighteen Chinese, some perhaps recruited for building the railroad, which was completed in September 1869, less than a year before the census was taken.

Finally, in 1860, the vast, remote, and sparsely-settled northern county was the Tejon district, but its two major population centers consisted of the “Sinks of Tejon” Indian reservation and the military outpost at Fort Tejon, both of which were incorporated into the new county of Kern in 1866. Consequently, what had been in 1860 a township of 920 residents, 45% of them Indians, 43% American and European, and 11% Spanish-surnamed, dwindled to only 265 persons ten years later. Some of these were in the new settlement called Petrolioopolis, later the San Fernando oil district, which emerged after the drilling of the first oil well at Pico Canyon in 1865. There were also miners in the Soledad mining district, in such places as San Francisquito Canyon, east of Newhall, and scattered sites in the Antelope Valley; as well as a small contingent of farmers throughout the town-
ship. In the Soledad township in 1870, 57% of residents were American and European and 42% were Spanish-surnamed. Again, no Indians were enumerated locally.

In conclusion many histories of early American-era Los Angeles and its environs refer to the significant changes that affected the county during the 1860s. With the end of the glory years of the Gold Rush, the floods and droughts that decimated the cattle industry, to the ascendancy of agriculture, the torturous process of California land claims, the dissolution of the large-scale rancho, and the early stages of the development and population boom that brought early urbanization and suburbanization to the region through the mid-1870s, Los Angeles County was enmeshed in transformative change.

Although general references have been made to demography, particularly in noting the emergence of the American and European majority, little has been known about the specifics of population change during the interesting and crucial era. This study’s examination of the 1860 and 1870 censuses, the only two of the nineteenth-century that are directly comparable, gives us the best, if somewhat inevitably flawed, view of this change. It is notable that, while the city of Los Angeles did experience a surge in American and European population growth, so that 50.4% of its residents came from this broad group, there were even greater proportions of growth in such outlying areas as Los Nietos, which added almost as many Americans and Europeans as the city of Los Angeles during the decade, Santa Ana/Anaheim, San Pedro/Wilmington, and the Los Angeles township surrounding the city. It is also important to note the precipitous decline of the Indian population. Noting that this community was depleted in half between the 1852 state census and the 1860 federal census, more than 90% of those present in 1860 were gone only ten years later. Also of significance out of proportion to their numbers was the rise of a small, but widely disliked Chinese community. There were new settlements at Anaheim, Compton, Spadra, and Wilmington to account for, improvements at San Pedro Harbor, the establishment of Camp Drum during the Civil War, the completion of the Los Angeles and San Pedro Railroad, and the reapportionment of the Tejon Indian reservation.

and military outpost at Fort Tejon to Kern County in mid-decade, as well.

Rather than merely a statistical exercise, the examination of the 1860 and 1870 censuses for Los Angeles County provides another way to understand just how important the decade was for the region and helps us appreciate what was to transpire in the years ahead.

Notes

1 See U.S. General Land Office, “Lands in Los Angeles County,” issued in July 1869 to advertise the “Stearns Ranchos” and which provides statistical information on Los Angeles city and county. An interesting early example of a real estate prospectus in the Los Angeles area is “Prospectus for the Sale of Los Angeles Lands” (San Francisco: Bacon & Co.,) 1869. The pamphlet was issued in September 1869 to advertise a subdivision of two hundred city lots by Prudent Beaudry, who was mayor of the city in the mid-1870s. Unlike the relatively simple terms of real estate transactions previously, Beaudry’s method of monthly installments, his paying of taxes, assessments and rates for the owner, who would then repay him at 1 ½% interest per month, clauses preventing the removal of existing improvements without Beaudry’s consent, conditions for voiding the contract, advance payment options, and others signifies the growing sophistication of the real estate market by 1870.


3 [J.M. Guinn], Illustrated History of Los Angeles County (Chicago: Lewis Publishing Co., 1889), 294-.

4 Hawley, “The Present Condition, Growth, Progress, and Advantages of Los Angeles City and County, Southern California,” 27.


6 This included 4,093 “whites,” which included Mexicans and Californios, forty-five blacks and mulattos, and 3,693 Indians, the latter surpassing the entire enumeration of the 1850 census. La Estrella de Los Angeles, the Spanish-language version of the newspaper The Los Angeles Star, 27 November 1852 and J.M. Guinn, A History of California and an
7 For example, neither the 1850 or 1852 censuses incorporated township breakdowns. By 1880, the number of townships had increased to thirty-one, making direct comparisons to the 1870 difficult.

8 The analysis was made from scans of original sheets which were posted on the web site of Ancestry.com. Each page was double checked, so that number of persons recorded on the sheet was matched to those numbers recorded for gender and race/ethnicity.

9 In Camarillo’s *Chicanos in a Changing Society*, table 10, 118, he shows the Los Angeles city total as 8,504. On 116, he also gives slightly different figures from those in this study concerning the number of Blacks, Chinese, and Indians in both censuses. Guinn, *A History of California and an Extended History of Its Southern Coast Counties*, 297, shows the Los Angeles city populations in 1860 as 4,399 and in 1870 at 5,614 while the county is 15,309 in 1870. These all vary from the table “Population, 1781-1990” from Leonard and Dale Pitt, *Los Angeles from A to Z* (Berkley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1996), 403.

10 It should be added that there was an 1863 smallpox epidemic that took the lives of hundreds of persons, most, evidently, from the *California*, Mexican, and Indian populations.


12 Del Castillo in *Los Angeles Barrio*, 34-35, he gives the total of the “Mexican-American” population in 1860 as 2,069 and in 1870 as 2,160, compared to my enumeration of 2,281 and 2,442, respectively. Camarillo, table 10, 118, however, provides figures of 2,565 in 1860 and 2,131 in 1870. On Table 6, 40, Del Castillo lists the Mexican-born population as 640 in 1860 and 615 in 1870. This study enumerated 720 in 1860 and 662 in 1870.

13 See, for example, Ludwig Louis Salvator, *Los Angeles in the Sunny Seventies*, 164-65 and Cleland, *Cattle on a Thousand Hills*, 175, for descriptions of Los Nietos.

14 The Compton district had 160 residents in 1870. A little under 60% were male and 83% were American and European (almost 90% of these being American-born), while the remainder were Spanish-surnamed.

15 The Azusa district in El Monte township had, in 1870, 320 persons, of whom 60% were male and 65% were American or European (94% of these being American-born), while 34% were Spanish-surnamed (there being three Chinese, as well.)
When “Media” Meant Newspapers
by Abraham Hoffman

Before television and radio became the primary means of reporting the issues of the day, people looked to newspapers for their information. Unlike the present time, when major cities are dominated by one “supernewspaper” that attempts to reach all audiences, people in the early 20th century could choose from a broad selection of newspaper editorial opinions. In California, the larger cities offered four or five newspapers, each with a particular point of view and a personal approach to journalism that made them controversial and, at times, downright vicious.

During the Progressive Era, San Francisco hosted five major newspapers—the Call, Bulletin, Chronicle, Examiner, and News. Each paper reflected the personalities of its publisher or editor. For example, the Bulletin, edited by Fremont Older, led the attack against Boss Abraham Ruef and political corruption. By contrast, the Call was an extremely conservative journal. The Chronicle represented the Republican viewpoint. William Randolph Hearst published the Examiner and in many ways gave it a modern look—the first eight-page newspaper in the state, an emphasis on sensationalism, and a fighter in circulation wars. Edward W. Scripps began the San Francisco News with a liberal orientation.

In the southern part of the state, Los Angeles in the first decade of the 20th century saw no less than seven newspapers being published, reflecting the enormous growth of the city and the intense competition for newspaper readership. The Evening Express, edited by Edward A. Dickson, championed the progressive cause. On the conservative side, the Times, owned by Harrison Gray Otis and edited by his son-in-law, Harry Chandler, was militantly anti-union and supported the conservative wing of the Republican party. In 1903 William Randolph Hearst started the Examiner as a competitor with the Times for morning circulation, a rivalry that went on for six decades until the two papers cut a deal in 1962 that made the Herald-Examiner the city’s only afternoon paper. The Times in turn folded the Mirror, a paper the company had started in 1948, leaving the Times as the city’s only morning newspaper until the upstart Daily News challenged it three decades later.

Other Los Angeles newspapers in the Progressive Era included Samuel T. Clover’s News, the liberal Scripps’s Record, Hearst’s Herald, and the Tribune. Occasionally some enterprising businessman would attempt to begin a paper, but most efforts were short-lived. By the 1930s the News, Record, and Tribune were gone, leaving only the Illustrated Daily News (later shortened to Daily News) as the city’s only paper to support the Democratic party and liberal causes. Its run ended in December 1954 when it was taken over by the Times-Mirror Company and combined with the Mirror to form the Mirror-News. Hearst’s Herald, an afternoon paper, took over the Express in December 1931 and became the Herald-Express, a name that endured until the 1962 deal that retitled it the Herald-Examiner.

The McClatchy family owned another important chain of newspapers in California. Charles K. McClatchy established the Sacramento Bee and followed it with the Modesto Bee and Fresno Bee as a Central Valley newspaper chain. Generally progressive in its editorial policy, the Bee chain supported Theodore Roosevelt for President in 1912, and Hiram Johnson for governor in 1910. Its blind spot, prejudice against Japanese Americans, marred an otherwise high standard of journalism.

Smaller cities at the beginning of the 20th century, such as San Diego, with the Union (a Spreckels family paper) and the Sun (a Scripps paper), and Santa Barbara, with the News and the Press, demonstrated that journalism in these growing resort cities was an enterprise that competed for readers. Across San Francisco Bay, the Oakland Tribune began publication in 1874. The Knowland fam-
ily bought it in 1915. It remained for many years the leading newspaper on the East Bay. Other towns offered weekly newspapers that were often owned by one person who acted as both editor and publisher. The Bridgeport Chronicle-Union went beyond the city limits to report on events in Mono County; the Inyo Register, based in Bishop and owned for many years by W.A. Chalfant, did the same for much of the eastern Sierra in competition with the Inyo Independent.

The sense of personal journalism to be found in the newspapers of the time may well astonish the modern reader. Perhaps the most controversial publisher was Harrison Gray Otis of the Los Angeles Times. Otis viewed Los Angeles as a creation of his own making, and he had no patience with differing views. He was especially vicious towards labor unions and the labor movement. His editorials blasted unions and their members as sluggers, rowdies, bullies, gas-pipe ruffians, brutes, roughnecks, anarchists, pinheads, blatherskites, and skunks, terms found in just a brief survey of Times editorials of the early 1900s. Otis belittled members of the City Council, progressives, and socialists, insulting them in a fashion that today would be considered libelous. Editors of other papers who opposed Otis responded in kind, though not quite down to Otis’s level.

Los Angeles newspapers squabbled so much over such issues as the construction of the Owens River-Los Angeles Aqueduct, the qualifications of various political candidates, and the labor movement grew so bad in the early 1900s that city residents despaired over ever reading objective news stories. In 1911 the voters approved the creation of a municipally owned newspaper—the first and perhaps only metropolitan newspaper published by a city government. For two years the Municipal News offered a weekly summary of newsworthy municipal affairs, reported with painstaking fairness. The editorial page contained no less than four parallel columns—Republican, Democratic, Progressive, and Socialist—commenting on public issues. It was a fascinating experiment in the direction the progressive move-

ment might go, but publication ceased in 1913 when the city government eliminated the paper’s budget.

The newspaper coverage of the early 20th century focused attention on issues that would have far-reaching effect on Californians. Political corruption, municipal services, water resource development, and streetcar franchises aroused public attention and discussion. Between 1900 and 1930 newspapers provided a forum for debate, particularly for questions of strife and radicalism. Whatever their political orientation, newspaper readers in California could get their own two cents’ worth of events of the day for, well, two cents, the usual price of a newspaper at the time.

One final anecdote may reveal just how intense was the loyalty of some newspaper readers as well as their animosity to the papers they disliked. As a college student working at the Los Angeles Central Library in the 1950s, I manned the newspaper desk as part of my duties. One evening an elderly woman came to the desk and requested the latest issue of the San Francisco Chronicle. Someone else was reading it, so in all innocence I offered her the San Francisco Examiner. With a most audible sniff as if I had presented her with a heap of garbage, she said vehemently, “I do not read Hearst publications.”
Ode to the Pioneers

There was nothin’ doin’ in Ohio for sure,
California beckoned all
To begin a new life was the only cure,
to answer a much higher call.
The call was for freedom, a new start on life,
the Golden State, answer to dreams.
Just leave the old farm, the hard work and strife,
the right decision was made, it sure seems.
But riches don’t happen to fall from the sky;
frustration and hard work were part
of his efforts to reach his goals that were high,
and create a new life, a new start.
An odd job was worked, one here and one there,
but times were tough for all.
So at night he’d pick up his guitar with care,
and sing to himself and the wall.
But a voice like his, it had to be heard,
he was too good to just sing at home.
He could write songs and yodel just like a bird,
weren’t long... he wasn’t alone,
For there were many men who could pick guitar
and sing a good hillbilly song.
But most would never become a great star
and now are forgotten and gone.
But some had the grit and the talent was there
to be noticed from all the rest.
Some had the genius which is always so rare,
and they were always at their best.
A chance meeting of three special men one night
was really the start of it all.
They knew they could sing but wages were slight,
and the Depression took its toll.
For each had to work and help pay the rent,
as living was hard on all.
What little each had was too often spent,
They waited three years for “the call.”

On L.A. radio this group sang their stuff,
then added Hugh and Carl Farr.
The rich mellow tones on “The Last Round-up”
was the start of their rising star.
“Tumbling Tumbleweeds” was a fantastic song,
and it sounds just as good today.
“Cool Water” the next big hit to come along
made their time and hard work pay.
The Sons of the Pioneers were really hot,
and they were much in demand.
Their sound and their songs were requested and sought,
this group was now in command.
Their singing was wanted in movies, of course, as Hollywood made its call. They could sing ballads in jail or on a horse, this group was at ease with it all. They did a few back up songs with Gene Autry, and a Charles Starrett film. A cowboy singer was added, Pat Brady, as Leonard left for a new realm. Of course he returned throughout the years as a reigning movie star. And the group he helped start. The Sons of the Pioneers, traveled in film just as far. Roy Rogers was King of the Cowboys, you see, and Leonard Slye a name of the past. Roy and the pioneers sang frequently, and their friendship was to last throughout the years. Republic films and the fairs; their fame continued to grow. It showed in their songs, the style, the care, their sound is unique, we know.

Somewhere in the depths of one’s soul there’s a seed, creating that special thought. The mind who penned “Tumbling Tumbleweeds” could not foresee what he wrought. For there existed another sense I am told within genius, they’re only a few. A spiritualness with the past, oh so bold, with the desert, the cowboy, he knew. Bob Nolan could sing and write a great song. He could ride and rope a horse too. Understanding the ways of the West, now near gone, lonely feelings of past were made new. The sadness, the passing of old western times written in music and verse. His melodies more than just notes and fine rhymes, his writing realistic and terse. Said young Leonard Slye to Tim Spencer one day, “Let’s get Bob Nolan to sing the songs that we love; we’ll do ‘em our way.” Wasn’t long till they were practicing. Their harmonizing style which slowly took shape, a new western sound was born. From the prairie life which they could not escape, and the cowboy, so lonesome, so forlorn. Now the Pioneer Trio was lookin’ for work, they could pick well and carry a tune. For all of ‘em was always on the alert to make pocket change they’d sure croon. At a bar or a party or on radio too, they never made much on their own.
As a threesome, together, soon they just knew,
as a group they were better than one.
Tho’ each had his own particular sound,
they respected each other’s style.
And soon they were tops, the best singers around,
’tis no wonder they had time to smile.

Doc suddenly stopped as a lump filled his throat,
one tear appeared in his eye.
His thoughts hit upon a melancholy note,
and he raised his drink on high.
For off in the distance he heard them still,
he captured their sound in his mind.
Their looks, their voices, their style, so real,
further words he could not find.
But he managed a toast to the group he loved best,
to good times and bygone days.
To Roy, Tim and Bob and to all of the rest,
and one shot for old Gabby Hayes.
Then speaking above all the noise in the bar,
everyone stopped to hear
this man who would toast a group gone so far,
The Sons of the Pioneers.
“For it is a fact well known today
that there is none to compare.
And anyone who still listens will honestly say
the best are the Pioneers.”

As Doc finished his toast, downed his glass on high,
the waitress stepped up with a beer.
The band played “Ghost Riders in the Sky”
to honor the Pioneers.
And buying a round for the table that night
Everyone let out a cheer.
Not for the drinks, they knew Doc was right, but for
The Sons of the Pioneers.

Gary Turner
MONSIGNOR WEBER has been busy publishing and promoting several important works on the Los Angeles Archdiocese. *The History of the Archdiocese of Los Angeles and Catholic Pioneers of Southern California* are now available in the gift shop at the San Fernando Mission. Plus, a miniature book on Milton Hershey is also at the bookstalls.

Two Westerners have recently earned prestigious appointments. Congratulations to GORDON BAKKEN, who was named a distinguished lecturer for the Organization of American Historians. Gordon has also been working on new projects and an upcoming article in the Winter Issue of the *Branding Iron*. A nod goes to ERIC NELSON for his recent appointment to the Board of Directors of the Southern California Historical Society. Eric has been responsible in allying the Los Angeles Corral of Westerners scholarship program with the Autry Museum.

ABE HOFFMAN, STEVE KANTER, MICHELLE ZACK and SID GALLY attended the “Rocket Science and Region: The Rise, Fall, and Rise of the Aerospace Industry in Southern California” at the Huntington Library in early August.

A sincere thanks to GARY and VICKI TURNER for their wonderful hospitality in hosting the Fandango. The theme of cowboy poetry was a great success with nearly 90 people in attendance. Vicki and her crew did a spectacular job of preparing a great dinner and excellent desserts. ELIZABETH NELSON contributed a delicious salad to the meal. PAUL RIPPENS arranged for the musical entertainment, which was the “high note” of the evening. A tip of the hat goes to Eric Nelson who made sure none went dry at the “watering hole.” The original poetry came from many quarters. ABE HOFFMAN, JAN STEWART, EARL NATION, JERRY SELMER, KEN PAULEY and GARY TURNER were among those who did their best to provide “rhyme and occasionally reason” to the festivities. In sum, it was one of the most successful events in recent memory and raises expectation for next year’s gala event.

*The Southern Californian*, a quarterly publication of the HSSC, had a nice profile of Dawson’s Book Shop, highlighting the store’s development by MUIR and GLEN DAWSON and the recent operation of the store by Michael Dawson. Michael has added a special gallery featuring both current and historical photographs and books on photography.

ROBERT CLARK has identified a few corrections to the Spring Issue (Number 246) on the 60th Anniversary of the Los Angeles Westerners. DON BOELTER, not HOMER BOELTER, is pictured on page 14. Neither Homer or Don were the second sheriff of the corral. Homer was the third sheriff behind Britzman and PAUL GALLEHER. Bob also noted that many of the early photos in this issue were taken by LONNIE HULL, an early member of the corral.
Gary and Vicki Turner hosted a memorable Fandango.

Eric Nelson seems happy after a visit to the grub line.

This is a well written book about a little known figure of the West. It follows the life of Luther Sage Kelly from his birth in 1849 at Geneva, New York until his death in 1928 at Paradise, California. He was a true mountain man even though he arrived in the West decades late for the heyday of that breed. He started learning the way of the woods and marksmanship in the forest around Seneca Lake, near his home. No records of his formal schooling exist, but he had a lifelong interest in history, literature and poetry. The story really starts when Kelly enlisted as a regular in the army in the waning days of the Civil War. He was fifteen when he enlisted for three years, and during this time he first experienced the adventure of the West while stationed in the Dakota Territory. The book then follows Kelly as he journeys alone into the Yellowstone Valley from which he would acquire his moniker. This is where he honed his skills in the wilds and had many encounters with Indians, both peaceful and not. Kelly would treat indigenous peoples fairly and with respect wherever he went, and his life took him many places. The passages from his memoirs and letters are in the flowery descriptive prose of those times.

Luther “Yellowstone” Kelly led a most interesting and varied life. He was a scout during the Great Sioux War and the Nez Perce Campaign. Kelly was involved with two expeditions to Alaska as a scout while in his late forties. He received a commission as a captain at the age of fifty in the Philippine-American War. He became an Indian agent at the San Carlos Reservation in Arizona when he was fifty-five years old. He crossed paths with many notables of the day, from Col. Nelson A. Miles to Bill Cody to George Bird Grinnell. He was even a member of Teddy Roosevelt’s “Tennis Cabinet.” He was a friend of our own E. A. Brininstool, and they exchanged many letters and photographs during the last decade of Kelly’s life.

When Kelly was looking for a publisher for his Yellowstone Kelly: Memoirs of Luther S. Kelly, Brininstool tried to persuade him to use Arthur H. Clark. This didn’t happen. However, when Yale Publishing put out the book in 1926 they ended the book before his adventures in Alaska and the Philippines. There is one photograph in the book of E. A. Brininstool and Luther Kelly taken in 1927. There is also a photograph from the collection of our founder, Homer E. Britzman.

The author first became aware of Yellowstone Kelly in 1957. His interest has grown ever since. When he retired in 1990 he was able to devote most of his time to this book. In 2003 the second half of Kelly’s manuscript detailing the Alaska and Philippine years turned up. Keenan was able to use that information in this book. This is the first book to tell the complete story of one of the West’s more colorful and long-lived characters.

—Tim Heflin