PART ONE

The Idea of the Indian: Invention and Perpetuation

Since the original inhabitants of the Western Hemisphere neither called themselves by a single term nor understood themselves as a collectivity, the idea and the image of the Indian must be a White conception. Native Americans were and are real, but the Indian was a White invention and still remains largely a White image, if not stereotype. According to a modern view of the matter, the idea of the Indian or Indians in general is a White image or stereotype because it does not square with present-day conceptions of how those peoples called Indians lived and saw themselves. The first residents of the Americas were by modern estimates divided into at least two thousand cultures and more societies, practiced a multiplicity of customs and lifestyles, held an enormous variety of values and beliefs, spoke numerous languages mutually unintelligible to the many speakers, and did not conceive of themselves as a single people—if they knew about each other at all. By classifying all these many peoples as Indians, Whites categorized the variety of cultures and societies as a single entity for the purposes of description and analysis, thereby neglecting or playing down the social and cultural diversity of Native Americans then—and now—for the convenience of simplified understanding. To the extent that this conception denies or misrepresents the social, linguistic, cultural, and other differences among the peoples so labeled, it lapses into stereotype. Whether as conception or as stereotype, however, the idea of the Indian has created a reality in its own image as a result of the power of the Whites and the response of Native Americans.

If the term Indian and the images and conceptual categories that
go along with that collective designation for Native Americans are White inventions, then the first question becomes one already old in 1646 when an unnamed tribesman asked the Massachusetts missionary John Eliot: “Why do you call us Indians?” The first task of this book becomes therefore the study of the origins of the terminology and imagery for the collective Indian among those European nations most powerful in the colonization of the Western Hemisphere: Spain, France, and England. That the term survives into the present, evokes imagery and emotion yet today, and constitutes an intellectual classification of Native Americans in our own time raises the second major question: Why has the idea of Indian persisted for so many centuries? This problem is considered in general in the second half of this part as prelude to the histories of various aspects of White thinking and policy.

The Spanish Legacy of Name and Imagery

What Whites called the discovery of the New World and its inhabitants was, of course, part of the new economic and intellectual world of Western Europe at the time. The rising spirit of nationalism and the emergence of nation-states in that area spurred exploration of the non-European world and divided the rest of the globe into national spheres of colonization. The new printing press disseminated information about the new-found lands and expanded educated Europeans’ knowledge of other peoples and their ways of life. But, if Europeans added a fourth part, America, to the traditional tripartite division of the inhabited world, they comprehended that New World and its peoples in terms of their own familiar conceptual categories and values, as can be seen in the terminology and overall images in first the Spanish and then the French and English accounts and travel literature.¹

The specific term Indian as a general designation for the inhabitants of North and South America in addition to some Asians stems from the erroneous geography of Christopher Columbus. Under the impression he had landed among the islands off Asia, he called the
peoples he met *los Indios*. Although he quite self-consciously gave new names to islands upon his first voyage, his application of the term *Indios* seems to have been almost casual. The word was introduced to the public in the offhand manner of an aside through his oft-reprinted letter of 1493.\(^2\) Regardless of whether Columbus thought he had landed among the East Indies or among islands near Japan or even elsewhere near the Asian continent, he would probably have used the same all-embracing term for the natives, because *India* stood as a synonym for all of Asia east of the river Indus at the time and *Indies* was the broadest designation available for all of the area he claimed under royal patent.\(^3\) Even after subsequent explorations corrected Columbus’s error in geography, the Spanish continued to employ *Indios* for all peoples of the New World, including the Aztec and Inca societies. As Gonzalo Fernández de Oviedo y Valdés explained to his readers in *De la natural hystoria de las Indias* (1526), the general term was *Indians* “for so caule wee all nations of the new founde lands.”\(^4\) The word continues in Spanish usage today and still includes the Filipinos as well. From the Spanish term came eventually the French *Indien*, the German *Indianer*, the English *Indian*, and similar words in other European languages for the New World inhabitant.

Not only was the general word a Spanish legacy to Europe but so was the basic imagery of the Indian. Until the latter half of the sixteenth century what educated Europeans knew of the geography and inhabitants of the Americas came mainly from Spanish sources, for the initial White explorations and settlement of the Western Hemisphere were conducted under the auspices of that nation. Collections of travel accounts and chronicles of Spanish discoveries appeared as early as the first decade of the 1500s, but the first comprehensive and authoritative collection of travel literature, compiled by Giovanni Battista Ramusio under the title *Delle navigazioni et viaggi* and published in three massive volumes in Venice, did not appear until the 1550s.\(^5\) In the third volume, which is devoted to the New World, all of the extracts and journals are of Spanish origin except for the voyages of Verrazano and Cartier for the French monarch. Likewise, the first translated materials on the Americas published by Richard Eden for the English in the same decade drew largely upon Spanish accounts except for those of some Italians exploring for other countries.\(^6\)

The initial image of the Indian, like the word itself, came from the pen of Columbus. Although neither Columbus nor the converted Jew he took along to act as translator understood the language of the
islanders they encountered on the first voyage, the Admiral of the Ocean Sea described with confidence in his widely published letter of 1493 the lifestyles of those peoples he called Indians:

The people of this island and of all the other islands which I have found and of which I have information, all go naked, men and women, as their mothers bore them, although some of the women cover a single place with the leaf of a plant or with a net of cotton which they make for the purpose. They have no iron or steel or weapons, nor are they fitted to use them. This is not because they are not well built and of handsome stature, but because they are very marvellously timorous. ... It is true that, after they have been reassured and have lost this fear, they are so guileless and so generous with all that they possess, that no one would believe it who has not seen it. They refuse nothing that they possess, if it be asked of them; on the contrary, they invite any one to share it and display as much love as if they would give their hearts. They are content with whatever trifle of whatever kind that may be given to them, whether it be of value or valueless. ... They do not hold any creed nor are they idolaters; but they all believe that power and good are in the heavens and were very firmly convinced that I, with these ships and men, came from the heavens, and in this belief they everywhere received me after they had mastered their fear. This belief is not the result of ignorance, for they are, on the contrary, of a very acute intelligence and they are men who navigate all those seas, so that it is amazing how good an account they give of everything. It is because they have never seen people clothed or ships of such a kind. ...

In all these islands, I saw no great diversity in the appearance of the people or in their manners and language. On the contrary, they all understand one another, which is a very curious thing. ...

In all these islands, it seems to me that all men are content with one woman, and to their chief or king they give as many as twenty. It appears to me that the women work more than do the men. I have not been able to learn if they hold private property; it seemed to me to be that all took a share in whatever any one had, especially of eatable things.

How Columbus ascertained the religious values and property customs of the islanders must be left to his imagination, but the description he gave of the Arawak tribespeople was the first in a long succession of such images of the Indian as lacking in European accomplishments but pleasant withal.
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In contrast to this favorable view of Indians, he also provided the first of the bad images as well:

In these islands I have so far found no human monstrosities, as many expected, but on the contrary the whole population is very well formed. . . . Thus I have found no monsters, nor had a report of any, except in an island "Carib," which is the second at the coming into the Indies, and which is inhabited by a people who are regarded in all the islands as very fierce and who eat human flesh. They have many canoes with which they range through all the islands of India and pillage and take whatever they can. They are no more malformed than are the others, except that they have the custom of wearing their hair long like women, and they use bows and arrows of the same cane stems, with a small piece of wood at the end, owing to their lack of iron which they do not possess. They are ferocious among these other people who are cowardly to an excessive degree, but I make no more account of them than of the rest. From this hearsay but accurate description of the Caribbean cannibals came the line of savage images of the Indian as not only hostile but depraved.

As important in establishing the early conception and imagery of the Indian was an oft-reprinted tract of Amerigo Vespucci, after whom the continents of the New World were named. In the tract that gained him this distinction, the Florentine merchant who sailed for both Spain and Portugal summarized his experiences with the natives of Brazil. Although modern scholars question the authenticity of some of the navigations chronicled in Vespucci's Mundus Novus, published around 1504–1505, it provided European readers with the most detailed ethnography of New World peoples since Columbus. Furthermore, this pamphlet reinforced and enhanced the ambivalent images of the Indian in the minds of educated Europeans at the time, for its publication was even more widespread than Columbus's letter and its description of Indian customs was far more detailed and vivid. So influential was this description at the time that it deserves quotation at length to convey both its flavor and its impact upon the European imagination:

First then as to the people. We found in those parts such a multitude of people as nobody could enumerate (as we read in the Apocalypse), a race I say gentle and amenable. All of both sexes go about naked, covering no part of their bodies; and just as they spring from their mothers' wombs so they go until death. They have indeed large
square-built bodies, well formed and proportioned, and in color verging upon reddish. This I think has come to them, because, going about naked, they are colored by the sun. They have, too, hair plentiful and black. In their gait and when playing their games they are agile and dignified. They are comely, too, of countenance which they nevertheless themselves destroy; for they bore their cheeks, lips, noses and ears. Nor think those holes small or that they have one only. For some I have seen having in a single face seven borings any one of which was capable of holding a plum. They stop up these holes of theirs with blue stones, bits of marble, very beautiful crystals of alabaster, very white bones, and other things artificially prepared according to their customs. But if you could see a thing so unwonted and monstrous, that is to say a man having in his cheeks and lips alone seven stones some of which are a span and a half in length, you would not be without wonder. For I frequently observed and discovered that seven such stones weighed sixteen ounces, aside from the fact that in their ears, each perforated with three holes, they have other stones dangling on rings; and this usage applies to the men alone. For women do not bore their faces, but their ears only. They have another custom, very shameful and beyond all human belief. For their women, being very lustful, cause the private parts of their husbands to swell up to such a huge size that they appear deformed and disgusting; and this is accomplished by a certain device of theirs, the biting of certain poisonous animals. And in consequence of this many lose their organs which break through lack of attention, and they remain eunuchs. They have no cloth either of wool, linen or cotton, since they need it not; neither do they have goods of their own, but all things are held in common. They live together without king, without government, and each is his own master. They marry as many wives as they please; and son cohabits with mother, brother with sister, male cousin with female, and any man with the first woman he meets. They dissolve their marriages as often as they please, and observe no sort of law with respect to them. Beyond the fact that they have no church, no religion and are not idolaters, what more can I say? They live according to nature, and may be called Epicureans rather than Stoics. There are no merchants among their number, nor is there barter. The nations wage war upon one another without art or order. The elders by means of certain harangues of theirs bend the youths to their will and inflame them to wars in which they cruelly kill one another, and those whom they bring home captives from war they preserve, not to spare their lives, but that they may be slain for food; for they eat one another, the victors the vanquished, and among other kinds of meat human flesh is a common article of diet with them. Nay be the more assured of this fact because the father has already been seen to eat children and wife, and
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I knew a man whom I also spoke to who was reputed to have eaten more than three hundred human bodies. And I likewise remained twenty-seven days in a certain city where I saw salted human flesh suspended from beams between the houses, just as with us it is the custom to hang bacon and pork. I say further: they themselves wonder why we do not eat our enemies and do not use as food their flesh which they say is most savory. Their weapons are bows and arrows, and when they advance to war they cover no part of their bodies for the sake of protection, so like beasts are they in this matter. We endeavored to the extent of our power to dissuade them and persuade them to desist from these depraved customs, and they did promise us that they would leave off. The women as I have said go about naked and are very libidinous; yet they have bodies which are tolerably beautiful and cleanly. Nor are they so unsightly as one perchance might imagine; for, inasmuch as they are plump, their ugliness is the less apparent, which indeed is for the most part concealed by the excellence of their bodily structure. It was to us a matter of astonishment that none was to be seen among them who had a flabby breast, and those who had borne children were not to be distinguished from virgins by the shape and shrinking of the womb; and in the other parts of the body similar things were seen of which in the interest of modesty I make no mention. When they had the opportunity of copulating with Christians, urged by excessive lust, they defiled and prostituted themselves. They live one hundred and fifty years, and rarely fall ill, and if they do fall victims to any disease, they cure themselves with certain roots and herbs. These are the most noteworthy things I know about them.10

The influence of Vespucci's vivid characterization may be seen in the first pictorial all-Indian scene and the first known description of Indians published in the English language. Although naked people appeared as Indians in the woodcuts illustrating the letters of Columbus and Vespucci (see Plate 1), the first picture depicting the domestic life of the Indians as such was produced in Augsburg or Nuremberg around 1505.11 Supposedly of the Tupinamba or Guarani of Brazil, the scene graphically portrayed the vice most sensational and horrifying in European eyes—cannibalism—as an everyday Indian way of life (see Plate 2). Native life as portrayed in the picture fits the first brief mention of Armenia, or America, in English. Published some time between 1511 and 1522, the text was taken from a Dutch pamphlet of the period:

the people of this lande have no kyng nor lorde nor theyr god [...] But all things is commune/ this people goeth all naked But the men
and women have on theyr heed/ necke/ Armes/ Knees/ and fete all
with foders bounden for ther bewtynes and sayrenes. These folke
lyven lyke bestes without any resonablenes and the wymen be also
as comon. And the men hath conversacyon with the wymen/ who
that they ben or who they fyrst mete/ is she his syster/ his mother/
his daughter/ or any other kyndred. And the wymen be very hoote
and dysposed to lecherdes. And they eete also on[e] another[.]
The man eteth his wyfe[,] his chylderne/ as we also have seen and
they hange also the bodyes or persons fleeshe in the smoke/ as men
do with swynes fleeshe. And that lande is ryght full of folke/ for they
lyve commonly. iii. C[300] yere and more as with sykeness they dye
nat/ they take much fysshe for they can goen under water and
fe[t]che so the fisshes out of the water. And they were also on[e]
upon a nother/ for the olde men brynge the yonge men therto/
that they gather a great company therto of towe partyes/ and come
the on[e] ayene the other to the felde or batcyll/ and flee on[e] the
other with great hepes. And nowe holdeth the fylde/ they take the
other prisoners And they brynge them to deth and eete them/ and
as the dede is eten then sley they the rest. And they been eten also/
or otherwyse lyve they longer tymes and many yeres more than
other people for they have costly sypces and rotes/ where they them
selfe recover with/ and hele them as they be seke.\textsuperscript{12}

With the new printing press purveying such images in print and
picture, the idea of the Indian as different from the European quickly
developed in the minds of Europeans even before they knew for sure
that these people did not live off Asia.

As the Spanish empire extended over the American continents
and Europeans came to understand that these new-found lands were
indeed a New World, the Spanish observations amplified what was
known of the diversity of the aboriginal inhabitants of the Western
Hemisphere but did not change the fundamental conception of the
Indian. The basic themes that would dominate so much of White
thinking on Native Americans for the next few centuries were well
developed in the literature on the Spanish conquest and settlement of
the Americas. Using the twin criteria of Christianity and “civilization,”
Spaniards found the Indian wanting in a long list of attributes:
letters, laws, government, clothing, arts, trade, agriculture, marriage,
morals, metal goods, and above all religion. Judgments upon these
failures might be kind and sympathetic or harsh and hostile, but no
one argued that the Indian was as good as the European in this early
period. Neither discovery that the new-found lands constituted a
whole new world nor the conquest of the Aztec and Inca civilizations
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altered the basic understanding of the Indian as a generic conception for the inhabitants of the Americas. Knowledge of Aztec and Inca achievements in art and agriculture and in social and political organization added to the concrete information about the diversity of peoples but did not transform the overall conception of the Indian. If the Aztecs, for example, possessed sophisticated governmental, agricultural, and social systems, so too they practiced a religion that appeared to Spanish eyes as the very worship of the Devil, with its emphasis on human sacrifice. Indians might, therefore, have the wrong or no religion, have misguided or no government, in addition to other negative qualities attributed to the stereotype, but they always stood in Christian error and deficient in civilization according to Spanish standards of measurement.

Under this impression, no wonder Spaniards debated what means were necessary to bring the Indian in line with their ideals of Christian civilization according to European criteria. Was the nature of the Indian so bestial as to demand force and ultimately enslavement to accomplish his conversion to Christ and Spanish ways, or was the Indian sufficiently rational and human to achieve these goals through peace and example alone? The Dominican friar Bartolomé de Las Casas, appalled by the cruelty, the suffering, and the deaths that accompanied Spanish exploitation of the natives, became the most vigorous publicist and lobbyist for the side favoring peaceful means and Indian freedom. In his arguments he portrayed the Indian as essentially virtuous:

God created these simple people without evil and without guile. They are the most obedient and faithful to their natural lords and to the Christians whom they serve. They are the most submissive, patient, peaceful, and virtuous. Nor are they quarrelsome, rancorous, querulous, or vengeful. Moreover they are more delicate than princes and die easily from work or illness. They neither possess nor desire to possess worldly wealth. Surely these people would be the most blessed in the world if only they worshipped the true God.

Las Casas' opponent in the great formal debate on the matter in 1550 at Valladolid, Juan Ginés de Sepúlveda, delineated Indian character in quite different terms as he sought to justify Spanish conquest and enslavement of Native Americans:

Now compare their [the Spanish] gifts of prudence, talent, magnanimity, temperance, humanity, and religion with those little men (homunculos) in whom you will scarcely find traces of hu-
manity; who not only lack culture but do not even know how to write, who keep no records of their history except certain obscure and vague reminiscences of some things put down in certain pictures, and who do not have written laws but only barbarous institutions and customs. But if you deal with the virtues, if you look for temperance or meekness, what can you expect from men who were involved in every kind of intemperance and wicked lust and who used to eat human flesh? And don't think that before the arrival of the Christians they were living in quiet and the Saturnian peace of the poets. On the contrary they were making war continuously and ferociously against each other with such rage that they considered their victory worthless if they did not satisfy their monstrous hunger with the flesh of their enemies, an inhumanity which in them is so much more monstrous since they are so distant from the unconquered and wild Scythians, who also fed on human flesh, for these Indians are so cowardly and timid, that they scarcely withstand the appearance of our soldiers and often many thousands of them have given ground, fleeing like women before a very few Spaniards, who did not even number a hundred.16

Brave or meek, the Indian stood condemned in Sepúlveda's words.

The significance of these two opposing conclusions, employing two disparate images, lies not in their contrast alone but in what they show about Spanish conceptions of Indian as a general category. Although Las Casas tried to differentiate orders of barbarians among Native Americans, both he and Sepúlveda, like other Spaniards, viewed all peoples of the Western Hemisphere as a collective entity when they used the term Indios.

French and English Terms and Images

To what extent these conceptions bequeathed by the Spanish to other Europeans became the preconceptions of the French and English in their subsequent contact with Native Americans is difficult to tell. Even without such advance information, the French and the English would have approached the New World's inhabitants with the same basic values and orientations as had the Spanish. Thus,
The Idea of the Indian

whether they were or were not influenced by Spanish reports, French and English explorers saw Native Americans in light of the Christianity and civilization they knew and valued and therefore made the same comparisons as had the Spanish adventurers and settlers earlier. That such judgments had to be the outcome of contact between the French and English with the Indians was further assured by the type of native societies and cultures the representatives of those two nations encountered.7 No Aztec or Inca civilizations awaited discovery and exploitation in the areas claimed by the two countries. Rather than peoples with complex social and governmental organizations, the explorers of those two nations met “wilder” Indians, and so perhaps the denomination of these peoples as savage in French and savage in English seemed more appropriate to early explorers from those two countries. Certainly this impression led to Jacques Cartier’s conclusion upon the natives of the Gaspé Basin he encountered in 1534: “These men may very well and truly be called wild, because there is no poorer people in the world.”18

Sixteenth-century Frenchmen, Italians, and Englishmen generally employed a variant of the Latin sylvaticus, meaning a forest inhabitant or man of the woods, for the Indian as the earlier spellings of sauvage, salvatico, and savage show so well in each of the respective languages. English usage switched from savage to Indian as the general term for Native Americans in the seventeenth century, but the French continued to use sauvage as the preferred word into the nineteenth century.19 The original image behind this terminology probably derives from the ancient one associated with the “wild man,” or wilder Mann in Germany. According to medieval legend and art, the wild man was a hairy, naked, club-wielding child of nature who existed halfway between humanity and animality. Lacking civilized knowledge or will, he lived a life of bestial self-fulfillment, directed by instinct, and ignorant of God and morality. Isolated from other humans in woods, caves, and clefts, he hunted animals or gathered plants for his food. He was strong of physique, lustful of women, and degraded of origin. As the chief historian of the image suggests:

Wildness meant more in the Middle Ages than the shrunken significance of the term would indicate today. The word implied everything that eluded Christian norms and the established framework of Christian society, referring to what was uncanny, unruly, raw, unpredictable, foreign, uncultured, and uncultivated. It in-
cluded the unfamiliar as well as the unintelligible. Just as the wilderness is the background against which medieval society is delineated, so wilderness in the widest sense is the background of God’s lucid order of creation. Man in his unreconstructed state, faraway nations, and savage creatures at home thus came to share the same essential quality.20

French and English explorers, like Columbus, were therefore both surprised and not surprised by the lifestyles they encountered when compared to what they expected of “wild” strangers. For the French, the dictionary definition of sauvage came to be that of André Thévet’s description of the Tupinamba: “a marvelously strange wild and brutish people, without faith, without law, without religion and without civility.”21 In fact, these are almost exactly the words used in the great Encyclopédie of the eighteenth century to describe the sauvage: “peuples barbares qui vivent sans loix, sans police, sans religion, & qui n’ont point d’habitation fixe.”22 According to the author of this definition, a large part of America was still peopled with savages who were ferocious and ate human flesh but who lived in natural liberty because they lacked civilized institutions.

English usage mixed both savage and Indian in the travel accounts and letters of the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. Information about the Western Hemisphere and its inhabitants first became available in any quantity in English through the translations of Richard Eden in the 1550s. In these translated texts and the marginal notations upon them, Eden uniformly employed Indians for Indios.23 The more famous Richard Hakluyt the Younger in his great The Principal Navigations, Voyages, Traffiques, and Discoveries of the English Nation, published in 1598–1600, also uses Indians for Indios in the Spanish accounts he includes but “wild men” for the sauvages of Jacques Cartier’s journals. Moreover, in his marginal notations he invariably writes savages regardless of the original word in the text.24 He shares this preference for savage with many of the early English adventurers in their denomination of the natives of Roanoke, Virginia, New England, and northward.25 Many other explorers, however, did select more neutral terms, like inhabitant, to describe the Native Americans they met in the sixteenth century.26 but no English explorer’s account used Indians until the seventeenth century.

The officers of the Virginia Company in London wrote of natives in their instructions to governors of that colony, but the recipi-
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cents of those letters and the Englishmen resident in Virginia talked most frequently of *Indians* and less often of *infidels* and *savages* in reply, even though they were well aware of the various tribes among whom they lived, as the famed Captain John Smith’s writings show.27 The same mingling of general terms for Native Americans and specific names and understanding of individual tribes can be found in the writings of the Pilgrims and Puritans during the first decades of their plantations in New England.28

What Englishmen called Native Americans and how they understood them after a few decades of settlement was summarized by Roger Williams in a brief analysis of nomenclature in *A Key Into the Language of America; Or, An Help to the Language of the Natives in That Part of America Called New-England* (1643). Under the heading “By what names are they distinguished,” he divided terminology into two sorts:

First, those of the *English* giving: as *Natives, Salvages, Indians, Wild-men*, (so the Dutch call them *Wilden*) *Abergeny men, Pagans, Barbarians, Heathen.*

Secondly, their *Names*, which they give themselves.

I cannot observe that they ever had (before the coming of the *English, French or Dutch amongst them*) any *Names* to difference themselves from strangers, for they knew none . . .

They have often asked mee, why we call them *Indians*, [. . .] *Natives, &c.* And understanding the reason, they will call themselves *Indians*, in opposition to *English, &c.*29

Although few Englishmen possessed the linguistic skill or the toleration of the founder of Rhode Island, his summary of European terms seems accurate in light of the publications and manuscripts of the time. For Englishmen as for other Europeans, the use of general terms for Native Americans coexisted with knowledge of specific differences among the peoples so denominated. Williams’s list also suggests that Native Americans themselves needed new general terms to designate the peoples invading their lands and to differentiate themselves from those strangers just as much as the Europeans did in the contact process.

Less used than *Indian* and *savage* but still prevalent among early English synonyms for Native Americans, as Williams’s little catalog indicates, were the terms *infidel, heathen, and barbarian.* Both *infidel* and *heathen* were based upon religious criteria and derive from ancient Jewish and early Christian distinctions between themselves and
other peoples. In fact, at the time of the initial English colonization of
the New World, the word nation still retained its older meaning of a
people or race usually heathen as well as the more modern meaning of
a country or kingdom. In brief, the term designated a foreign people
of another religion or culture as well as the territory they occupied. 96
Given the ambiguity of the word at the time and the nationalistic
outlook emerging then, small surprise that Englishmen applied nation
to what later was called a tribe. The latter term did not replace the
former until well into the nineteenth century. The older usage is
perhaps best known today in the references to the League of the
Iroquois as the Five Nations, but then the term was used widely for
individual tribes as well as for other confederacies in the colonial and
early national period of the United States. Barbarian contrasted, of
course, with one who was civilized and stemmed from the ancient
Greeks’ prejudice against peoples whose languages sounded a babble
to them. By the sixteenth century, barbarian and beathen had come
to be used almost interchangeably in English usage, for civility and
Christianity were presumed necessarily and therefore inextricably
associated. 97

Just as all these terms indicate that the French and the English
like the Spaniards compared their own societies and cultures with
those of the Native Americans, so they too, like their rivals to the
south, created basically favorable and unfavorable images of the In-
dian. What the French concluded from these images of the good and
bad savage is told in pages 12–22. 98 How the English moved from
supposedly factual descriptions of the Native Americans to the sym-
bolism of the Indian can be traced briefly from Richard Hakluyt
to Thomas Hobbes and John Locke. 99

The English discoveries of the last quarter of the sixteenth cen-
tury could be followed easily by that country’s readers from the
accounts reprinted or published for the first time in the various
compendia of Richard Hakluyt the Younger. In the folio pages of the
third volume of his last and greatest collection, The Principal Naviga-
tions, Voyages, Traffiques, and Discoveries of the English Nation
(1598–1600), appeared the usual opposing descriptions of the inhabi-
tants of the New World. Of the English accounts he printed, perhaps
no person provided a more discouraging view of the Americans than
Dionysse Settle in his discussion of Innuik Eskimo eating habits. After
an account reeking with his disgust for their custom of eating meat
raw, he concludes: “What knowledge they have of God, or what
Idoll they adore, we have no perfect intelligence, I thinke them rather
Anthropophagi, or devourers of mans flesh than other wise: for that there is no flesh or fish which they find dead (smell it neverso filthily,) but they eate it, as they finde it without any other dressing. A loathsome thing, either to the beholders or hearers." From this same man comes the remarkable tale of the capture of an old woman during a skirmish with the Eskimos: "The old wretch, whom divers of our saylers supposed to be eyther a devill, or a witch, had her buskins plucked off, to see if she were cloven footed, and for her ugly hew and deformity we let her goe."  

In this case, preconception seemed to have created image, and image in turn became fact. From Hakluyt, the diligent reader could also obtain a most favorable view of the Indian. Now well known through modern quotation are the phrases of Arthur Barlowe, who sailed in 1584 under the auspices of Sir Walter Raleigh to reconnoiter his patron's grant from the Queen. He sums up his first impression of the natives of Roanoke Island after his initial reception as "very handsome, and goodly people, and in their behavior as mannerly and civil, as any of Europe." After a banquet, he again comments: "We were entertained with all love, and kindnes, and with as much bountie, after their manner, as they could possibly devise." Although he noted that the Indian peoples maintain an extremely ferocious warfare among themselves, he depreciated any fears of hostilities from these natives because: "for a more kinde and loving people, there can not be found in the world, as farre as we have hitherto had triall." No wonder Barlowe concluded: "Wee found the people most gentle, loving, and faithful, void of all guile, and treason, and such as lived after the manner of the golden age."  

From Raleigh's attempt to establish a colony upon the Carolina coast come some of the best "scientific" descriptions of Native Americans in the sixteenth century. Accompanying the expedition that founded the Roanoke colony were the artist John White, who provided detailed drawings of the flora and fauna of the area, and the mathematician Thomas Hariot, who gave an elaborate description "of the commodities there found . . . and of the nature and manners of the natural inhabitants" in his *A Brieue and True Report of the New Found Land of Virginia*. Hariot assured his fellow Englishmen that the natives of the proposed colony were easily intimidated by White arms and valor, that their towns and fighting strength were small, and that they were in awe of English artifacts and skills. In short, the natives were readily available for English colonization and exploitation, to tell which was his purpose in writing the pamphlet. Published
originally in 1588 and included by Hakluyt in his travel collections, it was reissued in 1590 by the Flemish engraver and publisher Theodor de Bry at the behest of Hakluyt as the first volume in his great illustrated series of *Grand Voyages to America*. Now Englishmen and other Europeans could see pictures of Indians as well as read the accompanying ethnography of Hariot. Under the hands of De Bry's engravers, the portraits and posture of the Carolina Indians became more classical in pose and composition than the more accurate watercolors of John White, from which the engravers worked (Plate 3). In pictures and in Latin, German, French, and English, Europeans could judge for themselves the appearance, the clothing, the government, the religion, the manner of fishing and making boats, and the burial customs of the Carolina natives. These neoclassical Indians were thought such fit illustrations of the Indian in general that the De Bry plates subsequently adorned Captain John Smith's *The Generall Historie of Virginia, New-England and the Summer Isles* (1624) and even appeared in slightly modified form as late as 1705 in Robert Beverly's *History and Present State of Virginia*. Thus the heritage of the lost colony of Roanoke and the legendary Virginia Dare proved to be of two sorts: one, the peril of colony making in the new land; and two, the classical portrait of the Indian in the colonial period.40

By the time of the founding of Jamestown in 1607, therefore, the English, whether as promoters of colonization, founders of the Virginia Company, or as adventurers to the new colony, all thought they knew what Indians were like, how they looked and behaved, and what could be expected from them. Small wonder their expectations were fulfilled. Did these images even predetermine their actions in early encounters? Their terminology and descriptions all indicate that the English saw Indians according to the twin criteria of Christianity and civilization. The Native Americans of the Jamestown area also probably had some images of the Whites from previous contact or at least hearsay from the Roanoke colony. Perhaps in this way both sides exhibited behavior that confirmed previous stereotypes of each other.40

Once again one of the first impressions was of hospitality, but as English adventurers and Indian leaders competed over land and power cautious cooperation turned to outright conflict. As one gentleman observed as early as 1607: "The [native] people used our men well untrill they found they began to plant & fortify, then they fell to skyrnising & kylled 3 of our people."41 The most in-
formative and certainly the most voluminous reports on the numerous tribes of the Jamestown area came from the pen of Captain John Smith. In his many self-advertisements he tells of how he adopted a policy of striking fear into the native population in order to coerce their respect and their help in colony building. Although predisposed to see the bad side of Indian character and custom, Smith nevertheless presented an ambiguous picture of the Indian to his readers. If, on the one hand, they appeared “inconstant in everie thing, but what feare constraineth them to keepe,” they also were “craftie, timorous, quicke of apprehension & very ingenuous.” While Smith carefully differentiated the various tribes in contact with the English on the James, he characterized them all as Indians in his description and therefore perpetuated the general category in English minds at the same time as he presented the dual evaluation of that category.

How both images served the needs of the English may be seen in the pamphlet of Alexander Whitaker, a minister in Henrico, Virginia, who urged his fellow countrymen to support the philanthropic impulse in the colony for both base and high motives in his Goode Newes from Virginia (1613). To prove the natives needed conversion, he resorted to the image of the bad Indian:

... let the miserable condition of these naked slaves of the divell move you to compassion toward them. They acknowledge that there is a great good God, but know him not, having the eyes of their understanding as yet blinded: wherefore they serve the divell for feare, after a most base manner, sacrificing sometimes (as I have heere heard) their own Children to him. ... Their priests ... are no other but such as our English witches are. They live naked in bodie, as if their shame of their sinne deserved no covering: Their names are as naked as their bodie: They esteem it a virtue to lie, deceive and steale as their master the divell teacheth to them.

On the other hand, to prove them capable of conversion, Whitaker stressed the favorable aspects of Indian character and custom:

But if any of us should misdoubt that this barbarous people is uncapable of such heavenly mysteries, let such men know that they are farre mistaken in the nature of these men, for the promise of God, which is without respect to persons, made as well to unwise men after the flesh, as to the wise, &c. let us not thinke that these men are so simple as some have supposed them: for they are of bodie lustie, strong, and very nimble: They are a very understand-
ing generation, quick of apprehension, suddaine in their dispatches, subtile in their dealings, exquisite in their inventions, and industrious in their labour.

In fact, their government appears a model for their condition:

Finally there is a civill government amongst them which they strictly observe, and shew thereby that the law of Nature dwelleth in them: for they have a rude kinde of Common-wealth, and rough government, wherein they both honor and obey Kings, Parents, and Governours, both greater and lesse, they observe the limits of their owne possessions, and incroach not upon their neighbours dwellings. Murther is a capitall crime scarce heard among them: adultery is most severely punished, and so are their other offences.44

The missionary concluded such glimmerings of reason and government encouraged the English to hope for their conversion, while their savage condition demanded it. In brief, he used both images of the Indian to substantiate his argument for the prayers and particularly the generosity of the English people in the enterprise to bring these heathen under the command of Christ.

The continued conflict over land and power as the early English settlements expanded in Virginia culminated in what the Whites called the massacre of 1622 led by Opechancanough, the successor to Powhatan. The bloody devastation of the infant colony prompted one poet to pen perhaps the darkest picture of Indian character in his demand for revenge upon the murderers of supposedly innocent women and children:

... let these [lines] excite
Your military judgments to give light
In safe securing of the residue
Or extirpation of these Indian crewe.

For, but consider what those Creatures are,
(I cannot call them men) no Character
of God in them: Soules drown'd in flesh and blood;
Rooted in Evil, and oppos'd in Good;
Errors of nature, of inhumane Birth,
The very dregs, garbage, and spanne of Earth;
Who we're (I think) were mention'd with those creatures
Adam gave names to in their several natures;
But such as coming of a later Brood,
(Not sav'd in th' Arke) but since the generall Flood
So enraged was this poet over what he considered the perfidy of the Virginia natives that he lapsed into heresy to express his anger, for in depicting the savage character of the Indians he denied God's creation of all human beings in a single act at one time.

More orthodox in theology but equally uncomplimentary in judgment and vehemence were the words of Samuel Purchas in reaction to the massacre. In his first collection of travel accounts, Purchas his Pilgrimage or Relations of the World, the successor to Hakluyt in ambition if not in influence presented a less unfavorable picture of the Indian than he did in his magnum opus, Hakluytus Posthumus or Purchas His Pilgrimes, issued in four volumes in 1625. There in a discourse arguing for the benefits of Virginia settlement, he summarized his judgment of the natives:

On the other side considering so good a Countrey, so bad a people, having little of humanitic but shape, ignorant of Civilitie, of Arts, of Religion; more brutish than the beasts they hunt, more wild and unmanly then that unmanned wild countrey, which they range rather then inhabit; captivated also to Satans tyranny in foolish pieties, mad impieties, wicked idlenesse, busie and bloody wickednesse.48

The massacre of 1622 may have escalated English rhetoric, but the basic imagery had long been set in Virginia by White experiences previous to settlement as well as the actual contact during the early years of the colony. Subsequent English experience would only prove what they already knew about the good and bad qualities of Indian character and life. Tribes might differ and specific knowledge would increase about native individuals and groups, but the meaning of the Indian was beyond such knowledge.

The impact of the dual imagery upon the minds of educated Englishmen can be seen in their uses by that nation's two greatest philosophers of the seventeenth century. In discussing the fundamen-
tals of government in 1651, Thomas Hobbes thought the state of nature clearly undesirable:

In such condition, there is no place for Industry; because the fruit thereof is uncertain; and consequently no Culture of the Earth; no Navigation, nor use of the commodities that may be imported by Sea; no commodious Building; no Instruments of moving, and removing, such things as require much force; no Knowledge of the face of the Earth; no account of Time; no Arts; no Letters; no Society; and which is worst of all, continuall feare, and danger of violent death; And the life of man, solitary, poore, nasty, brutish, and short.

For proof that such horrible conditions could actually exist, he pointed to evidence all his readers knew already:

It may peradventure be thought, there was never such a time, nor condition of warre as this; and I believe it was never generally so, over all the world: but there are many places where they so live now. For the savage people in many places of America, except the government of small Families, the concord whereof dependeth on natural lust, have no government at all; and live at this day in that brutish manner, as I said before.

For John Locke “in the beginning all the World was America” also, but he contradicted Hobbes in equating the state of nature with the state of war, for men could live in reason and peace without government as the Europeans knew it. That the two eminent English philosophers believed the Indian proved their opposing cases shows the ambivalence of the imagery as well as the implications of using a general name for all Native Americans regardless of what Whites knew of the social and cultural diversity among the inhabitants of the Western Hemisphere. In the books of Hobbes and Locke the Indian had moved from the contrasting descriptions of explorers and settlers to the ideological polemics of social philosophers.
Significance of Indian as a General Category and Conception

From the very beginning of White penetration of the Western Hemisphere, Europeans realized that it was inhabited by peoples divided among themselves. Even Columbus on his first voyage distinguished between peaceful and hostile Indians on the basis of cannibalism and military ardor. Subsequent Spanish explorers, conquerors, and writers noted the differences among the many Indian societies of the New World, especially between the Aztec and Inca civilizations and other peoples. Both French and English explorers remarked the contrasts between the Eskimos and other peoples to the south of them. Early English adventurers into Virginia spoke of Indians, savages, and infidels in one breath at the same time as they carefully studied the various alliances and specific characteristics of the tribes around Jamestown. The ability to differentiate one tribe from another only increased as White knowledge accumulated over time, but the general term Indian or a synonym continued to coexist with—and in spite of—such information. If Whites understood the many differences among Native American peoples, why did they persist in using the general designations, which required the lumping together of all Native Americans as a collective entity? The answer to this question reveals much about later as well as early White images of Native Americans.

Increased knowledge of the fundamental differences among peoples of the world also seemed to promote Europeans’ recognition of the similarities among themselves. In other words, exploration and expansion overseas resulted from and reinforced nationalism at the same time that it promoted an overall collective vision of a Europe in contradistinction to the rest of the world. The transition in thinking can perhaps be seen best in the increasing use of “Europe” for self-reference during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries in preference to the older “Christendom.” Another indication would be the new word continent to characterize the emerging geographical notions of collective physical self-definition of Europeanness in contrast to other
peoples broadly conceived.\textsuperscript{49} Humanist scholars endowed the old image of mythical Europa with new secular characteristics in tune with their times and what they considered her place in history. The basic attributes ascribed to continents showed most vividly in the symbolic pictures applied to title pages and to maps, but the same meaning lay behind the more prosaic written descriptions and discourses on the peoples of the world. Europeans portrayed their own continent in terms of intellectual, cultural, military, and political superiority, for Europa was usually pictured wearing a crown, armed with guns, holding orb and scepter, and handling or surrounded by scientific instruments, pallets, books, and Christian symbols. While Asia was richly dressed, rarely did she possess superior signs of power, learning, or religion. America and Africa appeared naked, and the former usually wore a feathered headdress and carried a bow and arrow. Europe, in brief, represented civilization and Christianity and learning confronting nature in America (see Plate 4).\textsuperscript{50}

The general terms \textit{heathen}, \textit{barbarian}, \textit{pagan}, \textit{savage}, and even \textit{Indian} revealed these criteria of judgment at the same time that they validated the use of collective terms for the peoples of other continents. The European takeover of the New World proved to Europeans, at least, their own superiority and confirmed the reliability of the classification of peoples by continents. Common concepts combined with successful conquest reinforced the general impression of the deficiency of primitives everywhere and validated the continuation of the general conception and the glossing over of the growing knowledge of specific social and cultural differences among New World peoples. Even among themselves and the peoples they had long known well, Europeans correlated whole nationalities with uniform moral and intellectual attributes; it should be no surprise that they should stereotype the new peoples they met elsewhere. If Shakespeare had his Caliban to symbolize New World savagery, he also had his Shylock, his Othello, as well as his Irishmen, Turks, Italians, and others to appeal to his audiences' preconceptions.\textsuperscript{51}

Part of this stereotyping of national as well as continental characteristics must be ascribed to the confusion among the realms of culture and biology, nation and race prevalent then and until recently in Western thought. Lifestyles, bloodlines, and national boundaries were all mixed together in White analysis of humankind. Until social heritage and biological heredity were separated in the twentieth century, national character, racialism, and culture were confused and therefore blended together, whether of nations or of continents. Al-
though as time passed the relations among environment, biology, and culture might be seen as dynamic, with each being the cause as well as the effect of the others, their confusion due to imprecise delineation and misunderstanding of the mechanism of transmission meant that race and national character studies were the same thing until very recent times. Nations, races, and cultures were all basically seen as one interchangeable category for the understanding of peoples, and individuals were usually judged as members of their collectivity rather than as different, separate humans. Therefore, general terms embracing stereotyped characteristics made sense to Whites and could exist alongside knowledge of specific societies with individual characteristics or of individuals with varying qualities.

One important consequence of this style of thought was the continuance of the general term Indian. The use of the general term demanded a definition, and this definition was provided by moral qualities as well as by description of customs. In short, character and culture were united into one summary judgment. The definition and characterization of Indian as a general term constitutes the subject proper of this book as opposed to the history of the evolution of images and conceptions of specific tribes. The basic question to be asked of such overall White Indian imagery and conception is not, therefore, why its invention in the first place but why its continuance, or perpetuation, for so many succeeding centuries? To what extent do these old approaches to the Indian still constitute the chief White views of Native Americans even today?

**Persisting Fundamental Images and Themes**

The centuries-long confusion and melding of what seem to us fundamentally different, even incorrect, ways of understanding human societies account for several persistent practices found throughout the history of White interpretation of Native Americans as Indians: (1) generalizing from one tribe's society and culture to all Indians, (2) conceiving of Indians in terms of their deficiencies according to White ideals rather than in terms of their own various
cultures, and (3) using moral evaluation as description of Indians.52 Not only does the general term Indian continue from Columbus to the present day, but so also does the tendency to speak of one tribe as exemplary of all Indians and conversely to comprehend a specific tribe according to the characteristics ascribed to all Indians. That almost no account in the sixteenth century portrays systematically or completely the customs and beliefs of any one tribe probably results from the newness of the encounter and the feeling that all Indians possessed the same basic qualities.53 Although eyewitness accounts and discourses by those who had lived among Native Americans in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries often describe in detail the lives of a specific tribe or tribes, they also in the end generalize from this knowledge to all Indians. The famous reporters on Native American cultures in the colonial period of the United States, for example, invariably treated their tribe(s) as similar enough to all other Indians in customs and beliefs to serve as illustrations of that race in thought and deed.54 Even in the century that saw the rise of professional anthropology, most social scientists as well as their White countrymen continued to speak and write as if a specific tribe and all Indians were interchangeable for the purposes of description and understanding of fundamental cultural dynamics and social organization.55 Today, most Whites who use the word Indian have little idea of specific tribal peoples or individual Native Americans to render their usage much more than an abstraction, if not a stereotype. Even White writers on the history of White images of the Indian tend to treat all Native American cultures as a single Indian one for the purposes of analyzing the validity of White stereotypes.56

Another persistent theme in White imagery is the tendency to describe Indian life in terms of its lack of White ways rather than being described positively from within the framework of the specific culture under consideration. Therefore, tribal Americans were usually described not as they were in their own eyes but from the viewpoint of outsiders, who often failed to understand their ideas or customs. Images of the Indian, accordingly, were (and are) usually what he was not or had not in White terms, rather than in terms of individual tribal cultures and social systems as modern anthropologists aim to do.57 This negative prototype of the deficient Indian began with Columbus but continues into the present as any history of the White education of Native Americans reveals. To this day such education is still too often treated as philanthropy to the "culturally deprived" Indian.58
Description by deficiency all too readily led to characterization by evaluation, and so most of the White studies of Indian culture(s) were (and are) also examinations of Indian moral character. Later White understanding of the Indian, like that of earlier explorers and settlers, expressed moral judgments upon lifestyles as well as presented their description, or mixed ideology with ethnography, to use modern terms. Ethnographic description according to modern standards could not truly be separated from ideology and moral judgment until both cultural pluralism and moral relativism were accepted as ideals. Not until well into the twentieth century did such acceptance become general among intellectuals, and even then only a few Whites truly practiced the two ideals in their outlook on Native Americans. Thus eyewitness description prior to this century and so much still in our time combines moral evaluation with ethnographic detail, and moral judgments all too frequently passed for science in the past according to present-day understanding. If ideology was fused with ethnography in firsthand sources, then those images held by Whites who never had experience with Native Americans were usually little more than stereotype and moral judgment.

Whether describing physical appearance or character, manners or morality, economy or dress, housing or sexual habits, government or religion, Whites overwhelmingly measured the Indian as a general category against those beliefs, values, or institutions they most cherished in themselves at the time. For this reason, many commentators on the history of White Indian imagery see Europeans and Americans as using counterimages of themselves to describe Indians and the counterimages of Indians to describe themselves. Such a negative reference group could be used to define White identity or to prove White superiority over the worst fears of their own depravity. If the Puritans, for example, could project their own sins upon people they called savages, then the extermination of the Indian became a cleansing of those sins from their own midst as well as the destruction of a feared enemy.

Since White views of Indians are inextricably bound up with the evaluation of their own society and culture, then ambivalence of Europeans and Americans over the worth of their own customs and civilization would show up in their appraisal of Indian life. Even with the image of the Indian as a reverse or negative model of White life, two different conclusions about the quality of Indian existence can be drawn. That Indians lacked certain or all aspects of White civilization could be viewed as bad or good depending upon the observer's feel-
ings about his own society and the use to which he wanted to put the image. In line with this possibility, commentators upon the history of White imagery of the Indian have found two fundamental but contradictory conceptions of Indian culture.82

In general and at the risk of oversimplifying some four centuries of imagery, the good Indian appears friendly, courteous, and hospitable to the initial invaders of his lands and to all Whites so long as the latter honored the obligations presumed to be mutually entered into with the tribe. Along with handsomeness of physique and physiognomy went great stamina and endurance. Modest in attitude if not always in dress, the noble Indian exhibited great calm and dignity in bearing, conversation, and even under torture. Brave in combat, he was tender in love for family and children. Pride in himself and independence of other persons combined with a plain existence and wholesome enjoyment of nature's gifts. According to this version, the Indian, in short, lived a life of liberty, simplicity, and innocence.

On the other side, a list of almost contradictory traits emerged of the bad Indian in White eyes. Nakedness and lechery, passion and vanity led to lives of polygamy and sexual promiscuity among themselves and constant warfare and fiendish revenge against their enemies. When habits and customs were not brutal they appeared loathsome to Whites. Cannibalism and human sacrifice were the worst sins, but cruelty to captives and incessant warfare ranked not far behind in the estimation of Whites. Filthy surroundings, inadequate cooking, and certain items of diet repulsive to White taste tended to confirm a low opinion of Indian life. Indolence rather than industry, improvidence in the face of scarcity, thievery and treachery added to the list of traits on this side. Concluding the bad version of the Indian were the power of superstition represented by the "conjurers" and "medicine men," the hard slavery of women and the laziness of men, and even timidity or defeat in the face of White advances and weaponry. Thus this list substituted license for liberty, a harsh lot for simplicity, and dissimulation and deceit for innocence.

Along with the persistence of the dual image of good and bad but general deficiency overall went a curious timelessness in defining the Indian proper. In spite of centuries of contact and the changed conditions of Native American lives, Whites picture the "real" Indian as the one before contact or during the early period of that contact. That Whites of earlier centuries should see the Indian as without history makes sense given their lack of knowledge about the past of
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Native American peoples and the shortness of their encounter. That later Whites should harbor the same assumption seems surprising given the discoveries of archeology and the changed condition of the tribes as the result of White contact and policy. Yet most Whites still conceive of the "real" Indian as the aborigine he once was, or as they imagine he once was, rather than as he is now. White Europeans and Americans expect even at present to see an Indian out of the forest or a Wild West show rather than on farm or in city, and far too many anthropologists still present this image by describing aboriginal cultures in what they call the "ethnographic present," or as if tribes live today as they once did. Present-day historians of the United States, likewise, omit the Indian entirely after the colonial period or the last battles on the Plains for the same reason. If Whites do not conceive of themselves still living as Anglo-Saxons, Gauls, or Teutons, then why should they expect Indians to be unchanged from aboriginal times, Native Americans ask of their White peers?

If Whites of the early period of contact invented the Indian as a conception and provided its fundamental meaning through imagery, why did later generations perpetuate that conception and imagery without basic alteration although Native Americans changed? The answer to this question must be sought partially in the very contrast presumed between Red and White society that gave rise to the idea of the Indian in the first place. Since Whites primarily understood the Indian as an antithesis to themselves, then civilization and Indianess as they defined them would forever be opposites. Only civilization had history and dynamics in this view, so therefore Indianess must be conceived of as ahistorical and static. If the Indian changed through the adoption of civilization as defined by Whites, then he was no longer truly Indian according to the image, because the Indian was judged by what Whites were not. Change toward what Whites were made him ipso facto less Indian.

The history of White-Indian contact increasingly proved to Whites, particularly in the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, that civilization and Indianess were inherently incompatible and verified the initial conception that gave rise to the imagery. Death through disease and warfare decimated the aboriginal population in the face of White advance and gave rise by the time of the American Revolution to the idea of the vanishing race. If Whites regarded the Indian as a threat to life and morals when alive, they regarded him with nostalgia upon his demise or when that threat was safely past.

Indians who remained alive and who resisted adoption of civiliza-
tion appeared to accept White vices instead of virtues and so became those imperfect creatures, the degraded or reservation Indian. If there is a third major White image of the Indian, then this degraded, often drunken, Indian constitutes the essence of that understanding. Living neither as an assimilated White nor an Indian of the classic image, and therefore neither noble nor wildly savage but always scorned, the degraded Indian exhibited the vices of both societies in the opinion of White observers. Degenerate and poverty-stricken, these unfortunate were presumed to be outcasts from their own race, who exhibited the worse qualities of Indian character with none of its redeeming features. Since White commentators pitied when they did not scorn this degenerate Indian, the image carried the same unfavorable evaluation overall as the bad or ignoble Indian.

Complete assimilation would have meant the total disappearance of Indianness. If one adds to these images the conceptions of progress and evolution, then one arrives at the fundamental premises behind much of White understanding of the Indian from about the middle of the eighteenth century to very recent times. Under these conceptions civilization was destined to triumph over savagery, and so the Indian was to disappear either through death or through assimilation into the larger, more progressive White society. For White Americans during this long period of time, the only good Indian was indeed a dead Indian—whether through warfare or through assimilation. Nineteenth-century frontiersmen acted upon this premise; missionaries and philanthropists tried to cope with the fact. In the twentieth century anthropologists rushed to salvage ethnography from the last living members left over from the ethnographic present, and historians treated Indians as "dead" after early contact with Whites. In these ways modern Native Americans and their contemporary lifestyles have largely disappeared from the White imagination—unless modern Indian activism reverses this historic trend for longer than the recurring but transitory White enthusiasm for things Indian.

That the White image of the Indian is doubly timeless in its assumption of the atemporality of Indian life and its enduring judgment of deficiency does not mean that the imagery as a whole does not have its own history. The problem is how to show both the continuity and the changes in the imagery. Ideally such a history would embody both (1) what changed, what persisted, and why, and (2) what images were held by whom, when, where, and why. On the whole, scholars of the topic attempt only one or the other of these approaches and adopt quite different strategies in doing so. One
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group traces the imagery in the cultural context and intellectual history of a nation or of Western civilization. The other group examines the socioeconomic forces and vested interests of White individuals and groups. To oversimplify somewhat, the first group of scholars sees the imagery as a reflection of White cultures and as the primary explanation of White behavior vis-à-vis Native Americans, while the second group understands the imagery to be dependent upon the political and economic relationships prevailing in White societies at various times. Usually the former concentrates upon imagery and ideas, and the latter emphasizes policy and actual behavior toward Native Americans. As a result of these differences in attention and explanation, nowhere does one find a comprehensive history of White imagery.

If the remarkable thing about the idea of the Indian is not its invention but its persistence and perpetuation, then the task of this book becomes one of delineating that continuity in spite of seeming changes in intellectual and political currents and alterations in social and economic institutions. Accordingly, Part Two searches beneath the "scientific" conception of the Indian as it moves from premises in Christian cosmogony to modern anthropology for the familiar imagery. Part Three examines the persistence of the dual imagery of the Indian in imaginative and ideological literature and art despite changing intellectual and political climates. The last part turns to the continuing use of the basic Indian imagery to justify White public and private policies and actual dealings with Native Americans as political regimes altered and economic institutions changed.