New Mexico Historical Review

Volume 69 | Number 2 Article 5

4-1-1994

Congregation and Population Change in Mission Communities of Northern New Spain: Cases from California and Texas

Robert H. Jackson

Congregation and Population Change in the Mission Communities of Northern New Spain: Cases From the Californias and Texas

ROBERT H. JACKSON

Several factors modified the demographic evolution of the Indian converts living in the mission communities of northern New Spain. Patterns of fertility and mortality certainly were crucial, and consistently high mortality that was greater than fertility undermined the ability of Indian populations to reproduce and grow. Over the long term, elevated mortality wiped out the populations of most frontier missions, often within several generations.

Disease, living conditions, and the stresses of cultural change condemned many Indian groups in the missions to near extinction, but a second factor determined the size of the Indian populations living in the missions. *Congregación*, the resettlement of Indian converts into compact mission communities, was at the core of the evangelization and acculturation program in the missions. In the face of chronically high mortality rates, the ability of missionaries to attract new converts to repopulate the mission communities determined not only the size of the Indian population, but also its age and gender structure.[1] The implementation of congregación also had other implications for the development of the mission communities of northern New Spain. In the case of Alta California, for example, resettlement of new converts replenished the labor force, which enabled the Franciscan missionaries to produce large surpluses and subsidize the military garrisons in the province. At the beginning of the development of the Alta California missions in

Robert H. Jackson, a member of the Department of History and Geography at Texas Southern University, earned his doctorate in 1988 from the University of California, Berkeley. He is a specialist in Latin American and Borderlands history. Jackson is author of more than thirty articles and three monographs forthcoming from the University of New Mexico Press, and co-edited a collection of essays forthcoming from the University of Nebraska Press.

the early 1770s, the Franciscans reached an agreement with the colonial government to subsidize food supply to the military garrisons in exchange for control over mission temporalities.[2] Moreover, when pressured to close the missions in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, the Franciscans responded by pointing out that large numbers of only marginally acculturated Indian converts still lived at the missions.[3] Analyzing the implementation of the policy of congregación is critical for understanding patterns of demographic change in the mission communities of northern New Spain, yet paradoxically few scholars examine congregación in discussions of demographic change in the missions.

This essay explores in a comparative fashion congregación and changes in the Indian populations in the mission communities of the Californias and Texas. It highlights the importance of discussing congregación as an element of both demographic studies of mission populations, and frontier policy. I first examine Baja and Alta California initially colonized in 1697 and 1769 respectively, and the Texas mission frontier that opened after 1716. Included within the discussion of Texas is one additional element to the story of the implementation of congregación: the response of different Indian ethnic groups in Texas. I compare and contrast congregación in the San Antonio missions populated by Coahuiltecans, and Refugio mission established among the Karankawa of the Texas gulf coast. Both groups were nomadic hunter-gatherers, but responded to the overture of the missionaries in different ways.

The Jesuit, Franciscan, and Dominican missionaries stationed in the Baja and Alta California missions attempted to congregate to the new communities all Indians living in each mission district. Missionaries continued resettlement efforts for as long as Indians continued to live outside of the missions; there were soldiers to help resettle converts often through coercion, and Indian groups living outside of the missions did not resist resettlement efforts. Two distinct patterns of congregación emerge from an analysis of extant parish registers and censuses from Baja California and Alta California missions.

The congregación of Indians to newly established missions in Baja California occurred rapidly. The case of San Fernando mission (established in 1769) is illustrative. Between 1770 and 1818 the Franciscan and Dominican missionaries stationed at San Fernando baptized 1,290 converts. Significantly, 95 percent of all baptisms of converts occurred in the first decade of the mission's existence.[4] In the 1770s, the massive resettlement and conversion of Indians at San Fernando translated into the rapid growth in the number of Indians living at the mission. The highest recorded population of 1,406 was in 1775, six years following the establishment of the mission, but the numbers then declined over the next fifty years so that a mere nineteen Indians continued to live at the mission in 1829. The difference between the number of bap-

TABLE 1: NET POPULATION GROWTH AND DECLINE IN FOUR BAJA AND ALTA CALIFORNIA MISSIONS

Years	Baptisms of Converts	Births	Burials	Net Gain +/-
(San Fernando de Velicata)				
1770–1779	1220	233	N.A.	N.A.
1780–1789	29	298	623	-296
1790–1799	29	117	216	-70
1800–1809	0	37	308	-271
1810–1818	12	14	85	-59
(Nuestra Señora del Rosario)				
1774–1779	617	66	314	369
1780–1789	172	151	362	-39
1790–1799	135	123	233	25
1800–1809	5	50	182	-127
1810–1819	3	31	87	-53
(Santa Cruz)				
1791–1799	809	89	404	494
1800–1809	410	122	554	-22
1810–1819	246	114	405	-45
1820–1829	249	137	418	-32
1830–1834	23	46	128	-59
(San Juan Bautista)				
1797–1799	315	31	296	50
1800–1809	1178	325	917	586
1810–1819	180	310	579	-89
1820–1829	902	457	1039	320
1830–1834	56	174	355	-125

Source: Robert H. Jackson, "The Dynamic of Indian Demographic Collapse in the Mission Communities of Northwestern New Spain: A Comparative Approach with Implications for Popular Interpretations of Mission History," in Virginia Guedea and Jaime Rodríguez, eds., *Five Centuries of Mexican History/Cinco Siglos de Historia de México*, 2 vols., (México, D.F., 1992), 1:139-56.

tisms of converts, births to Indian women living at the mission, and burials shows that the mission population experienced a net decline in every decade after 1780.[5]

Rosario mission, established by the Dominicans in 1774, provides an example of a more gradual congregación of Indians. The Dominicans baptized 617 converts during the first six years of the existence of the mission, but the number of converts declined in the following four decades. In 1776, 564 Indians reportedly lived at the mission, and 347 in 1791.[6] The numbers dropped in the following years, and in 1829 only thirty-eight Indians continued to live at the mission. The analysis of extant baptismal and burial registers shows that births and baptisms of converts were greater than burials only during the years 1774 to 1779 and the decade 1790 to 1799. In the 1780s and again after 1800 the number of burials were greater than the number of baptisms.[7]

The combined population of the Baja California missions shows a growth in the total number of Indians living in the missions until 1768, when 7,149 converts lived in fourteen establishments. Over the next three decades the number of converts declined precipitously despite the establishment of new missions and the congregación of thousands of converts. In 1804, 2,815 Indians lived in eighteen mission communities. A series of devastating epidemics between 1769 and 1782 killed thousands, and the Indian population never recovered.[8]

In contrast to the Baja California missions where the missionaries congregated the Indian populations in a short period of time, the Franciscans in Alta California continued to resettle Indians from increasing distances from the mission communities as late as the 1820s, and in several cases as late as the 1830s. Following the congregation of Indians living in the immediate area surrounding the mission community the Franciscans, aided by soldiers, penetrated interior valleys in search of new converts. Congregación of converts continued until interior groups such as the Central Valley Yokuts resisted the military expeditions. The Franciscans were able to increase the number of Indians living in the mission until 1820. In that year 21,063 converts lived in twenty missions. As Indian resistance increased in the 1820s and 1830s the number of converts living in the missions dropped, even in spite of the establishment of a new mission in 1823. In 1834, on the eve of the secularization of the missions, 15,225 Indians remained. The decline in population of nearly 5,000 occurred as a result of high mortality, the drop in the number of converts entering the missions, the emancipation of a small number of converts from the paternalistic control of the missionaries, and flight from the missions. Flight from the missions became an even greater problem in the decade following the 1834 secularization of the missions.[9]

Franciscan missionaries congregated numbers of Indians to the missions throughout their operation, although in many years the number of recorded burials was greater than the combined total of births and baptisms of converts. At Santa Cruz mission (established in 1791), for example, the missionaries baptized 809 converts between 1791 and 1799. The maximum population of 523 was recorded in 1796. Over the following decades the number of converts congregated and the total mission population fluctuated, but the most rapid decline was in the years 1830 to 1834 when the number of new recruits dropped off significantly. In five years the Indian population living at the mission experienced a net loss of 59.[10] The number of Indians living at San Juan Bautista (established in 1797) increased during the years 1797 to 1809 and again from 1820 to 1829, two periods of resettlement of large numbers of Indians. During the first period 1,493 were resettled, and during the second 902. The Indian population experienced a net decline of 214 from 1810 to 1819 and again after 1830. During the same years the Franciscans congregated only 236 Indians while recorded burials totaled 934.[11]

In both the Baja and Alta California cases examined above the outcome was the same: mission populations expanded during periods of active resettlement of large numbers of converts to the mission communities, and then dropped when congregación slowed down. As alluded to above, patterns of congregación also modified the age and gender structure of the mission populations. Census data are most complete for the Alta California missions, where the number of children, and women of childbearing age declined when the number of converts resettled to the missions dropped. Mortality among children and women was higher than for men.[12]

The above analysis of congregación in the Baja and Alta California missions provides useful insight for understanding demographic patterns at other mission communities in northern New Spain where missionaries implemented the policy of congregación. An examination of the congregación of Coahuiltecans to the five San Antonio missions and Karankawas to Refugio mission in Texas shows both similarities and dissimilarities to the patterns outlined above.

Franciscans from the apostolic colleges of Querétaro and Zacatecas operated five missions in the San Antonio area: San Antonio de Valero (established in 1718); San José y San Miguel (established in 1720); and, Purísima Concepción, San Juan Capistrano, and San Francisco de la Espada, which were all relocated to the San Antonio area from eastern Texas in 1731. The Franciscans congregated nomadic hunter–gatherers, collectively known as Coahuiltecans, who lived in small bands in northern Coahuila and central Texas as far east as San Antonio. There

were somewhere between twenty and one-hundred separate Coahuiltecan bands. A total of fifty-five bands are identified in mission records.[13]

Evidence shows that similar to the Californias the military played an important role in the congregación of Indians to the San Antonio area missions, although the motivations of individual Indians or entire bands for entering the missions were most likely very complex. What is clear, however, is that the military helped the Franciscans retrieve fugitives from the missions and convince others to settle in the missions. For example, in April 1737 Tacame band members fled San Francisco de la Espada mission, and by June no Indians remained at the mission. The Franciscan stationed at the mission, aided by an escort of ten soldiers, returned 108 Indians to San Francisco in December. Three years later, in 1740, seventy-seven of the fugitive Tacame settled at San Antonio de Valero.[14] Similarly, the missionary at San Juan Capistrano, accompanied by thirty soldiers, visited the Gulf coast and coastal islands in 1771, and brought 107 new converts and fugitives from other missions who were then resettled at San Juan Capistrano, San Francisco, and Purísima Concepción missions.[15]

Flight from the missions can be interpreted as having been a rejection of the changes in life-style introduced by the missionaries. Fear of disease was a second factor. In 1739, a lethal epidemic broke out in the San Antonio area causing many Indians to flee the missions. During the rest of 1739 and in early 1740 the missionaries made several trips accompanied by soldiers to return fugitives, and to bring new converts to the missions.[16]

The problem of fugitivism continued at the end of the eighteenth century. A set of guidelines written in 1787 or 1788 for the missionary stationed at Purísima Concepción mission noted that

> From time to time, the missionary should journey to the coast and bring back the fugitives, who regularly leave the mission, trying at the same time to gain some pagans, if possible, so that more conversions are realized and the mission does not come to an end because of a lack of natives.[17]

Mission registers of baptisms and burials document patterns of congregación and changes in population levels. The most complete records are those for the San Antonio de Valero mission. The population of San Antonio de Valero fluctuated in the first decades following the establishment of the mission, but grew slowly from the 1730s to the early 1740s. The Franciscan missionaries were able to recruit converts from outside of the mission community to replace those individuals who died, and to expand the size of the mission population. Despite high

levels of mortality the population of the mission experienced a net in crease of 161 from 1727 to 1746, the number of baptisms of converts reached 273, and births totaled 230. In 1746, the population of the mission was 390. Over the following thirty-four years the net decline in the population was about 293, which can be attributed to a decline in the number of converts entering the mission, down to 131, and declining numbers of births, down to 183. The mean number of baptisms of converts was fourteen during the earlier period of population growth, but fell to four after 1747. The mean number of births dropped from twelve to five in the years after 1747. In the late 1770s a mere seventy–seven Indians continued to live at San Antonio de Valero (see Tables 2 and 5).

An examination of the vital rates of the San Antonio mission population (see Table 3) using the microcomputer program *Populate* that employs inverse projection to calculate sophisticated demographic statistics (gross reproduction ratio, net reproduction ratio, and mean life expectancy at birth) demonstrates the relationship between the resettlement of new converts and mission population levels. In the period 1727 to 1781 there were five major mortality crises at San Antonio de Valero mission: measles epidemics in 1728, 1749, and 1768; and, smallpox in 1762 and 1781. Moreover, there was elevated mortality during the 1757–1761 quinquennium. Crude death rates per thousand population fluctuated during the epidemic and non–epidemic years, but the impact of the epidemics can clearly be seen in elevated mortality rates and substantially lowered net reproduction ratios. In five quinquenniums during which no major epidemics attacked the population of San Antonio de Valero, the crude death rate averaged fifty–two per thousand population, and a net reproduction ratio of 0.42 which signifies a rate of decline over a generation of 48 percent. In the quinquennium during which there were epidemic outbreaks the mean death rate was ninety–five per thousand population, 1.8 times the death rate in non–epidemic years, and was as high as 121 per thousand population during the 1762–1766 quinquennium or 2.3 times the mean crude death rate in non-epidemic years. The mean net reproduction ratio was 0.12 which signifies a rate of decline of 88 percent over a generation. Finally, mean life expectancy at birth dropped dramatically from 15.5 years in non–epidemic periods to 3.9 during the six quinquenniums with elevated mortality caused by epidemics. Epidemics of contagious diseases were traumatic episodes which increased the overall death rates, substantially lowered life expectancy, and accelerated the process of demographic collapse. There were more non–epidemic than epidemic years, however, and the Indian population was not viable (able to grow through natural increase) even in non–epidemic years.

TABLE 2: QUINQUENNIUM TOTALS OF BAPTISMS AND BURIALS RECORDED AT SAN ANTONIO DE VALERO MISSION, 1722–1781

Quin.	Population Begin Quin.	Births	Baptisms of Converts	Burials	Net Gain +/–
1722–26	290	19	67	N.A.	N.A.
1727–31	229*	53	102	95	60
1732–36	289*	39	34	74	–1
1737–41	288*	64	86	76	74
1742–46	362*	74	51	97	28
1747–51	390*	57	58	163	–48
1752–56	342*	43	26	83	–14
1757–61	328	21	20	119	–78
1762–66	275	17	7	129	–105
1767–71	170*	15	10	54**	–29
1772–76	125	15	1	25*	–9
1777–81	77	23	1	34	–10*

* Estimated figure. ** Adjusted figure.
Source: Mardith Schuetz, "The Indians of the San Antonio Missions 1718-1821," (doctoral dissertation, University of Texas at Austin, 1980), 128, 131, 136-38, 142-44.

TABLE 3: DEMOGRAPHIC STATISTICS OF SAN ANTONIO DE VALERO MISSION, 1727–1781

Year	Estimated Population	Crude Rates Birth/Death	Reproduction Gross	Ratio Net	Mean Life Expectancy
1729	207	51/92	2.88	0.25	5.9
1734	271	29/55	1.44	0.26	11.5
1739	282	45/54	2.16	0.54	15.9
1744	350	42/55	2.09	0.54	16.2
1749	333	34/98	1.79	0.07	2.9
1754	321	27/52	1.49	0.3	12.9
1759	275	15/87	0.81	0.02	2
1764	212	16/121	0.72	0.01	1.2
1769	149	20/72	0.89	0.06	4.9
1774	120	25/42	1.33	0.45	21.2
1779*	71	45/101	3.24	0.3	6.2*

* Adjusted figures.
Source: Table 2.

The Gross Reproduction Ratio (GRR), an index of the population's production of children, shows that in non-epidemic years birth rates were moderate to high, although birth rates did dip in epidemic years and especially in the late 1750s and the 1760s. The GRR averaged 1.70 in non-epidemic periods, 1.42 in epidemic years (the GRR for the 1777–1781 quinquennium has been excluded because the data on births has been adjusted downward), and a mere 0.81 between 1757 and 1771. The consistently low net reproduction ratios in non-epidemic years were caused by the chronically high levels of infant and child mortality. Birth rates also dropped from the 1720s to the 1780s, reflecting a pattern of higher mortality among females than males, especially young mothers, and a declining number of women of child-bearing age in relation to the total population. Higher mortality rates among children and women can be attributed to a variety of different factors, including endemic diseases such as respiratory ailments, diarrhea, and syphilis, poor prenatal care (perhaps a poor diet for pregnant women which caused low birth weight), poor and unsanitary living conditions in the mission community, and a lack of proper medical attention.

Death rates consistently higher than birth rates created an unviable population that would have disappeared in several generations had it not been replenished through the continued recruitment of converts from outside of the mission community. The population of San Antonio grew until the late 1740s, and then gradually declined as the number of Indians congregated dropped, and death rates remained consistently higher than birth rates.

Similar patterns can be extrapolated for the other four San Antonio area missions, although records are not as complete. Baptismal and burial registers survive for San José mission from 1778 to 1823 and 1781 to 1824, respectively. In the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries a small number of settlers lived in the area outside of the walls of the mission, which, according to one scholar, makes it impossible to separate the baptisms and burials of Indians from non-Indians, especially after about 1800.[18] However, some generalizations can be made on the basis of the broad patterns documented. A total of 357 baptisms were recorded at San José between 1778 and 1823 and 350 burials from 1781 to 1824. The data for the years 1781 to 1820 show a steady decline of the population from 1781 to 1805 followed by population growth after 1806.[19] Allowing for possible under-registration, especially for the settler population, the record indicates that the Indian population of the mission declined from the 1780s to 1800. The number of settlers living outside the walls of the mission probably grew after about 1800, and soon passed the total number of Indians living at the mission. The growth of the settler population accounts for the excess of baptisms over deaths after 1806.

The decline of the population of San José mission after 1780 contrasts with an earlier pattern of population growth at all of the missions in the first half of the eighteenth century. The early growth of the mission populations, primarily through the recruitment of converts, can be documented by the total number of baptisms and burials reported in the 1745, 1756, 1758, and 1762 reports for San José, Purísima Concepción, San Juan Capistrano, and San Francisco missions. The Franciscans congregated large numbers of Indians at the missions. With the exception of the years 1745 to 1756 at San Juan Capistrano, the total number of baptisms was greater than the number of burials. The resettlement of converts at the Purísima Concepción, San Juan Capistrano, and San Francisco missions, however, slowed after 1745. At San Francisco de la Espada, for example, the net difference between baptisms and burials from 1731 to 1745 was 180, but a mere 122 from 1745 to 1762. Similarly, at San Juan Capistrano there was an excess of 301 baptisms from 1731 to 1745, 155 more burials than baptisms from 1745 to 1756, and then an excess of fifty–six baptisms between 1756 and 1762 (see Table 4).

The period of the most active congregation of Coahuiltecans ended in the 1750s and 1760s (1740s in the case of San Antonio de Valero mission), as seen in the long term population trends in the missions (see Table 5). The largest populations recorded at the missions were either in the 1750s or 1760s, and then the population of all five missions declined. The Franciscans continued to congregate Indians to the missions, as for example in 1771.

A final factor appears to have played a role in the congregation of the Coahuiltecans in the San Antonio missions: control of Indian converts within the mission compounds. At the time of the early flight from the missions in the 1730s and 1740s the mission compounds were not complete, and it was easier for the Indians to escape. In 1740, for example, Captain Toribio de Urrutia reported that the buildings at the missions were primarily temporary structures.[20] However, by the mid–to–late 1740s or 1750s the compounds of the five missions had been enclosed by walls that served to better control the Indian converts, although, as noted above, fugitivism remained a problem until at least the end of the eighteenth century. For example, in 1745 a stone wall surrounded Purísima Concepción mission. Similarly, the building complex at San Francisco mission was completed between 1756 and 1762 with the construction of Indian houses that formed three sections of a wall that surrounded the mission. By 1758, San José mission was completely enclosed by walls, and the Indian houses were built inside the mission walls.[21] Raids by hostile Indians such as Apaches and Comanches

TABLE 4: TOTAL OF BAPTISMS AND BURIALS REPORTED AT THE SAN ANTONIO MISSIONS AND ESPIRITU SANTO AND ROSARIO MISSIONS IN SELECTED YEARS

Years	San José Bap./Bur.		Purísima Bap./Bur.		San Juan Bap./Bur.		San Francisco Bap./Bur.	
1720–58	964	498						
1758–68	90	?						
1731–45			393	265	515	214	393	213
1745–56			260	213?	123	278	247	159
1756–62			139	80?	209	153	175	141
TOTAL	1054	?	792	558	847	645	815	513
Years	**Espíritu Santo Bap./Bur.**				**Rosario Bap./Bur.**			
1722–58	499							
1754–58					137			
1758–68	124				63			
1722–68		278						
1754–68						110		
TOTAL	636	278			200	110		

TABLE 5: THE POPULATION OF THE SAN ANTONIO MISSIONS IN SELECTED YEARS

Year	Valero	San José	Concepción	San Juan Captistrano	San Fran. Espada
1721	240	227			
1740	238	249	210	169	121
1745	311		207	163	204
1750		220			
1756	328		247	265	200
1758		281			
1762	275		207	203	207
1768		350			
1772	125	183	178	198	174
1777	125	183	140	156	153
1783	144	128	76	99	96
1786	126	189	104	110	144
1790	48	144	47	21	93
1804		57	27	28	37
1809		55	21	20	24
1815		49	16	15	27

Habig, *The Alamo Chain of Missions*, 270; Schuetz, "The Indians of the San Antonio Missions," 128.

necessitated the defensive posture adapted at the missions, but complexes surrounded by walls with Indian houses located inside those walls could also keep the Indian converts inside.

The Franciscans also established missions on the Gulf coast for the Karankawa, but encountered greater difficulty in implementing congregación. The Karankawa were hunter–gatherers who inhabited some 200 miles of the Gulf Coast of Texas south from Galveston Bay. In the 1690s, there was a total of some 3,200 to 3,600 Karankawa living in small bands, and migrating within a defined territory on a seasonal basis to exploit different food resources. During the spring and summer months Karankawa bands lived along the coast or coastal islands, and moved inland during the winter. Karankawa bands rarely spent more than several weeks at a given camp, but frequently returned to a favored campsite year after year.[22]

Seasonal patterns of migration proved to be a major impediment to the mission congregación program because the Franciscan missionaries were unable to significantly modify Karankawa behavior. During the eighteenth century the Franciscans established three missions in Karankawa territory: Nuestra Señora del Espíritu Santo, that operated from 1722 to 1831 at different sites; Nuestra Señora del Rosario, that operated from 1754 to 1807 although it was abandoned for ten years between 1779 and 1789; and Nuestra Señora del Refugio, that operated between 1793 and 1830 although increasing Comanche raiding in the 1820s forced its abandonment in 1824.[23] Over a period of nearly eighty years the Franciscans failed to permanently congregate the Karankawa, and the mission communities merely became an added source of food resources during the lean winter months.

There are numerous examples of short and long–term absences of Karankawa converts from the missions. For example, in 1771 Franciscans from the San Antonio missions resettled ten Karankawa fugitives from Rosario mission to Purísima Concepción mission.[24] In October 1795 twenty–six residents of Refugio mission were absent on the coast.[25] In 1796, the Karankawa at both Rosario and Refugio abandoned the missions, but some individuals returned in the following year.[26]

The instability of the mission populations can be measured in extant censuses from the 1790s and first decade of the nine teenth century (see Table 6). Mission populations frequently fluctuated on a seasonal basis. For example, the number of Indians at Rosario was fifty–seven in November 1791 prior to the return of the Karankawa to the mission, but stood at 114 in June of the following year prior to the summer exodus to the coast. Similarly, the population of Rosario grew from 107 in October 1792 to 148 in December.

Table 6: The Population of Espíritu Santo, Rosario, and Refugio Missions

Year	Espíritu Santo	Rosario	Refugio
1747	400		
1754		500	
1758	178	400	
1768	300		
	93	101	
1783	214		
1785	116		
1787	103		
May 1790		51	
Dec 1790		67	
Mar 1790		85	
Jul 1791		57	
Nov 1791		114	
Jun 1792		83	
Oct 1792			
Feb 1793			138
Aug 1793		139	125
1794	125		
	111		
Feb 1795			43
Oct 1795		107	82
Oct 1796		148	
Dec 1796		97	
Jun 1797		254	175
Dec 1798		70	
Dec 1800			
1802		63	
1804		61	224 (Dec)
1805		62	
1809			122
1815			115
1822	50		
1830			21

Source: Carlos Castañeda, *Our Catholic Heritage in Texas 1519-1936*, 7 vols., (Austin, Texas: Von Boeckman-Jones Company, 1936-1958), 3:125, 186-87; 4:23, 32, 233; 5:32-34, 64, 104, 189, 191; 6:126, 318; Forrestal, *Solis Diary*, 3-42; J. Autrey Dabbs, trans., "The Texas Missions in 1785," *Preliminary Studies of the Texas Catholic Historical Society* 3 (1940), 5-24; Kathleen Gilmore, "The Indians of Mission Rosario," in David Orr and Daniel Crozier, eds., *The Scope of Historical Archaelogy Essays in Honor of John L. Cotter* (Philadelphia 1984), 170-71; William Oberste, *A History of Refugio Mission* (Refugio 1942), 101, 160, 169-70, 210, 253, 267, 324.

The Spaniards also failed to overcome Karankawa resistance to the mission regime. In 1778, a group of Karankawas, lead by a man baptized at Rosario mission, revolted against Spanish rule and wiped out the crew of a Spanish ship. This revolt lasted for about ten years, at which time the Franciscans returned to reopen the mission.[27] In 1794, Refugio mission was relocated following an attack by hostile Karankawa. There were periodic Karankawa attacks on Refugio mission until about 1807.[28]

Karankawa also migrated between missions, and in some instances permanently moved from one mission to another. After the founding of Refugio, Indians living at Rosario opted to move to the new establishment, probably because it was closer to the rich food resources found along the Gulf coast. In June 1797 for example, 128 Karankawas from Rosario were living at Refugio.[29]

An analysis of the extant baptismal and burial registers for Refugio mission provide important insights to the dynamic of the mission program among the Karankawa during the early nineteenth century (see Table 7). The Franciscans baptized thirty–two non–mission Karankawa between 1807 and 1827, the majority of whom were young children. The 1820 baptism of an Indian woman estimated at being twenty–two years of age was the exception. Burials were distributed between children and adults. The calculation of the vital rates of the mission population using *Populate* (see Table 8), however, shows an extreme under–registration of deaths which skews the data. In other words, the Franciscans recorded the deaths of the Indians who died at the mission, and most likely were unaware of the deaths of many Indians, who the missionaries listed as residents of the mission but who died away from Refugio. In some years, particularly in the 1820s and especially following the abandonment of the mission in 1824 as a consequence of Comanche raiding, the Franciscans recorded no burials at all.[30]

The missionaries recorded the births of 112 children at the mission, an average of slightly less than six per year. One important pattern emerges from the record of baptisms, however. Some children of converts attached to the mission were born away from the mission. In June 1815 for example, José Gaitan, the Franciscan stationed at Refugio, baptized a seven–month–old boy born to a couple previously baptized at the mission. In May 1817 Gaitan baptized a three–month–old girl, the daughter of Indians also baptized at Refugio. The normal practice in the Texas missions was to baptize a baby within several days of birth. In the following decade the time between birth and baptism in some instances became greater. In October 1825 Fray Miguel Muro, now living at Goliad, baptized the three–year–old son of Indians previously baptized at Refugio. The entry recorded that the boy had been born "en el campo." In July of the following year Muro baptized a four–year–old girl, also born "en el campo," the daughter of Karankawa converts. There

are other examples of parents who the missionaries considered to be members of the Refugio mission community bringing older children for baptism.[31]

Several conclusions can be made on the basis of the analysis of patterns of baptisms and burials at Refugio mission: the congregación program among the Karankawa was very different from the congregación of Coahuiltecans in the San Antonio missions. Enough baptisms occurred within a few days of the birth of a child to indicate that some Karankawa resided at Refugio mission on a more or less permanent basis. The baptism, after a period of months or even years, of children of previously baptized adults, however, when taken within the context of the ethnohistoric data on the Karankawa and reports of the missionaries themselves, clearly shows that many were only part-time inhabitants of the mission. The pattern of seasonal migration between the interior and the coast certainly included the mission, which became a relatively reliable source of food during the winter.

More importantly, many Karankawa accepted the mission program on their own terms, as did the Chiriguano of southeastern Bolivia.[32] The Franciscans congregated only a fraction of the total Karankawa population, even as late as the first decades of the nineteenth century. For example, when established in 1754, 500 Cujanes and Guapites settled at Rosario mission, and some 400 remained four years later in 1758. The Franciscans stationed at Rosario baptized only 137 in the first four years of the existence of the mission, and baptized only sixty-three more over the following decade.[33] The missionaries at Refugio baptized an equally small number of people in the early nineteenth century. A small number of Karankawa families accepted mission life, but did not remain at the missions for any length of time. The missionaries stationed at Refugio between 1808 and 1828 baptized the children of non-mission Indians, but few if any adults. Some adults were buried at the mission, and may have accepted baptism on their deathbed. Baptism of children may have been one condition for Karankawa to visit the missions and receive food rations. Many adults appear to have been reluctant to be baptized, however.

The under-registration of deaths (see Table 8) confirms that the Karankawa never accepted sedentary life. Many Karankawa considered to be members of Refugio mission died while away from the mission, and their deaths were never recorded. The Franciscans failed to fully congregate the Karankawa to the same extent as they had with the Coahuiltecans at an earlier date, or for that matter in the Baja and Alta California missions.

Several general mission reports echoed the frustration of the Franciscans in trying to congregate the Karankawas. In particular the Franciscans complained about what they perceived to be a lack of support from the military and governor—to keep the Karankawas congre-

TABLE 7: POPULATION, BAPTISMS, AND BURIALS REPORTED AT REFUGIO MISSION, 1793–1828

Year	Population	Baptism of Converts	Births	Burials
Feb 1793	138			
Aug 1793	125			
Feb 1795	43			
Oct 1795	82			
Jun 1797	175			
Dec 1804	224			
1808		1	10	0
1809	122	1	8	5
1810		10	7	6
1811		0	6	5
1812		4	8	5
1813		1	5	4
1814		0	6	4
1815		2	3	1
1816		3	11	2
1817		1	6	6
1818		0	8	0
1819		0	7	1
1820		1	3	8
1821		0	3	2
1823		0	4	0
1824		2	2	0
1825		1	7	3
1827		2	5	0
1828		3	2	0
1830	21			

Source: Refugio Mission Baptismal and Burial Registers, Catholic Archives of Texas, Austin; Oberste, *History of Refugio*, 101, 160, 169-70, 210, 253, 267, 324.

TABLE 8: DEMOGRAPHIC STATISTICS OF REFUGIO MISSION BASED ON RECORDED BIRTHS AND DEATHS, 1808–1828

Year	*Crude Rates*		*Reproduction Ratio*		Mean Life Expectancy
	Births	Deaths	Gross	Net	
1810	62	3	4.1	2.37	45.3
1815	41	22	2.74	1.72	42.3
1820	26	13	1.76	1.32	52.9
1825	22	3	1.48	1.31	69.8

Source: Table 7.

gated at the three missions—support the missionaries stationed in the San Antonio missions received. For example, Solis described conditions at Rosario mission in 1768 in the following terms:

> The task of converting and of inducing the Indians to live at the mission has been a difficult one, and some of those who had been living there have fled back again to the hills, river-banks or to the seashore . . . Still another reason [for flight] is because the military officers neglect to bring into the town or to inflict punishment upon those that run away, and because they neglect to pursue them and bring them back. Whenever they do bring back any of the fugitives they fail to administer to them any punishment that might serve as a check and that might instill into them the fear of fleeing from the mission.[34]

In describing conditions at Espíritu Santo two decades later, José Franco Lopez similarly blamed the military and governor for the failure of the congregation of the Karankawas:

> Nearly as many natives have fled to the coast and woods, both from among those who were brought there, and from those who, born in the mission, were induced by the bad example of the coastal Indians, to follow them. Neither the clamor nor the supplications of the missionaries have been successful in obtain-

ing repressive measures from the Governor of the Province to put a stop the almost daily escapes (even when these occur in his presence).[35]

Jesuits, Franciscans, and Dominicans labored along the northern frontier of New Spain to create stable, well–populated mission communities modeled on the central Mexican *congregaciones*, but with mixed results. Indians in the Californias entered newly established missions by the thousands, but Indians also resisted efforts to congregate them. As discussed above, patterns of congregación clearly modified the size and age–gender structure of the Indian populations living in the missions.

The congregación of Coahuiltecans to the five San Antonio missions was similar in many ways to patterns documented for missions in the Californias. The Indian populations of the San Antonio missions experienced chronically high mortality rates that were consistently higher than birth rates. The size of the mission populations fluctuated with the ebbs and flows of the congregación program as the missionaries attempted to repopulate the missions and return fugitives. As shown in the detailed case of San Antonio de Valero, the number of Indians living at the mission began to drop after the mid–1740s, when the congregación program began to falter.

The final case study, that of the Karankawa missions of the Texas Gulf Coast, is different from the three discussed above, but was more typical of the overall experience in the Texas missions. The failure of the Franciscans to congregate the Karankawas to Refugio mission highlights the significance of maintaining stable populations to achieve the goals of evangelization and acculturation, and the importance of military support to keep the Indian converts at the missions. The Karankawa dealt with the Franciscan missionaries at all three missions on their own terms, and many elected to not remain at the missions permanently. Rather, they incorporated the missions into a well–established pattern of seasonal migration to exploit different food resources.

One thing is clear in all case studies observed. Indian populations congregated in the missions were not viable, and the number of Indians living at the missions inevitably declined once the number of new converts entering the missions declined. Beyond the question of the impact of congregación on mission demographic patterns, scholars examining mission history should keep a second aspect of the impact of mission congregación in mind. Missionaries attempted to remold the social organization, marriage practices, religious beliefs, world view, and economic organization, among other things, of the Indians brought to live in the missions. The act of baptism initiated Indians into the mission community, but did not automatically change their culture and be-

liefs. Missionaries targeted children for more complete indoctrination. What impact did the constant turnover in population have on efforts by the missionaries to reform adults and indoctrinate children?

NOTES

1. For a discussion of *congregación* and the size of Indian populations living in missions see Robert H. Jackson, "Gentile Recruitment and Population Movements in the San Francisco Bay Area Missions," *Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology* 6 (1984), 225–39; Jackson, "Patterns of Demographic Change in the Missions of Central Alta California," *Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology* 9 (1987), 251–72; Erick D. Langer and Jackson, "Colonial and Republican Missions Compared: The Cases of Alta California and Southeastern Bolivia," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 30 (April 1988), 286–311. Spanish civil and religious officials first implemented congregación in central Mexico in the late sixteenth century in response to Indian population decline which left many villages underpopulated or unpopulated. See Charles Gibson, *The Aztecs Under Spanish Rule: A History of the Indians of the Valley of Mexico 1519–1810* (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1964), 282–86 and passim; James Lockhart, *The Nahuas After the Conquest: A Social and Cultural History of the Indians of Central Mexico, Sixteenth Through Eighteenth Centuries* (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1992), 44–46.

2. Jackson, "Population and the Economic Dimension of Colonization in Alta California: Four Mission Communities," *Journal of the Southwest* 33 (Autumn 1991), 387-439.

3. Jackson, "The Post-Secularization Dispersion of the Alta California Mission Populations, 1834-1846," *RMCLAS Proceedings 1991*, 27-44.

4. Jackson, "The Dynamic of Indian Demographic Collapse in the Mission Communities of Northwestern New Spain: A Comparative Approach with Implications for Popular Interpretations of Mission History," in Virginia Guedea and Jaime Rodriguez, eds., *Five Centuries of Mexican History/Cinco Siglos de Historia de Mexico*, 2 vols. (México, D.F., 1992), 1:139-56.

5. Ibid.; Jackson, "Epidemic Disease and Population Decline in the Baja California Missions, 1697-1834," *Southern California Quarterly* 63 (Winter 1981), 308-46.

6. Jackson, "Demographic Patterns in the Missions of Northern Baja California," *Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology* 5 (1983), 130-39.

7. Jackson, "Dynamic of Indian Demographic Collapse in Mission Communities."

8. Ibid.

9. Ibid.; Jackson, "Post-Secularization Dispersion."

10. Jackson, "Dynamic of Indian Demographic Collapse in Mission Communities."

11. Ibid.

12. Jackson, "The Dynamic of Indian Demographic Collapse in the San Francisco Bay Missions, Alta California, 1776–1840," *American Indian Quarterly* 16 (Spring 1992), 141–56.

13. T. N. Campbell, "Coahuiltecans and Their Neighbors," in *Handbook of North American Indians*, 20 vols. (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution, 1983), 10:343-58.

14. Marion A. Habig, *The Alamo Chain of Missions, A History of San Antonio's Five Old Missions* (Chicago, Illinois: Franciscan Herald Press, 1968), 49.

15. Ibid., 136, 171, 215.

16. Ibid., 48–49, 88, 126–27, 165, 207.

17. Benedict Leutenegger, "Guidelines for a Texas Mission," in Anne A. Fox, ed., *Archaeology of the Spanish Missions of Texas* (New York: Garland Publishing, 1991), 113.

18. Mardith Schuetz, "The Indians of the San Antonio Missions 1718–1821" (diss., University of Texas, Austin, 1979), 130.

19. Ibid., 132, 145–46.

20. Habig, *Alamo Chain*, 49.

21. Ibid., 91–92, 95, 128, 211, 213.

22. William Newcomb, "Karankawa," in *Handbook*, 10:359–67; and Kathleen Gilmore, "The Indians of Mission Rosario," in David Orr and Daniel Crozier, eds., *The Scope of Historical Archaeology Essays in Honor of John L. Cotter* (Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Temple University Department of Anthropology, 1984), 163–91.

23. Ibid.; and William Oberste, *History of Refugio Mission* (Refugio, Texas: Refugio Times Press, 1942), 136–37, 170, 318.

24. Habig, *Alamo Chain*, 136. There are other examples of the relocation of coastal band members to the San Antonio missions. A 1784 report noted the presence of members of a band known as the Barrados at both San José and San Francisco missions. Moreover, following the Karankawa uprising at Rosario in the early 1780s, the Franciscans sent women and children who remained at the mission to San Juan Capistrano where most reportedly died. See J. Autrey Dabbs, trans., "The Texas Missions in 1785," *Preliminary Studies of the Texas Catholic Historical Society* 3 (1940), 5–24.

25. Oberste, *Refugio Mission*, 169.

26. Gilmore, "Indians," 166–67.

27. Ibid., 174–75.

28. Oberste, *Refugio Mission*, 136–37, 251.

29. Ibid., 210.

30. Refugio Mission Baptismal and Burial Registers, Catholic Archives of Texas, Austin.

31. Ibid.

32. Langer and Jackson, "Colonial and Republican Missions Compared."

33. Carlos Castañeda, *Our Catholic Heritage in Texas 1519–1936*, 7 vols., (Austin, Texas: Von Boeckman–Jones Company, 1936–1958), 4:23–26; Peter Forrestal, trans., "The Solis Diary of 1767," *Preliminary Studies of the Texas Catholic Historical Society* 1 (1931), 3–42; Gilmore, "Indians," 164.

34. Forrestal, "Solis Diary," 14–15.

35. Dabbs, "Texas Missions," 11.