

Encounter of Two Different Worlds: The Columbus-Indian Legacy of History

DONALD L. FIXICO

When the explorer Christopher Columbus—eternal hero, famous admiral, courageous discoverer, or fortunate fool—“lost” his way and rediscovered the Western Hemisphere, legends and history books inaccurately claimed that he had achieved a great feat.¹ In actuality, the initial meeting of two very different worlds had transpired. Life had developed differently in the opposite hemispheres of the world, reflecting different values, cultures, and evolutionary progress.

Since the sixteenth century, historians, scholars, and writers have made the romantic claim that the encounter of East and West was a historical miracle—the arrival of the European savior bringing “civilization” to the so-called New World. This bias provokes rather interesting questions to ponder. What did Columbus and the first Taino Indians he met think of each other?² What were their impressions? Did they think and react in economic or political terms?³ Did the Indians really believe that a “white” stranger had been sent to bring them a better way of life, i.e., Christianity and civilization, as written history (the non-Indian perspective) has claimed? Some prophecies of certain tribes tell of “white” looking strangers coming to their lands—the Hopi, Wintu, Acoma Pueblo, and Oglala Sioux. The tribes did not

Donald L. Fixico is a professor of history at Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo.

anticipate Christianity, but spiritual advisors suggested that the “white man” had different ways and different ideas.⁴ Most likely, both Columbus and the Taino Indians were awed by the sight of each other. During the initial encounter, each saw a very different-looking person, and each responded instinctively from his or her own cultural experience and knowledge. How they viewed each other is very important.

Columbus’s original diary was lost or destroyed, but the reconstruction of it by Bartolomé de las Casas reveals Columbus’s first perceptions of the Native Americans (Taino) whom he and his men met.⁵ In classrooms across the United States, students learn from misinformed, biased textbooks that Columbus, believing he had landed on the coast of India, called these “new” people “los Indios.” Columbus was lost, and he had misnamed the Native Americans when he referred to them in his journal.⁶ Through prejudiced eyes, he regarded the Taino as less than human and certainly below the dignity of the Spanish. And so history was recorded—the Spanish version of the Great Encounter, which became the generally accepted interpretation of the events of that fateful day. Only one side of the historical encounter would become known; the Indian point of view was blatantly ignored.

Attempting to reconstruct the Taino version of the encounter with Columbus would be very difficult for lack of evidence and the disappearance of the people due to Spanish genocide and European diseases. This study does not attempt such a reconstruction but focuses on the neglect, in American history and literature, of the Indian point of view of the Great Encounter that, five hundred years ago, changed the course of the world. This neglect can be corrected through an examination of the “other side” of history since Columbus and an analysis of the Amero-centric view of American Indians resulting mainly from Eurocentrism. In addition to illustrating the development of separate European and Native American perspectives and comparing the two mind-sets, this study also questions the prevailing historiography about the American experience.

Perception governed the mind-sets of both the early Europeans and the American Indians. The Taino and Columbus perceived each other in relation to their respective cultures and noted the contrasts in cultural heritage and knowledge. In the case of the American Indians, perception and knowledge originated from their sociocultural understanding of themselves within their environment. The combination of these three factors—perception,

knowledge, and environment—governed Indian thinking about the strangers from the east. Of the three elements, environment had the greatest influence in shaping the native perception of the European.

The natural environment, sparsely populated by humans but filled with flora and fauna, inspired its native inhabitants to constantly re-examine their sociocultural relationships with all things. On the island of Guanahani, for example, the vastness of the natural environment—the island surrounded by the ocean—became a part of the people’s daily lives, their cultural development, and their history. Their songs, legends, and ideas derived from their natural environment and became a part of their heritage.

Familiarity with their environment allowed the Taino to establish continuity in their daily activities, focusing primarily on the need for food and shelter. Firmly rooted in a familiar landscape and a reasonably predictable range of activities, they conceived the importance of routine, organization, and structure, as they defined the norms of their culture and set the guidelines for their society. The Taino’s group-oriented view brought unity and strength to the community.

Daily activities such as food-gathering, religious worship, and kinship acknowledgment exemplified what the people believed to be important to their sustenance—community and environmental relations. At the same time, their activities influenced their material culture, e.g., the type of clothes they wore, the status of their economy, and their general progress. The physical manifestations of Taino and other native cultures and their adaptation to the Caribbean area impressed Christopher Columbus.

American Indians are practical people who stress the importance of basic needs. During the early years of Indian-white relations, essential needs governed their lives and influenced cultural development. Practicality within this context shaped their thinking and philosophies about the world, life, and death.

Native Americans existed in America as long as 35,000 years ago, or more. Thus their cultural, social, and physical characteristics developed over thousands of years.⁷ Well before the arrival of Columbus, Native American tribal communities had evolved, changed, and developed separate group identities throughout the Americas. It would seem logical, then, that thousands, or at least hundreds, of years or more would be required to alter them further.

The factor of time also influenced Native American ideologies as the various native groups evolved and adjusted to environmental and climatic conditions. Undoubtedly, the natural environment and the many powerful forces of nature shaped the intellect and philosophies of Native Americans. More than 20,000 species of flora in North America alone and enormous numbers of wildlife overwhelmed the Native Americans.⁸ Within the vastness of the wilderness, the plains, the mountains, the bodies of water, all of which hosted life in a complex, interrelated network, the people viewed themselves in a secondary role. Nature obviously represented a higher authority than people. In their native logic, in their oral traditions of creation, a "Great Force" created animals and people; thus the people believed themselves to be created from nature.⁹

Among Indians, social relations played a crucial role in comprehending life and advancing thought. Indians did not perceive themselves as above plants and animals but equal to or below them. They respected the spiritual power of each living thing and acknowledged sacred items and places. On a daily basis, plants and animals played pertinent roles, providing balance and order in the lives of the native people.¹⁰ The philosophical view that plants and animals possessed equal status with humans precluded any serious notion of exploiting nature. Plants and animals possessed spirits just as people did, and some were more powerful—for example, the thunderbird, particular healing herbs,¹¹ the native sacrament of Peyote, and sacred sites such as the Black Hills in South Dakota and Mackinac Island in Michigan.

This human-environment rapport persisted on a communicative level: The native people learned about plants and animals, then learned from them. The people respected the power and knowledge possessed by plants and animals and hoped to receive warnings and messages from them about the future. The people required plants and animals to sustain themselves with food, shelter, and clothing, but they also understood the need to protect and preserve the plant and animal populations for their healing powers and knowledge about life. A natural democracy of all things permeated most native societies and their beliefs.

Maintaining this kind of democratic view of life meant upholding kinship and social relations as well, according to social norms and laws. The people established, defined, and attempted to understand their relations with all things by acknowledging that they were merely a part of the entire universe. From this perspec-

tive, they saw life—the seasons, numbers, the life cycle: birth, life, and death—as a circle.¹²

Climatic conditions also affected native thought. Climate controls environment, dictating what types of flora and fauna can survive in a given area.¹³ In their cosmology, Indians attempted to explain events that were beyond their control, such as the shifting of the winds, hot and cold temperatures, seasonal precipitation, and planetary movements¹⁴ For example, many tribes observed the constant cycle of the seasons and integrated its circular principles into their records for maintaining history and ceremonial life. Climate, as well as the natural environment, had a strong influence on people's lives, affecting the development of their cultures and worldviews.

On the other side of the Atlantic, a different worldview existed. Centuries ago, Europeans also developed a religious relationship with the environment. Religion influenced Europeans for many generations, until the fifteenth century, when science and mercantilism came to play major new roles in society. The Europeans applied scientific studies in debating whether the world was flat or round. But rather than natural curiosity, it was economic motives that drove Europeans to explore new routes to the trade markets of the Indies.

Flexibility and adaptation are part of human evolution. In the Americas, climate and environment stimulated the native people intellectually, influencing them to make significant adjustments and learn to survive. On the other side of the world, economics and a need for technology drove European interests and influenced thought, forcing politics to become a major part of daily business negotiations. There, climate and environment prompted a physical response: Europeans sought to alter their surroundings instead of themselves. This is a major difference between Native Americans and Euro-Americans.

During the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, European nations deemed human-environment relations to be of little importance, preferring "human-controlled" situations. Viewing themselves as more important than nature, Europeans and Euro-Americans set out to change the environment, accepting climate as a constant.

In Europe, the future was in the hands of people who stood poised to seek, to fulfill curiosity, and to discover, even beyond their capability of understanding. Many Europeans willingly left their homeland, risked never coming back, for the pursuit of new trade routes. A desire to leave congested homelands, to improve

one's class standing, and to seek adventure encouraged Europeans to look for new markets.

In the Americas in 1492, the enormity of the Western Hemisphere allowed the native people to migrate widely and experience new areas. Unlike the geographic congestion of Europe, the spaciousness of the Americas allowed American Indians many more opportunities to explore and settle areas at a greater capacity, but it also made them feel a need for a sense of place and homeland. The adjustments they made to environment and climate helped create a "sense of place" on a tribal nation or village basis. This human-environment occurrence might be seen by some as a determination of "homeland," but a sense of place must precede identification of homeland for two important reasons. First, a sense of place does not necessarily mean recognition or acceptance of a homeland for a people. In numerous examples, native groups acknowledged sacred sites such as the Black Hills of the Sioux, Mackinac Island of the Great Lakes tribes, Lake Superior of the Ojibwa, Nanah Waya of the Choctaw, Blue Lake of the Taos Pueblo, but the people were reluctant to live there. Second, the sacred site often determines the location of the homeland, since the people had to live nearby in order to be able to return often to the sacred site to draw upon its metaphysical power. Stated in Anglo-American terms, this means that one does not live in the church but nearby, in order to be able to worship at the appointed times.

The determination of homelands was driven by two primary needs: (1) sufficient food, water, and shelter, and (2) a sense of place or a feeling of belonging to an area that offered spiritual blessings and medicinal power. However, some tribes were forced from their lands by other tribes and had to accept new homelands without a metaphysical attachment. In Native American history, many examples of displacement before Columbus can be cited; for example, the Chippewa forced the Sioux from the Lake Superior area, and the Navajo drove the Hopi to the high mesas in Arizona. Tribal dynasties rose to control hunting grounds, water supplies, and trade areas.

The Americas provided more than enough homelands for the native groups, supplying abundant food, clothing, and shelter. Living in areas over a period of time permitted the people to establish a rapport with the land, waters, flora, and fauna. After a while, the people felt spiritually connected to the homeland; many native groups philosophically referred to "Mother Earth"

or "Earth Mother." This relationship became an integral part of their beliefs, legends, history, and songs—their very identity. This relationship between the people and their homeland appears timeless, as in the case of the Pueblo Indians, who have lived in the American Southwest for hundreds, perhaps thousands, of years. Other tribes have a shorter period of identity with the homeland due to tribal wars and trade migrations.

Long-established identity with homelands influenced the perspectives of American Indian groups. How they viewed the world and other people, such as Columbus, derived from their relationships with their homelands and their essential needs for living, which included belief systems. For Native Americans, practical needs held a high priority. Pursuit of food and shelter, in harmony with the spiritual world, reduced time for developing technology and scientific discovery. For many generations, concerns about feeding one's family and securing shelter and spiritual protection shaped Indian thinking. Realizing the importance of limiting consumption to protect the environment, and recognizing the spirituality involved, they practiced the concept of sharing. For instance, eating too much food or expressing desire for more material goods than one could personally use evoked criticism from the community and perhaps caused misfortune for the person who devoured or desired too much. Most native societies did not tolerate greed; sharing one's good fortune from activities such as hunting reflected the people's belief that accumulation of wealth was pointless and illogical.

In contrast, among Euro-Americans individual accumulation was a means of attaining personal security and self-satisfaction. The bases of this individualistic attitude were possession, obsession, and greed. For the many Native Americans who simply could not relate to these attitudes, trying to compete in the capitalistic Anglo-American society was very difficult. They were seen by Euro-Americans as unambitious, lazy, and underachieving. Since the arrival of Columbus, mainstream American society has perceived American Indians unfairly, based exclusively on Euro-American values. The result is the negative image of American Indians that persists even today in art, literature, and classroom textbooks.

What has not been understood by the American mainstream is that group cooperation and a spiritual relationship with nature have guided Native American lives for generations and continue to influence their thoughts. The chief occupation of native people

has been to try to understand life, rather than to attempt to determine it. Life was and is complex, full of knowledge, unpredictable; the people must wait for the truth to be revealed. Native people learned to observe nature at work and regarded its actions as lessons for survival. Wisdom came with patience. If necessary, individuals waited for signs from the supernatural—dreams and/or visions—to discover the true knowledge. In the native universe, the coyote, the eagle, or the wind could be a messenger of information, even a prophet of the future. With so much to learn, the native mind functioned more effectively as a receiver of knowledge from nature, rather than as an investigator of nature.

By perceiving nature in this way, Indians established values based on what they believed was important. Tribal values among traditional Indians were and have remained basically incongruent in relation to the essential values inherited by the American mainstream from European civilization. Native values reflected local environmental influences for sustaining life; Euro-American values project an idealized life and attempt to build a utopia. The practicality of the American Indian and the idealism of the Euro-American were two different courses for cultural development. Why did this large incongruence happen?

The global configuration of land and water created two separate hemispheres over time—a kind of hemispheric polarization. The distance from Europe to America across the Atlantic Ocean is approximately three thousand miles. The European and Native American demographics fundamentally represented geographic differences in global hemispheric terms. As the human populations grew in isolated halves, each society evolved a worldview as if the other hemisphere did not exist. In a sense, these hemispheric differences set up two separate human evolutions and permitted a hemispheric polarization of peoples, civilizations, and worldviews. Between such diverse societies, communication has proved to be difficult.

For human beings, language is the primary means of expressing ideas, conveying culture, and perpetuating history. Most likely, language developed in response to the need for human interactions in relation to the familiar items within a community. Language is essential for group cooperation, for solidifying the social relations within a community.

As a tool for communication, however, language is limited by a community's vocabulary and its culture. When Columbus and the Taino met for the first time, their impressions of each other,

and the language they used to describe those impressions, differed widely, according to their separate cultural orientations and worldviews. Positive and negative relations weighed in the balance. To prevent false notions and false assumptions from being formed, a continuing dialogue would have to have been maintained. But in order for two different cultures to communicate, to comprehend each other intellectually, a shared language is essential. Unfortunately for the early Europeans and the Indian groups, the lack of a shared language led to misunderstandings that undermined rapport. The differences between the European and Native American groups led them increasingly to describe each other incorrectly.

Among Native Americans, certain individuals sometimes advanced in different directions, such as art and philosophy. Some manifested more intelligence than others, but these exceptional individuals remained products of their cultures. They possessed special knowledge, and their people respected them for their ideas, their decision-making abilities, and their wisdom. Some functioned as tribal leaders, while others helped people to understand the mysteries of life. Their words (or what remains of their meaning after English translation) are found today in translated oratories.¹⁵

Native American intellectualism was based on understanding nature and reacting to the knowledge received from nature. How did native intellectuals solve problems? A simple and direct approach typified the rationality of the native mind.¹⁶ Unfortunately, it is for this reason that non-Indians such as Columbus have interpreted the native mind to be incapable of complex thinking and abstract philosophy. Nothing could be farther from the truth. Indian people functioned in a complex world of both material and metaphysical reality, as expressed in their native languages. For example, when Black Elk, a holy man of the Oglala Sioux, described his vision, he stated that the true reality was the spiritual dimension of the metaphysical world rather than the concrete world of life on earth. For him, life on earth was like "a shadow cast upon the earth from yonder vision in the heavens."¹⁷

Native intellectuals called for the use of practical logic to comprehend the world and to solve problems. Logic involved a receptive process of observation and study for obtaining useful knowledge. If necessary, sufficient time had to be allowed for the processing of received knowledge. During this period, nothing was to be disturbed. The environment remained undisturbed

unless a disturbance was part of the message. The unexpected landing of Columbus could have been one of these events that drew the attention of the Caribbean natives, who may have viewed him as a messenger of knowledge. Operating from a different mind-set, Columbus used technology, science, and objective analysis to try to find his way to his intended goal—to reach the eastern lands of spices and riches by sailing west.

For Native Americans, the vastness of the land remained an intriguing mystery. Perhaps this natural storehouse had to be examined thoroughly before they would even consider setting sail across the Atlantic or Pacific. Native logic dictated that the immediate natural environment be studied first; therefore, no motive existed for Indians to sail across either ocean. Anything one learned was evaluated through the previous cognitive knowledge of one's culture. Culture determined the importance of any new information that might relate to society and technology. This logical determination is true for both American Indian and Anglo mainstream societies, although their cultures, and thus their reasoning and learning methods, developed differently. One logic was not superior to the other; each culture developed a logic that was appropriate to its own circumstances and conditions.

For American Indians, logic pertained to one's needs for life and was limited to such needs. Such native logic dictated what was more important and what was less important, placing relative values on all things. This native view was foreign to Columbus and later Europeans, and then to Euro-Americans, yet it was natural to Native Americans. Indians and Europeans moved in separate directions, their opposing views determining their understanding of the world and their attitudes toward each other.

Native Americans took a holistic approach in considering their sociocultural relationship with the natural environment and the universe.¹⁸ In particular, they considered the possible negative repercussions of any decisions they might make. The community had to survive; the group's interests had to be placed above the advancement of one person in order to secure and maintain balance in life rather than risking it. This democratic approach became a common pattern in native thought and advanced the idea that all things stood in equal relationship to each other throughout the universe. Within this circular order, native thinking logically acknowledged the unknown and assumed that all things had a role in life.

The people understood the importance of good interpersonal relations in order for the community to function in a positive manner. Thus kinship relations were a dominant factor in Native American societies. Behavior was guided by social patterns and consideration of community reactions. Among Euro-Americans, social relations were stressed for manifestation of communication in society. Unlike Euro-Americans, whose thoughts derived mainly from the philosophical logic of previous cultural influences, Native Americans depended on social relations, which affected their thoughts and outlooks on life.

In contemporary American mainstream society, material appearance is how people represent themselves. Generally, this representation reflects an individual desire within the confines of the cultural norms of the community. Unfortunately, most people automatically judge what they see and what people wear, just as Columbus judged the first Native Americans he saw. However, it is important to note that when people meet for the first time, what they are is not always what they appear to be.¹⁹ In order for diverse peoples to learn about each other, sufficient time is required for communication and understanding. In the case of the early Europeans and Native Americans, communication frequently failed, precluding a continuous rapport. Unfortunately, Native Americans remain misunderstood to this day.

What should non-Indians know about American Indians? The American Indian tribal worldviews really represent a complex combination of the physical reality (which Columbus viewed) and the metaphysical reality.²⁰ In order to begin to understand such a dual reality in Native American philosophy, the non-Indian must develop an accurate perception over a long period of time. Unfortunately, Euro-Americans have yet to exhibit the patience needed to completely understand Native Americans at all levels of their cultures.

European and Indian perceptions differed because the cultural needs of the societies developed differently. Furthermore, the values of the European and Native American systems substantiated this fundamental premise. At the community level, Europeans and Indians valued certain items that fulfilled particular needs. Such differences in values between the Europeans and Native Americans existed at a cultural level beyond basic sustenance within the natural habitat. For example, the needs of Europeans and Indians for survival would presumably be the same in early America, i.e., food, shelter, and clothing. But after

these fundamental necessities were obtained, the second level of needs differed in the separate cultures. Secondary needs for cultural expressions of art, economy, technology, and craftsmanship compelled Europeans and Native Americans to view the resources of America in contrasting ways. As a result, Europeans and Native Americans viewed each other differently, based on early external factors of cultural manifestations, accomplishments, and directions of advancement.

How, then, after satisfying the initial needs for survival, could Native Americans and Europeans have developed in such drastically different ways? First and most obvious, the vast geographic distance between the two hemispheres created a polarization of European and Native American sociocultural systems. If the width of the Atlantic Ocean had been smaller, would the ultimate encounter between Indians and Europeans have occurred sooner? And the question immediately arises, Would the results be the same?²¹ Conversely, if another fifty years had elapsed beyond 1492, perhaps the talented native mariners of the American Pacific Northwest would have “discovered” the Old World by sailing westward across the Pacific Ocean. Thor Heyerdahl suggests that native societies in South America may have made voyages to the Hawaiian Islands, transporting their goods and ideologies.²² One theory considers that American Indians may originally have populated the Western Hemisphere and migrated across the Bering Strait 25,000 years ago to populate the Eastern Hemisphere.²³ Generally, the tribal nations believed that they originated in their own homelands in the Western Hemisphere.

As it happened, the distance across the Atlantic Ocean of more than three thousand miles factored into the great historic encounter. The hemispheric distance created the extraordinary simultaneous emergence of divergent cultures, evolving at different rates due to different environmental conditions.

American Indians had a lengthy history before Columbus, beginning 35,000 to 50,000 years ago, according to early evidence of Sandia man found in the southwestern United States—possibly the oldest evidence found in the Western Hemisphere. Anthropological and archaeological research has documented that over five hundred different tribal nations inhabited the North American continent alone at the time of Columbus, and an even larger number lived in Mexico, Central, and South America. Placed into the perspective of the long history of Ameri-

can Indians, the arrival of Columbus was merely one of many noted episodes.

The numerous native groups were scattered throughout the Americas. They were all different from each other, because climate and environment led to varying cultural developments, values, beliefs, and worldviews. Many groups became aware of each other and established social and political relationships. Some tribes warred against one another, while others formed alliances. In general, the Indian nations regarded these changing relationships as more important than the arrival of Columbus, logically placing the European stranger or news about him as secondary in importance to daily needs and survival in the tribal homelands.

Trade networks were well established in many parts of native America, and many tribes also perceived themselves in relation to groups of people who lived great distances away. Trade routes were established along the Mississippi and Missouri rivers and throughout the Great Lakes area, the Southeast, Northeast woodlands, Pacific Northwest, and even Central and South America.

Intertribal warfare broke out frequently, causing native groups to view their relationships militarily. The Iroquois League in the Northeast, the Muscogee Creek Confederacy in the Southeast, and the later Sioux alliances on the northern Plains are examples of native groups that perceived other peoples as different and placed them within that perspective.

In summary, because of the variety of geographic areas, environments, climates, and worldviews, Native American groups developed in distinct physical and cultural ways and at different rates. Each group established an identity of its own. Racially, according to physical appearance, they were similar, but on no other level were the Native American groups alike until Columbus falsely called them "los Indios," lumping them together in one historical stereotype.

The complexity of nature has always intrigued Native Americans. Nature's vast storehouse of knowledge held the people in awe and led them to pursue deeper questions about life. In their world, the sun rose in the East without failure, renewing life with each day. Tribal intellectuals among the Taino looked in this direction for guidance and knowledge, and then one day in 1492, three unusual vessels arrived with the sun from the East. This encounter was the initial meeting of two minds and two worlds that would differ as long as both existed.

How the native people viewed Columbus has not been seriously studied, and how American Indians in general have perceived the American experience is unknown to most people. In the larger context of global history, the fateful encounter in 1492 was the meeting of two very different minds, changing the course of world history and propelling both Native Americans and Euro-Americans into a new era. Perhaps both sides will have a better understanding of each other during the next five hundred years, if they will try.

NOTES

1. Other explorers arrived well before Columbus in the Western Hemisphere, leaving evidence behind. The Scandinavian Vikings have been documented to have reached Greenland and North America sometime between A.D. 1006 and 1347. Buddhist texts tell about five priests who sailed along the Japanese Current from China in A.D. 458 and landed in Mexico or in Guatemala. Perhaps even before these efforts, the Egyptians may have reached the West in central Mexico, establishing a link between the pyramids of both hemispheres. But Columbus's initial voyage led to permanent colonization in North and South America. The life of Columbus has been written numerous times, but one interesting and insightful biography originally produced about 1571 is by Columbus's son, Fernando Colón, *The Life of the Admiral Christopher Columbus by His Son Don Ferdinand*, translated and annotated by Benjamin Keen (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1959).

2. The correct group of Indians that met Columbus on 12 October 1492 is the Taino, or Arawak. The more accepted information is that they were the Taino and they lived near the Carib, who inhabited nearby islands. Additional readings about the first contact are Sherburn F. Cook and Woodrow Borah, "The Aboriginal Population of Hispaniola," *Essays in Population History*, Vol. 1 (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1971); Alfred W. Crosby, *The Columbian Exchange: Biological and Cultural Consequences of 1492* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1972); William F. Keegan, ed., *Hispanic/Native American Interactions in the Caribbean: A Sourcebook* (New York, 1991); Kirkpatrick Sale, *The Conquest of Paradise: Christopher Columbus and the Columbus Legacy* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1990); Samuel M. Wilson, *Hispaniola: Caribbean Chiefdoms in the Age of Columbus* (Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama, 1990); Tzvetan Todorov, *The Conquest of America: The Question of the Other* (New York: Harper & Row, 1984); and David E. Stannard, *American Holocaust: Columbus and the Conquest of the New World* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992).

3. Bruce G. Trigger, "Early Native North American Responses to European Contact: Romantic versus Rationalistic Interpretations," *Journal of American History* 77:4 (March 1991): 1200.

4. Tribal prophecies of "white-looking" men arriving in tribal lands are told among certain tribes and recorded in Peter Nabokov, ed., *Native American*

Testimony: A Chronicle of Indian-White Relations from Prophecy to the Present, 1492–1992 (New York: Penguin Books, 1992), 6–17.

5. For reference to Columbus's diary, see Samuel Eliot Morison, ed., *Journals and Other Documents on the Life and Voyages of Christopher Columbus* (New York: The Heritage Press, 1963).

6. The original journal of Christopher Columbus was lost and rewritten by one of his men. For more information, see Morison, *Journal and Other Documents*.

7. Jesse Jennings has authored and co-authored books on early Indians or Paleo-Indians in America, such as *Prehistory of North America*, 2d ed. (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974); *The Native Americans: Prehistory and Ethnology of North American Indians*, with Robert F. Spencer et al. (New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1965); and *Prehistoric Man in the New World*, with E. Norbeck, eds. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964).

8. See William Cronon, *Changes in the Land: Indians, Colonists, and the Ecology of New England* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1983).

9. For many kinds of myths and legends regarding creation and the importance of life among the numerous tribespeople of North America, see Alfonso Ortiz and Richard Erdoes, eds., *American Indian Myths and Legends* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1984).

10. The possible ill effects of Indian and animal relations is discussed in Calvin Martin, *Keepers of the Game: Indian-Animal Relationships and the Fur Trade* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1978).

11. See Steven Foster and James A. Duke, *A Field Guide to Medicinal Plants: Eastern and Central North America* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1990).

12. The concept of circular philosophy is repeated in *Black Elk Speaks*.

13. For example, nearly five hundred types of flora exist in eastern and central North America. See Foster and Duke, *Field Guide to Medicinal Plants*.

14. See Gene Weltfish, *The Lost Universe: Pawnee Life and Culture* (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1965).

15. Refer to W. C. Vanderworth, *American Indian Oratory* (Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1966).

16. See Franz Boas, *The Mind of Primitive Man* (New York: MacMillan, 1911).

17. Black Elk described his spiritual journey in John Neihardt, ed., *Black Elk Speaks, Being the Life Story of a Holy Man of the Oglala Sioux* (1932; New York: Pocket Books, 1975), 190–94.

18. See Alfonso Ortiz, *The Tewa World* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969).

19. The actual quote referred to here is, "Everyone sees what you seem, but few know what you are," in reference to the dark, sinister character of people. See Niccolo Machiavelli, *The Prince* (originally published in 1532).

20. Several works exist on the metaphysical reality of American Indians. See Neihardt, *Black Elk Speaks*; John Lame Deer and Richard Erdoes, *Lame Deer Seeker of Visions* (New York: Pocket Books, 1976).

21. This hypothetical situation is portrayed in Martin Cruz Smith, *The Indians Won* (New York: Leisure Books, 1970).

22. Thor Heyerdahl, *Kon-Tiki: Across the Pacific by Raft* (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1950).

23. Refer to Jeffrey Goodman, *American Genesis: The American Indian and the Origins of Modern Man* (New York: Summit Books, 1981).