

Also by Dan Stone:

BREEDING SUPERMAN: Nietzsche, Race and Eugenics in Edwardian and Interwar Britain

COLONIALISM AND GENOCIDE (*co-editor with A. Dirk Moses*)

CONSTRUCTING THE HOLOCAUST: A Study in Historiography

HANNAH ARENDT AND THE USES OF HISTORY: Imperialism, Nation, Race and Genocide (*co-editor with Richard H. King*)

HISTORY, MEMORY AND MASS ATROCITY: Essays on the Holocaust and Genocide

RESPONSES TO NAZISM IN BRITAIN 1933–1939: Before War and Holocaust

THE HISTORIOGRAPHY OF THE HOLOCAUST (*editor*)

THEORETICAL INTERPRETATIONS OF THE HOLOCAUST (*editor*)

The Historiography of Genocide

Edited by

Dan Stone

Professor of Modern History, Royal Holloway, University of London

palgrave
macmillan



Editorial matter, selection, introduction, Chapter 14 © Dan Stone 2008.
All remaining chapters © their respective authors 2008.

All rights reserved. No reproduction, copy or transmission of this publication may be made without written permission.

No paragraph of this publication may be reproduced, copied or transmitted save with written permission or in accordance with the provisions of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988, or under the terms of any licence permitting limited copying issued by the Copyright Licensing Agency, 90 Tottenham Court Road, London W1T 4LP.

Any person who does any unauthorised act in relation to this publication may be liable to criminal prosecution and civil claims for damages.

The authors have asserted their rights to be identified as the authors of this work in accordance with the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

First published 2008 by
PALGRAVE MACMILLAN
Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire RG21 6XS and
175 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10010
Companies and representatives throughout the world

PALGRAVE MACMILLAN is the global academic imprint of the Palgrave Macmillan division of St. Martin's Press, LLC and of Palgrave Macmillan Ltd. Macmillan® is a registered trademark in the United States, United Kingdom and other countries. Palgrave is a registered trademark in the European Union and other countries.

ISBN-13: 978-1-4039-9219-2 hardback
ISBN-10: 1-4039-9219-3 hardback

This book is printed on paper suitable for recycling and made from fully managed and sustained forest sources. Logging, pulping and manufacturing processes are expected to conform to the environmental regulations of the country of origin.

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

The historiography of genocide / edited by Dan Stone.
p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 1-4039-9219-3 (alk. paper)

1. Genocide—History. 2. Crimes against humanity—History.

I. Stone, Dan, 1971—

HV6322.7.H57 2008

304.6'630722—dc22

2007048561

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
17 16 15 14 13 12 11 10 09 08

Printed and bound in Great Britain by
CPI Antony Rowe, Chippenham and Eastbourne

6322.7
.H58
Contents

<i>List of Charts</i>	vii
<i>List of Tables</i>	viii
<i>Notes on the Contributors</i>	ix
Introduction <i>Dan Stone</i>	1
I. Concepts	7
1. Defining Genocide <i>Ann Curthoys and John Docker</i>	9
2. Problems in Comparative Genocide Scholarship <i>Anton Weiss-Wendt</i>	42
3. Conceptions of Genocide and Perceptions of History <i>David Moshman</i>	71
4. Collective Violence and the Shifting Categories of Communal Riots, Ethnic Cleansing and Genocide <i>Veena Das</i>	93
5. Cultural Genocide in Australia <i>Robert van Krieken</i>	128
6. Genocide and Modernity <i>A. Dirk Moses</i>	156
7. Religion and Genocide: A Historiographical Survey <i>Doris L. Bergen</i>	194
8. Gender and Genocide <i>Adam Jones</i>	228
9. Prosecuting Genocide <i>William A. Schabas</i>	253
II. Case Studies	271
10. Genocide in the Americas <i>Alfred A. Cave</i>	273

10

Genocide in the Americas

Alfred A. Cave

Introduction

Although they often differ sharply on the numbers, scholars without exception now portray the European colonization of the Americas as a monumental, perhaps unprecedented, demographic catastrophe for the continents' indigenous peoples. Rejecting earlier estimates that held that the New World was sparsely populated in 1492, demographers now provide projections that, in their highest estimates, sometimes exceed 112,000,000.¹ There is general agreement that, whatever their precise pre-contact numbers, indigenous populations within a century after contact were reduced by 90% or more. There is agreement as well on the prime agent of that decimation: infectious diseases to which native peoples had no immunity. But it is also generally recognized that atrocities against native American peoples committed by the invader-colonizers also contributed to their population decline. Did those atrocities constitute genocide? On that question there has been disagreement and controversy.

At one extreme stands a group of scholars who argue that genocide on a massive and unprecedented scale was the primary characteristic of the history of colonization in the Americas. Perhaps the most outspoken and controversial member of this group is Ward Churchill. In *A Little Matter of Genocide* he declared that 'the American holocaust was and remains unparalleled, both in terms of its magnitude and in terms of the degree to which its ferocity was sustained over time not by one but by several participating groups.'² Elsewhere, Churchill wrote that the perpetrators of genocide against Indians anticipated 'the behavior and the logic that have come to be associated with Hitler's SS. They defined their enemy in purely racial terms, they understood war only in terms of the sheer annihilation of the racial enemy, and they engaged in war because of a combination of abstract conceptions of "progress" on the one hand, and a related desire for pure material gain on the other.'³

Another notable spokesman of this school is David E. Stannard. In his *American Holocaust*, Stannard took issue with those who refuse to call 'the near-total destruction of the Western Hemisphere's native people' genocide, on the grounds that it was primarily the 'inadvertent' but 'inevitable' result of epidemic disease. 'Although at times operating independently, for most of the long centuries of devastation that followed 1492, disease and genocide were interdependent forces acting dynamically – whipsawing their victims between plague and violence, each one feeding upon the other, and together driving countless numbers of entire ancient societies to the brink – and often over the brink – of total extermination.'⁴ Tzvetan Todorov, in *The Conquest of America: The Question of the Other*, found substantial support for that view in the writings of a number of contemporary historians of the Spanish invasion of the Americas, among them Fr. Toribio Motolinia, a priest not particularly sympathetic to Indians or their culture. Motolinia described 'ten plagues' which decimated the indigenous population. Only two were outbreaks of infectious disease. The others were deliberate acts of abuse and murder perpetrated by the Spanish, and included famine induced by the destruction of crops, systematic beating, starvation and overwork of enslaved Indian labourers in fields and mines, and in numerous instances, indiscriminate sadistic killing, including the widespread practice of tossing Indian babies to ravenous dogs. Motolinia's account, dating from 1534, is but one of many hundreds of contemporary records of the genocidal behaviour of conquistadores and colonists occurring in virtually every area of the American continents and extending over several centuries. Todorov, who declared the genocide in the Americas unsurpassed in its scope, dedicated his book to 'the memory of a Mayan woman devoured by dogs'.⁵

Despite the evidence of extensive abuse of indigenous peoples by colonizers, some writers have denied the validity of the concept of genocide to the understanding of the colonization of America. Historian James Axtell, to cite a leading example, has declared that 'genocide ... is historically inaccurate as a description of the vast majority of encounters between Europeans and Indians. Certainly no European colonial government ever tried to exterminate all Indians as Indians, as a race, and you can count on one hand the authorized colonial attempts to annihilate even single tribes ... [T]he vast majority of settlers had no interest in killing Indians – who were much too valuable for trade and labor – and those who did took careful aim at temporary political or military enemies.' Axtell concludes that descendants of the colonizers need not feel any particular sense of 'moral onus' surrounding the deeds of their forbearers. While recognizing that some colonists did some very bad things, he assures his readers that 'only the rare, certifiable, homicidal maniac sought to commit "genocide" against the Indians.'⁶

Others have agreed with Axtell in challenging the use of the terms 'genocide' and 'holocaust' as descriptive of the encounters of Europeans and Native Americans. Some scholars of the Nazi Holocaust in particular have argued that

for atrocities to merit the name of genocide, they must involve the full and sustained use of state power driven by an intention to achieve total racial extermination. The most notable spokesman for this viewpoint is Steven T. Katz, who maintains that 'the Holocaust ... the intentional murder of European Jewry during World War II, is historically and phenomenologically unique ... by virtue of the fact that never before has a state set out as a matter of intentional principle and actualized policy, to annihilate physically every man, woman and child belonging to a specific people.' Colonial policy makers in the Americas, by contrast, according to Katz, generally sought to protect Indian lives in time of peace, as they were needed as labourers, trading partners and military allies.⁷

It is apparent that at issue here is a question of definition. While there have been many efforts over the past half century to refine and focus definitions of genocide, the 1948 United Nations Convention on Genocide remains the sole authoritative international legal definition.⁸ The Convention declares, in Article II, that

Genocide means any of the following acts committed with the intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial, or religious group as such:

- (a) Killing members of the group
- (b) Causing severe bodily or mental harm to members of the group
- (c) Deliberately inflicting on members of the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part
- (d) Imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group
- (e) Forcibly transferring children of the group to another group.

Katz and other scholars who argue for the uniqueness of the Nazi Holocaust insist that we must define genocide in a far more narrow and exclusionary sense than the 1948 United Nations convention permits. Their critics argue that in so doing they minimize the sufferings of many victims of racial and ethnic hatreds. They have been faulted as well for not understanding the genocidal nature of the Nazi campaign to exterminate Gypsies, or the Turkish massacres of Armenians a quarter of a century earlier.⁹ Those issues lie beyond the scope of this paper. Whatever the merits of the case for the Holocaust's uniqueness, the distinctions Katz and others have drawn between twentieth-century Nazis and European colonizers are nonetheless useful, as they put in sharp focus the inadequacy of generalizations about genocide. To award or deny the label does not explain the violence, or enable us to comprehend the horrors lying beyond the words. To characterize the processes through which Native American lives and cultures were degraded and destroyed as 'genocidal' may express proper moral indignation, but it does not necessarily help us understand the complex,

multi-faceted and often contradictory patterns of inter-racial and inter-cultural interaction on colonial frontiers and within colonies in the Americas.

While examples of state-sponsored extermination of indigenous populations can be found in the records of every colonial power in the Americas, they were, as Axtell maintains, not the rule and were aimed not at all Indians but at a limited number of specific tribal groups. For that reason, Axtell advises that the term 'genocide' ought not to be used in discussions of colonialism in the Americas. But these campaigns of extermination, however limited in scope, meet the United Nations definition of genocide in that they sought to 'destroy, in whole or in part a national, ethnical, racial or religious group as such.' Granted colonial powers did not explicitly target all Indians for extermination. But the wars they waged against specific Indian nations were often genocidal in effect. Moreover, the violence visited upon tribal peoples all too often came to be justified by the growing belief that the victims no longer deserved to exist as a people. The campaigns to subdue those peoples far exceeded any rational military logic, and often led to outright mass exterminations. Axtell's dismissal of those cases in which European colonizers sought to 'annihilate ... single tribes' as actions against 'temporary military or political enemies' misses the essential point. When the killing and/or enslavement of the enemy continued after the victim group ceased to constitute any physical threat to the conqueror, those actions were acts of genocide.

Genocide, under the United Nations definition, does not require the sanction of the state. Indian fatalities in American colonies were often the result of killing campaigns mounted by colonists in apparent defiance of the will of the authorities. Colonial laws invariably forbade the slaughter of Indians in time of peace, or the murder of 'friendly' Indians in time of war. But Indians frequently fell victim to murderous settlers, who only infrequently were punished for their crimes. Were those killings genocide? While some argue that they are better described as 'massacres', the negligence and even complicity of colonial administrations in failing to protect indigenous peoples indicates that the line dividing officially sanctioned genocide and indiscriminate genocidal private killing was often far from distinct. Thus it is appropriate that the United Nations definition of genocide does not require such a distinction.

Ideological roots of racial violence in the Americas

Rabbi Abraham Joshua Herschel has declared that 'Auschwitz was built not with stones, but words.'¹⁰ As one recent scholarly study has noted, genocide is possible only if the 'victim group' has been portrayed 'as worthless, outside the web of mutual obligations, a threat to the people, immoral sinners, and/or sub-human.'¹¹ In providing a background for understanding the well-documented, unprovoked and extensive physical violence visited upon Native

Americans by both explorers and colonizers, the earliest historical accounts of the conquest and colonization of the Americas are telling. Among the most influential of the builders of verbal images of Indians was Peter Martyr, an Italian humanist resident in the Spanish court. His *Decades of the New World*, first published in its entirety in 1530, provided the first comprehensive history of the founding of the Spanish colonies in the Americas. In his characterizations of Native American peoples, readers found vivid word pictures of creatures bearing resemblance to humans in form, but lacking the social, moral and intellectual qualities of civilized beings. In a strangely ambivalent invocation of a 'Golden Age', the author portrayed some of those creatures as gentle folk who lived 'simply and innocently, without enforcement of laws, without quarreling, judges, and libels, content only to satisfy nature, without further vexation for knowledge of things to come.' But the innocent child of nature is not the dominant image of Indians conveyed in Peter Martyr's writings. Many of his Indians are vicious and bestial, given to cannibalism, devil worship, human sacrifice, sodomy and bestiality. Their wars, brutal and endless, gave ongoing expression to their essentially ferocious nature. Many lived like animals, without the trappings of civilization. Those who did erect elaborate cities and found monarchies gave the superficial appearance of being 'civilized', but revealed to the knowledgeable their depravity in the sacrifice of human captives on their high altars and in the cannibalizing of the victims' bodies. The overall emotional tenor of the *Decades* is conveyed in this description of some Indian captives whom Peter Martyr, an armchair traveller who never crossed the Atlantic, visited in Spain: 'There is no man able to behold them but that he shall feel his bowels grate with a certain horror, nature hath endowed them with so terrible a menacing and cruel aspect.'¹² These deformed and monstrous peoples might be human, but even if they were, they were clearly under the control of the Devil. Belief that the New World was Satan's realm was widespread among the Spanish, and among other European explorers and colonizers, from the early sixteenth century onwards.

Despite the efforts of Fr Bartolomé de las Casas and other dissenters to promote a more humane image of the peoples of the New World, the emphasis on Indian incapacity and depravity continued to dominate Spanish thought throughout the colonial era. Spanish intellectuals, intent upon resolving the question of the crown's right to occupy and subjugate the Americas, differed on various points, including the question of whether present Indian backwardness was the product of an inborn, unchangeable incapacity. The points of difference dividing commentators such as Las Casas, Vitoria and Acosta, who affirmed the Indians' basic humanity, from others such as Oviedo, Gomara and Sepulveda, who emphasized their brutish qualities, is by no means as wide as scholars once believed.¹³ Sixteenth-century Spanish writers were generally agreed that Indians of the New World, while varying in levels of savagery and

barbarism, lacked fully developed rational faculties and were therefore presently (or perhaps permanently) unable to construct and maintain civil societies in harmony with natural law. The hard-core critics of Indian life saw them as equivalent to Aristotle's 'slaves by nature', unworthy of freedom. Others, following Vitoria, affirmed that with proper tutelage and care, Indians could be prepared for freedom. While only a few denied their basic humanity, virtually all regarded Native Americans as inferior peoples living in cultures that were both backward and morally depraved. The sixteenth-century Spanish debates over Indian capacity would be replicated in varying forms by other European colonizers over the next few centuries. The images, in these debates, of Indians as intellectual inferiors and moral degenerates, provided support not only to those who justified their subjugation and dispossession, but on occasion, the extermination of those regarded as most savage.

Although in promoting the 'Black Legend' the English accused the Spanish of committing atrocities against the Indians in their charge,¹⁴ they nonetheless embraced uncritically the most negative of the Spanish characterizations of the victims.¹⁵ The most popular English treatise on geography, published in multiple editions in the late sixteenth and throughout the seventeenth century, included these descriptions of Indians: 'a people naked and uncivil ... given to sodomy, incest, and all kinds of adultery', to 'adoration of devils', 'blind witchcraft' and 'intercourse with foul spirits'. The author concluded that while Indians appeared to possess 'reason and the shape of men', their intellectual and moral deficiencies required that they be kept under the tutelage of European Christians.¹⁶ Early chroniclers and historians of England's first colonial ventures portrayed the New World as the Devil's realm and Indians as his slaves. Through the good offices of Christians, English writers affirmed, some might be delivered from that bondage and be led into truth and salvation. But many, perhaps most, were believed to be beyond hope. Sir Walter Raleigh, in the world history he wrote in the Tower of London, declared that all of the peoples of the Americas, North and South, had 'been brought by the devil under his fearful servitude.'¹⁷ In his histories of the colony founded at Jamestown in 1607, Captain John Smith maintained that had God not intervened to soften the hearts of the satanic Indians, and persuaded them to defy their master the Devil and send food to aid the starving colony, the English in Virginia would have all died in agony at the hands of savages skilled in torture.¹⁸ Smith's emphasis on providential intervention was echoed by numerous later historians of England's early colonial ventures. Governor William Bradford, in his history of the Plymouth colony, related that, upon first sighting the Pilgrims, the Indians of Cape Cod gathered in 'a dark and dismal swamp' and sought, through days of fiendish conjurations, to raise the Devil and hurl him against the Christians. But through God's intervention, His Elect remained safe. The Devil was kept at bay, and the Indians contrary to their true nature constrained

to offer their friendship and aid to the newcomers.¹⁹ Another Plymouth Governor, Edward Winslow, struck the same note in a report published in London in 1624. Had God in His mercy not 'filled the hearts of the savages with fear and astonishment', he wrote, the colony would quickly have fallen victim 'to their many plots and treacheries'.²⁰

English belief in God's protection of their New World ventures was not limited to His role in restraining Indian savagery. They also maintained that the epidemic diseases which afflicted the indigenous populations soon after first contact were both a judgement against sinful Indians and an act of kindness to God's own Elect. By killing Indians He was making room for the colonizers. Thomas Hariot, the chronicler of Sir Walter Raleigh's short lived Roanoke colony noted, in 1586, that whenever the English encountered any opposition, 'within a few day's departure from such a town, the people began to die very fast apace.' God, Hariot declared, was doing 'a special work ... for our sakes' by killing Indians.²¹ Comparable views of epidemic disease as divine judgement against diabolical peoples echoed through the English colonies in the early seventeenth century. They found their fullest expression in the writings of New England's Puritan historians. Edward Johnson, official historian of the Massachusetts Bay Colony, rejoiced 'at the wondrous work of the great Jehovah ... wasting the natural inhabitants with death's stroke'. By that means, the Almighty 'not only made room for his people to plant, but tamed the hearts of these barbarous Indians ... Thus did the Lord allay their quarrelsome spirits.'²²

The early chronicles and histories of colonization are thus dominated by a world view that believed Indians to be slaves of the devil, regarded their way of life as not only primitive but depraved and diabolical, and saw Indian mortality from infectious diseases evidence as an act of God intended to clear the wilderness of evil and make room for God's own people. These writings provide important insights into the ideological roots of racial violence in the Americas.

Genocide in Virginia and New England in the early seventeenth century

The first large scale racial war in North America began at Jamestown in 1622. After a decade and a half of episodic warfare, uneasy co-existence and sporadic killings, marked by increasing conflict over land boundaries, the murder of the Powhatan Holy Man Nemattanew precipitated a surprise attack on the English settlements in Virginia. One third of the settlers perished. The response of the London-based Virginia Company was to order the settlers to mount an exterminatory war against the Powhatan Indians that was not to end until they 'were no longer a people'. The colony's Governor Edward Waterhouse was happy to comply. 'It is infinitely better', Waterhouse wrote, 'to have no heathen among us.'²³ The campaign to obliterate these particular 'heathen' was carried out with

ruthless zeal. Settlers killed Powhatan tribesmen on sight. Over one-hundred Powhatans were murdered by poisoning at a dinner the English hosted, a dinner the Indians were told would lead to negotiations to end the war.²⁴ The tribe itself was driven out of the Virginia tidewater, as settlers complied with the 1624 resolution of the General Assembly that declared that 'the inhabitants of every corporation shall fall upon their adjoining savages.'²⁵ Greatly diminished in numbers, Powhatans found uncertain refuge in the interior. No historian doubts the brutality of the campaign against the Powhatans. But was it genocide? In the sense that the extermination of the Powhatan people was Virginia's objective, it is hard to answer 'no'. One scholar declares that had the early English settlers of Virginia been more numerous, they would have succeeded in satisfying their 'genocidal urges' by killing all of the Indians of Virginia.²⁶ Other writers, however, have argued that, despite the virulent anti-Indian rhetoric cited above, the Virginia colony's policy was never one of exterminatory war against all Indians. The English established and maintained friendly relations with several other tribes in the region, using them as trading partners and occasional military allies. The Virginia colonizers thus made a distinction between friendly and unfriendly Indians (or, as they would have it, pliant savages and vicious savages) that would reappear in other English and Anglo-American colonial areas over the centuries to come.²⁷ That recurrent distinction provided a rationale for genocidal actions aimed at, and officially limited to, specific presumably irreconcilably hostile groups but not at the entire Indian race. But it must be stressed once again that the singling out of any group for extermination or other specified forms of persecution based solely on group identity meets the legal definition of genocide as contained in the United Nations convention. Moreover, as we will demonstrate later, 'friendly' Indians were by no means exempted from long-term policies of subjugation and dispossession that were essentially genocidal in effect.

Among recent historians who debate the question of genocide in colonial America, the primary focus of attention has fallen, not on Virginia, but on New England, leading to a prolonged controversy over the nature of New England's first Indian war. For three centuries, beginning with the earliest Puritan accounts, historians generally portrayed the Pequots as a particularly aggressive, diabolical and dangerous tribe. Nineteenth-century historian Francis Parkman characterized Pequots as 'far worse than wolves or rattlesnakes'.²⁸ Alden T. Vaughan, writing in 1965, declared the tribe 'had incurred by its forced incursion into New England the enmity of its Indian neighbors and had won a notorious reputation for brutality'. The Pequot War, in Vaughan's view, was an admirable example of Indians and whites working together to deal decisively with a serious threat to their mutual security.²⁹

Recent studies of Pequot history and culture have challenged the assumptions that for so long had been used by historians to justify, or at least explain, the

Puritan attack on them. Most writers now agree that the Pequots were not a real threat to the security of the English colonies in New England.³⁰ They do not agree, however, on the motivations underlying the English attack, with some seeing the war's origins in Puritan greed and expansionism, and others finding them in mutual cultural misunderstandings that led the Puritans to imagine a danger where none existed and Pequots to fail to perceive the probable consequences of their refusal to submit to English demands.³¹ But there is no disagreement about the brutality of the Puritan campaign against the Pequots, a campaign marked by the deliberate burning alive of non-combatants in the assault on the Pequot village at Mystic, the summary execution of Pequot prisoners of war and the enslavement of their women and children. A number of scholars accordingly describe the Pequots as victims of genocide.³²

In a provocative and controversial article published in 1991, Stephen Katz dissented, arguing that the campaign against the Pequots was a defensive war, not a genocide. Given the Pequot refusal to turn over to Puritan justice Indians suspected of killing Englishmen and their efforts to form an alliance with the Narragansetts, the English 'rightly felt, given their demographic vulnerability, that their very survival was threatened.' He acknowledges that in the course of the war the Puritans massacred non-combatants, sought to kill all adult male Pequots, enslaved other survivors and finally eliminated the Pequots as 'an independent polity'. But Katz argues that the enslavement of 'the remaining communal members - the elderly, the women, and the children - directly contradicts the imputation of any intent to commit *physical* genocide.' Countering the objection that under the United Nations resolution of 1948 such actions clearly were genocidal, Katz maintains that one should employ a 'more stringent use of the term' that defines genocide 'to mean an intentional action aimed at the complete physical elimination of a people'. Revisionist historians who termed the Pequot War 'genocidal' were, he suggested, trying to tap into 'the emotive power the notion has acquired because of its connection with Auschwitz.' Katz emphasizes that 'the number [of Pequots] killed probably totaled less than half the tribe.' Conceding, however, that Puritan measures against the Pequots were extreme, he concluded that the war might be described as an example of a 'cultural genocide' driven by a determination 'to eliminate the Pequot threat once and for all' by destroying its tribal identity. The Pequots, Katz conceded, probably were not the threat that the Puritans imagined, but their motive in attacking the tribe was self-defense and thus was not genocide.

In support of that conclusion, Katz challenged the commonplace portrayal of the massacre at Fort Mystic as genocidal. Rejecting the claim of Jennings and others that the slaughter of non-combatants there had been planned prior to the assault on the village, Katz characterized the Fort Mystic action as a spontaneous response to wartime conditions.³³ On this issue, the chronicles and

histories of the war written by the Puritans themselves are of great value. The testimony of the English commanders at Mystic and of the historians who celebrated their victory tells us much about the Puritan mindset and permits us to make a judgement as to whether that mindset might be termed 'genocidal'. The Puritan writers, two of them officers who ordered the burning, made no apology and expressed no regret for the indiscriminate killing of Indian non-combatants. Instead, they represented their action as a righteous punishment of a people who, they argued, had mightily offended the Lord God. Even before the beginning of the campaign, as one Puritan historian recounted, clergy had demanded that the troops 'execute vengeance upon the heathen' by making 'the multitudes fall under your warlike weapons'.³⁴ That is the policy that was executed at Ft Mystic. The massacre there was a predictable outcome of the English perception of Indian adversaries. Captain John Underhill, commander of the Massachusetts Bay colony forces, admitted that both his Indian allies and the 'young soldiers' in the Puritan army were sickened by the slaughter, with some asking 'should not Christians have more mercy and compassion?' But Underhill took as his guide the military campaigns of King David in the Old Testament, and likened the Pequots to those enemies of God David slew. God in His anger allowed no compassion towards such people, 'but harrows them, and saws them, and puts them to the sword, and the terriblest death that may be.' As to the killing of innocent women and children, 'sometimes the Scripture declareth women and children must perish with their parents ... We had sufficient light from the word of God for our proceedings.'³⁵ Captain John Mason, the Connecticut colony's commander, portrayed God looking down on the burning village and laughing: 'his Enemies and the Enemies of his people to scorn making them as a fiery oven ... thus did the Lord God judge among the Heathen and filling the place with dead bodies.'³⁶ Later Puritan historians stressed the same note. Perhaps the most telling was Edward Johnson's strange report that the soldiers found it difficult to pierce the bodies of the Pequots with swords because 'the devil was in them.'³⁷ Puritan writers on the Pequot war leave us no reason to doubt that the Pequots were the victims of genocidal rage. Katz and others are correct in pointing out that New England's Puritan settlers did not plan the extermination of all Indians. But their identification of the Pequots, and later of other Indian tribes, as deserving of death or enslavement because of certain group characteristics (their imagined alliance with the devil, their presumed unusual treachery and brutality, etc.) certainly falls within most definitions of genocide. Neither Raphael Lemkin, who coined the term, nor the United Nations 1948 Convention on genocide foresaw the restriction of the term to the execution of a policy of total physical extermination.³⁸ The New England colonies at the end of the Pequot War systematically executed all Pequot warriors, and enslaved all others. Moreover, they demanded that their Indian allies do the same. No Pequot was set free.³⁹ These actions are

a prime example of officially sanctioned genocide inflicting suffering on all of the members of a group because of their group affiliation.

The targeting of specific Indian groups and the use of extreme measures against their non-combatants as well as their warriors recurred throughout both the colonial era and the years of frontier settlement in the emergent American nation states. Ironically, some of the most powerful and warlike Indian nations were often spared. For example, both the Dutch and later the English enlisted the Iroquois as allies and trading partners. The Dutch, however, employed the veteran Indian killer John Underhill in campaigns of extermination against the more vulnerable and less useful Indians of the lower Hudson valley and Long Island. Understandably, some historians suspect that 'defensive' wars against the very vulnerable were really driven by little more than greed.⁴⁰ That is an over-simplification. Chalk and Jonassohn have proposed a typology of genocide that identifies four motives: elimination of a real or potential threat; spreading terror among real or potential enemies; acquiring economic wealth; and implementing a belief, theory or ideology.⁴¹ Colonialist assaults on indigenous peoples were usually prompted by more than one of those motives, although it must be recognized that economic interests were often decisive in determining which groups would be the first to be targeted. In all areas, Native American groups which, for one reason or another, could not be integrated into the colonial economy were the most likely to be the earliest victims of genocide.

The mechanics of genocide in colonial America

The processes by which vulnerable indigenous peoples were driven from their lands or reduced to quasi-slavery were, in their effects, essentially genocidal. Some confusion on this point has been occasioned by the fact that the measures employed to subdue and dispossess indigenous peoples were seldom described initially as exterminatory. As we have seen, some writers have maintained that, in instances in which we lack clear evidence of intentionality to commit genocide, we ought not to describe the decimation of Native Americans and other victims of colonialism as genocide. But, as Tony Barta has argued, 'the appropriation of land' placed the colonizers in a relationship 'that implicitly rather than explicitly, in ways that were inevitable rather than intentional' fundamentally 'is a relationship of genocide'.⁴² We need, as Barta emphasizes, to focus on the acts, not the stated intentions, of the expropriators. While the role of ideology in justifying and sustaining genocidal practices over the long term remains essential, the early processes of colonial subjugation of indigenous peoples contain the seeds of genocide even if the intention is usually not explicitly avowed. In understanding the origins of genocide, the emphasis on 'intent' contained in the United Nations declaration must not

lead us to disregard the implications of policies genocidal in effect if not initially in avowed purpose.

Examination of the use by colonial regimes of brutal military measures often unfamiliar to European trained soldiers gives us some insight into the process by which this 'relationship of genocide' of which Barta speaks developed early in the occupation and appropriation of the territories of indigenous peoples. In their actions against resistant Indian tribes, both the French and the English in North America made use of scalp bounties that were first represented as necessary war measures but were essentially genocidal in effect and were later celebrated as such.⁴³ Europeans turned a ritual war practice observed by some, although not all, Native American peoples into an indiscriminate killing process, scalping not only warriors but non-combatants as well. Colonial governments paid bounties for scalps, offering payment on graduated scales that offered the most reward for adult males, but also compensated the killers of women and children at lower rates. The first bounty system was probably established by the French, who paid for the scalps of hostile Indians killed in Maine in 1688. New England relied originally on payments for body parts, usually heads or hands, demanding that their Indian allies bring in such grisly evidence that they had killed enemy Indians as ordered. In 1694, however, the Massachusetts General Court enacted a scalp bounty, and soon the colony was paying Indian killers 100 pounds for the scalp of male Indians over 10 years of age, 40 for women and 20 for children and infants.⁴⁴ These were attractive incentives, as the annual income of a New England farmer averaged around 25 pounds a year.⁴⁵ The practice soon spread to all other British colonies. Scalp taking became a popular and lucrative business venture. A Maine clergyman recorded in his journal in 1757 that he had received over 165 pounds as 'my part of the scalp money'.⁴⁶

Enactment of scalp bounties intensified frontier violence and victimized non-combatants. Bounty hunters usually did not discriminate between children and adults, or between men and women, and sometimes murdered friendly Indians as well. To cite but one incident out of many, the scalping in Virginia in 1759 of several Cherokee warriors returning from service on the British side in the war with France helped trigger an Anglo-Cherokee war.⁴⁷ Scalping continued during and after the American Revolution and:

turned, if anything, more sadistic and macabre, as when Ranger Colonel George Rogers Clark, during his celebrated siege of Vincennes in 1779, ordered his men to slowly scalp sixteen living captives – both Indian and white – in full view of the English garrison. The same year, during the Sullivan campaign against the Seneca, soldiers of the Continental Army weren't content with merely scalping their foes, living or dead. Not uncommonly they skinned them from the hips down in order to make leggings from the tanned 'hides'.⁴⁸

In the nineteenth century, scalp bounties played a role in 'the winning of the west'. To cite only a few examples, in Dakota territory, Sioux who resisted dis-possession and refused internment on reservations might be killed by bounty hunters, who received \$200 for their scalps.⁴⁹ Texas and California offered lavish scalp bounties and thereby encouraged indiscriminate Indian killing. When California failed to renew scalp bounty legislation, private business groups stepped in to offer on-going financial support to Indian killers.⁵⁰ Texas maintained its official scalp bounties through the 1880s, leading one historian to comment that whites in Texas, Anglo and Hispanic alike, 'had no more regard for the life of an Indian than they had of a dog, sometimes less'.⁵¹

Another innovation in American racial wars was the creation of special, irregular ranger units that struck by stealth deep in enemy territory, taking few prisoners and inflicting maximum pain.⁵² Such tactics were employed and perfected in New England during King Philip's (Metacom's) War by Captain Benjamin Church. Called out of retirement to fight Indians again during King William's War, Church exposed the genocidal nature of his activities in his description of a raid on a Christian (Catholic) Indian village in New Brunswick. Finding the men absent from the village, Church related that his rangers proceeded to club to death all the women and children they had left behind.⁵³ Better known are the exploits of Robert Rogers, whose most celebrated action during the French and Indian war was a raid on the Indian village of St Francis in Quebec in which, Roberts reported, his rangers killed around 200, most of whom were non-combatants.⁵⁴ Numerous witnesses to rangers' actions throughout the colonial era testified that these units killed indiscriminately. Typical is the Reverend Gideon Johnson's complaint in 1711 that Carolinians attacking Tuscarora villages did not make 'the least distinction between the guilty and the innocent ... it is vain to represent to them the cruelty and injustice of such a procedure'.⁵⁵

Both ranger units and militia forces sometimes deliberately murdered neutral or allied Indians as well as hostiles. In the few cases in which their officers were called to account for such atrocities, punishment, if any, was invariably light. The massacre of Indian Moravian converts at Gnadenhutten and the murder of several pro-American Delaware and Shawnee chiefs, all perpetrated by American militia officers during the Revolution are prime examples. The mentality that justified such violence was exposed in the comment of frontier general George Rogers Clark who, after tomahawking five Indian captives during the siege of Vincennes in 1779, boasted that 'he would never spare a man, woman or child of them on whom he could lay his hands'.⁵⁶ Clark's sentiment was widely shared, and led to numerous atrocities. The *Kentucky Gazette* on 15 March 1788, to cite an example, reported that settlers planned to leave poison scattered in abandoned houses, hoping that Indians attempting to use or loot the premises would receive lethal doses. Whites would be warned, by signs Indians could not read,

not to enter.⁵⁷ Listening to such stories, an English visitor a few years later remarked of Indians that 'nothing is more common to hear' in America 'than talk of extirpating them from the face of the earth, men, women and children.'⁵⁸

The 1864 massacre perpetrated by Colorado militia Colonel John M. Chivington offers a particularly blatant example of the persistence of that attitude. Chivington, an erstwhile Methodist preacher, was a rabid Indian hater who demanded the killing of infants on the grounds that 'nits make lice'. During the Colorado Indian war, Chivington and his men fell upon a Cheyenne encampment that was in fact at peace with the United States. They killed, scalped and mutilated, cutting out Cheyenne genitalia for hatbands and tobacco pouches. The Sand Creek massacre was, and remains, controversial. Chivington enjoyed the encouragement and support of Colorado's territorial governor, but his actions horrified federal official concerned with Indian pacification. Three federal investigations condemned Chivington, but when a United States Senator, speaking to a Denver audience, suggested 'civilizing' the western Indians as an alternative to killing, he was shouted down by screams of 'exterminate them'.⁵⁹ Theodore Roosevelt, one of the most scholarly of the Indian haters, declared Chivington's massacre 'as righteous and beneficial a deed as ever took place on the frontier'.⁶⁰ While most historical investigations of the circumstances of the massacre fault Chivington, some writers, remarkably, still agree with Roosevelt.⁶¹ The Sand Creek massacre was but one of many genocidal assaults on Indian villages during the western Indian wars. A California militia officer captured the spirit of those campaigns in 1849 when he described a Pomo village assaulted by his unit as 'a perfect slaughter pen'.⁶²

Warfare against Indians commonly utilized 'burnt earth' tactics, sometimes called 'feedfight', intended to destroy the Indian subsistence economy and produce mass starvation. One notable example is Colonel James Grant's assault on the Cherokee in 1761 which left 5,000 without shelter or food.⁶³ Another is General James Sullivan's campaign against Iroquois who supported the British during the Revolutionary war, a campaign that laid waste to hundreds of square miles of once prosperous country.⁶⁴ 'Mad Anthony' Wayne's victory at Fallen Timbers in 1794 was indecisive, but his subsequent destruction of Indian villages and fields forced the Miami, the Shawnees and their allies to their knees.⁶⁵ In the western Indian wars of the following century, the destruction of the buffalo herds brought the Great Plains nations to the edge of starvation and facilitated their dispossession and confinement on reservations.⁶⁶

Perhaps the most extreme measures of colonial genocide were experiments in germ warfare. In 1763, two Delaware chiefs visiting Fort Pitt to initiate peace discussions were given a present: two blankets. The receipt they signed, still on file, tells us that the purpose was 'to Convey the Smallpox to the Indians'. The order to do so came from the British commanding General, Lord Amherst, who had directed his subordinates to infect the Indians 'by means of blankets,

as well as to try Every other method that can serve to extirpate this Execrable Race'.⁶⁷ As one historian of Pontiac's uprising notes, 'it is plain that Indians were well beyond European laws of war' which strictly forbade killing by poison.⁶⁸ It is not clear whether this was the first attempt or whether it was successful. We do know that there were later efforts to use biological agents against Indians. For example, a California newspaper in 1853 noted approvingly that local settlers, in addition to knifing and shooting Indians, were taking steps to infect them with smallpox.⁶⁹ More research needs to be done on this aspect of genocide on the western frontier.

Indian killing on frontiers and elsewhere

Colonial and national governments in both North and South America by law and decree sought to protect the lives of peaceful Indians. One of the most persistent themes in public records is complaints that efforts to make that protection a reality were ineffective, particularly in frontier regions. Often those efforts were half-hearted. But even with the best of intentions, authorities everywhere soon found their ability to restrain murderous whites driven by greed or racial hatred or both quite limited. As to the British colonies, here again contemporary historical literature is revelatory. Anti-Indian violence was not always limited to the backcountry. The writings of Daniel Gookin, the Massachusetts Bay Colony superintendent of Indian affairs, make clear his conviction that the Indian supporters of King Philip were objects of divine wrath because of their failure to embrace the Gospel. But Gookin was appalled by the clamour in Boston to kill Indian converts to Christianity as well. The genocidal fury directed at the 'praying Indians' was partly deflected, but many of their number died prematurely as a result of their internment on a barren island in Boston harbour.⁷⁰ Other Indian groups over the years were even less fortunate, falling victim to Indian haters, some of whom wore militia uniforms. As New England authorities sought to restrain indiscriminate anti-Indian violence during Metacom's War, a rebel force of Indian haters in Virginia under the command of Nathaniel Bacon deposed the royal governor, William Berkeley, who had restricted the scope of a frontier Indian war. Bacon, once regarded as a precursor or 'torchbearer' of the American Revolution for his opposition to royal authority, is now, thanks to the path breaking work of historian Wilcomb Washburn, seen as an advocate and perpetrator of genocide. Bacon's forces killed no hostile Indians on the frontier, but before their repression did rob and murder peaceful Indian communities within the colony.⁷¹

While Indian-hating populist elements elsewhere did not overthrow governments, those who governed often testified that their authority did not extend to the punishment of Indian killers. When a rum-seller named Frederick Stump was jailed in Carlisle, Pennsylvania, in 1768 for murdering ten Iroquois, he was freed by a mob and remained at liberty.⁷² Some years later, Pennsylvania's governor

declared that 'no jury in any of our frontier counties will ever condemn a man for killing an Indian. They do not consider it in the light of murder, but as a meritorious act.'⁷³ Mob action also freed several Indian killers in Virginia in 1767, leading General Thomas Gage to complain that the colonists generally were resolved never to punish a white man for killing an Indian.⁷⁴ After independence, territorial Governor Harrison of Indiana reported to the legislature that the task of keeping peace with the Indians was made difficult by the refusal of juries to convict 'even one of the many people who have committed murder on their people'.⁷⁵ President George Washington complained that 'frontier Settlers' too often believed that killing an Indian 'is no crime at all'.⁷⁶

In the following century, western political leaders frequently exacerbated the problem by demagogic pronouncements against Indians. In California in the early 1850s, state officials opposed the efforts of federal agents who sought to negotiate treaties reserving some land for the state's surviving Indian groups. They secured the defeat of those treaties in the United States Senate. While some white Californians were eager to make use of Indians as slave labour, two governors advocated extermination as the solution to the 'Indian problem'. One, Peter Barnett, declared in 1851 that 'a war of extermination will continue to be waged ... until the Indian race is extinct.'⁷⁷ Western newspapers often called for Indian killing. 'Extermination', declared the San Francisco *Bulletin* in 1851, 'is the quickest and cheapest remedy' to conflicts between settlers and natives peoples.⁷⁸ Punishment of those who responded to such genocidal exhortations was often impeded not only by popular sentiment but by state laws denying Indians the right to testify in courts against whites.

How many Indians fell victim to murderous frontiersmen and other Indian haters? We will probably never know. In 1894, the United States Census Bureau estimated that between 1775 and 1890 more than 8,500 Indians were killed by individuals on their own initiative. Some authorities believe the real total was far, far higher, perhaps exceeding 100,000.⁷⁹ Some argue that only state-conducted killing should be termed genocide; but the many instances of tacit complicity by authorities who failed to protect Indians argue against that exclusion which, as we noted earlier, is not required in the United Nations declaration against genocide. Penalties for killing Indians, when imposed at all, were often ridiculously lenient. Consider, for example, the case of a sixteenth-century Indian woman burned to death in her hut by a Spaniard angered when she resisted his efforts to rape her. The Spanish governor fined the rapist/murderer five pesos!⁸⁰ Similar stories can be found in every colony in the Americas.

The question of cultural genocide

In response to pressure from the United States and other major powers, the United Nations in its 1948 Convention rejected draft language that would have explicitly recognized *cultural genocide* as a crime, despite evidence that assaults

on indigenous customs and mores not infrequently had the effect of meeting the standard of 'inflicting severe bodily or mental harm on members of a group'. For native American peoples, it is well documented that acute personal disorientation, depression, illness, alcoholism, suicide and consequent high mortality rates were often outcomes of presumably benevolent official programmes intended to 'civilize' them. The physical violence of Indian haters was only one aspect of the suffering of indigenous peoples under colonial rule. Preoccupation with biological extermination must not be permitted to deflect attention from the sometimes well-meaning but, nonetheless, frequently lethal efforts of the colonizers to protect and uplift their charges through changing and ultimately eliminating their cultures.

For the Americas, the most thorough investigations of increases in the death rate of peoples whose cultures were targeted for elimination have focused on the Spanish missions in upper California from their founding through their closure in the nineteenth century. Some of the first published evidence was anecdotal, but since the mid-twentieth century a number of careful statistical studies have left no room to doubt that the missions were indeed lethal places. The Spanish effort to extirpate native religion and culture, win converts and harness Indian labour through rigorous discipline and strict confinement not only inspired more resistance, passive and otherwise, than once imagined, but also was accompanied by an Indian mortality far higher than in the outside native and Spanish populations. In the missions, as Stannard notes, 'the annual death rate exceeded the birth rate by more than two to one. This is an over-all death-to-birth rate that, in less than half a century, would completely exterminate a population of any size that was not being replenished by new conscripts.'⁸¹ The reasons remain somewhat controversial, but the best evidence attributes this abnormal mortality to a combination of psychological disorientation and despair, poor sanitation, over-crowding, inadequate diet, over work and physical abuse.⁸²

Was this genocide? As the objective of the friars was not extermination but salvation, re-education and exploitation of Indian labour, that question at first glance seems very problematic. But it must be recognized that if we are to understand colonial Indian policies at all, we must be sensitive to the effects of programmes of forced assimilation on Indian survival. That is the important issue, regardless of what label we chose to affix or withhold. Some have argued that the term *ethnocide* is more appropriate in description of 'the suppression of a culture, a language, a religion' as 'it is a phenomenon that is analytically different from the physical extermination of a group'.⁸³ The evidence from California and elsewhere suggests, however, that a clear line cannot be drawn between 'genocide' and 'ethnocide', as the latter often leads to a slow process of partial physical extermination that, apart from the issue of intentionality, arguably meets or at least approximates the conditions of genocide specified in the United Nations convention.

Whether 'ethnocide' is seen as a form of genocide or is regarded as a separate analytical category is, I believe, of minor importance. The examination of the circumstances that have led to the reduction of indigenous populations and the demoralization and in some cases extinction of cultures cannot be, and has not been, constrained by debates over definitions. Recent investigations of inter-cultural conflicts in the Americas have produced a rich new literature on the past history and present status of matters as diverse as deprivation and mortality on Indian reservations, cultural repression in Indian boarding schools, ongoing Indian health problems, struggles over Indian land rights, Pan-Indian movements, federal Indian policies and movements of religious revitalization. Comparable topics have been pursued by Latin Americanists. Of particular interest are studies of conflicts between Hispanicized mestizo cultures and indigenous peoples. The overall thrust of current scholarship on the problems of assimilation, forced and otherwise, has been threefold: to continue the analysis of the past damage wrought by many presumably benevolent programmes of Indian uplift, to describe and evaluate various Indian resistance strategies including those involving partial assimilation (thereby challenging the once dominant image of the Indian as passive victim), and, often, to lend support to demands for policy changes that restore Indian self-sufficiency and self-determination.⁸⁴ But this is not to suggest that genocide in its starkest form has not been a part of the contemporary history of the Americas. The late twentieth century witnessed campaigns of extermination against indigenous peoples in Central America, Brazil and Paraguay, mounted both with and without, the support of the state.⁸⁵ Crimes of genocide against Native Americans are not found only in the historical record. Sadly, they remain a present reality.

Notes

1. R. Thornton, *American Indian Holocaust and Survival: A Population History since 1492* (Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1987), p. 23.
2. W. Churchill, *A Little Matter of Genocide: Holocaust and Denial in the Americas 1492 to the Present* (San Francisco, CA: City Lights Books, 1997), p. 4.
3. Quoted in M. A. Jaimes, 'Sand Creek: The Morning After', *The State of Native America: Genocide, Colonization and Resistance*, ed. M. A. Jaimes (Boston, MA: South End Press, 1992), p. 3. Jaimes concurred, declaring 'the U.S. destruction of its indigenous population resembled the campaigns of Nazi Germany' far more closely than more recent genocides in places such as Cambodia. 'The Third Reich and the United States did what they did for virtually identical reasons.' Most other cases, she concluded, 'deviate significantly in motivation if not in method'.
4. D. E. Stannard, *American Holocaust: The Conquest of the New World* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992), p. xii.
5. T. Todorov, in *The Conquest of America: The Question of the Other* [1984] (Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1999), pp. 133–8. For the full text in English translation, see T. Motolinia, *History of the Indians of New Spain* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1973). J. G. Varnar and J. J. Varnar, *The Dogs of Conquest* (Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1983) provide evidence of the extensive use of 'dogging'.
6. J. Axtell, *Beyond 1492: Encounters in Colonial America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992), pp. 261–2.
7. S. T. Katz, 'The Uniqueness of the Holocaust: The Historical Dimension', in *Is the Holocaust Unique? Perspectives on Comparative Genocide*, ed. A. S. Rosenbaum (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 2001), p. 49. See also D. Lipstadt, *Denying the Holocaust: The Growing Assault on Truth and Memory* (New York, Free Press, 1993). Some Holocaust scholars, however, follow Yehuda Bauer in drawing a distinction between the Jewish Holocaust, which they argue was unique, and other instances of genocide, including Nazi killings of members of other ethnic groups. See Bauer, 'The Place of the Holocaust in Contemporary History', in *Studies in Contemporary Jewry*, vol. 1, ed. J. Frankel (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1984), pp. 213–14.
8. Of the many theoretical redefinitions in the literature on genocide, this writer follows most closely the work of Leo Kuper, who, although recognizing shortcomings in the United Nations convention, works within its parameters because of its standing international law. See, in particular, Kuper's *Genocide: Its Political Use in the Twentieth Century* (New York: Penguin, 1981).
9. For an excellent example of this criticism, see D. E. Stannard, 'Uniqueness as Denial: The Politics of Genocide Scholarship', in *Is the Holocaust Unique?*, ed. Rosenbaum, pp. 245–90.
10. Quoted in Rosenbaum, ed., *Is The Holocaust Unique? Perspectives on Comparative Genocide*, p. 211.
11. F. Chalk and K. Jonassohn, *The History and Sociology of Genocide* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1990), p. 28.
12. The quotations above are from Richard Eden's 1555 translation reprinted in E. Arber, ed. *The First Three English Books on America* (New York: Kraus Reprint Company, 1971), pp. 70–1. For the complete text in a modern translation, see F. A. McNutt, trans., *De Orbe Novo: The Eight Decades of Peter Martyr D'Anghera*, 2 vols. (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1912.) For a corrective to the once fashionable view that Peter Martyr anticipated the eighteenth-century cult of the Noble savage, see A. Pagden, *The Fall of Natural Man: The American Indian and the Origins of Comparative Ethnology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), pp. 24, 52.
13. This point is thoroughly developed in Pagden, *The Fall of Natural Man*.
14. See C. Gibson, *The Black Legend: Anti-Spanish Attitudes in the Old World and the New* (New York: Alfred K. Knopf, 1971); W. S. Mabry, *The Black Legend in England: The Development of Anti-Spanish Sentiment, 1558–1660* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1971).
15. A. A. Cave, 'Richard Hakluyt's Savages: The Influence of 16th Century Travel Narratives on English Indian Policy in North America', *International Social Science Review*, 60 (1985), 3–24.
16. George Abbot, *A Briefe Description of the Whole World* [1589] (London: William Sheares, 1634).
17. Sir Walter Raleigh, *Works*, (Oxford: The University Press, 1829), vol. 4, pp. 693–4.
18. J. Smith, *A Map of Virginia* [1612], reprinted in P. Barber, ed., *The Jamestown Voyages under the First Charter, 1606–1609* (London: The Hakluyt Society, 1969), vol. 11, pp. 354, 364, 372; W. Randel, 'Captain John Smith's Attitude Toward the Indians', *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography*, 46 (1939), 218–29.
19. W. Bradford, *Of Plymouth Plantation*, ed. S. E. Morison (New York: Knopf, 1976), p. 84.
20. E. Winslow, 'Good Newes from New England', [1624] in *The Story of the Pilgrim Fathers*, ed. E. Arber (New York: Kraus Reprint, 1969), pp. 513–14.
21. R. Hakluyt, *The Principal Navigations, Voyages, Traffiques and Discoveries of the English Nation* [1600] (Glasgow: J. MacLeose and Sons, 1908), vol. 8, pp. 374–83.

22. E. Johnson, *Johnson's Wonder-Working Providence*, ed. J. F. Jameson (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1910), pp. 41, 48–9, 79–80.
23. S. M. Kingsbury, ed., *The Records of the Virginia Company of London* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1905–35), vol. III, p. 672.
24. F. W. Gleach, *Powhatan's World and Colonial Virginia* (Lincoln, NB: University of Nebraska Press, 1997), pp. 148–73; A. T. Vaughan, 'The Expulsion of the "Salvages": English Policy and the Virginia Massacre of 1622', *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd series, 35 (1972), 57–89; W. F. Craven, 'Indian Policy in Early Virginia', *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd series, 1 (1944), 65–82; W. S. Powell, 'Aftermath of the Massacre: The First Indian War, 1622–1632', *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography*, 66 (1958), 44–75.
25. W. W. Hening, ed., *The Statutes at Large, being a Collection of all the Laws of Virginia, from the First Session of the Legislature, in the Year 1619* (New York: R. & G. & W. Bartow, 1823), vol. 1, p. 128.
26. G. B. Nash, *Red, White and Black: The Peoples of Early North America*, 4th edn (Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 2000), p. 73.
27. For a detailed analysis of tribal relations in early colonial Virginia, see J. F. Fausz, *The Powhatan Uprising of 1622: A Historical Study of Ethnocentrism and Cultural Conflict* (Ph.D. dissertation, College of William and Mary, 1977). Also of value, and more accessible, are Fausz's articles, including 'The Barbarous Massacre Remembered: Powhatan's Uprising of 1622 and the Historians', *Explorations in Ethnic Studies*, 1 (1978), 16–36; 'Profits, Pelts and Power: English Culture in the Early Chesapeake, 1620–1662', *Maryland Historian*, 4 (1983), 15–30; 'Patterns of American Aggression and Accommodation Along the Mid-Atlantic Coast', in *Cultures in Contact: The Impact of European Contacts on Native American Cultural Institutions AD 1000–1800*, ed. W. W. Fitzhugh (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian, 1985), pp. 225–68.
28. F. Parkman, *France and England in North America*, ed. D. Levin (New York: Viking, The Library of America, 1983), vol. 1, p. 1084.
29. A. T. Vaughan, *New England Frontier: Puritans and Indians, 1620–1675* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1965), pp. 93–154.
30. Vaughan modified his earlier insistence of Pequot War guilt, writing in 1979 'I am less certain than I was fifteen years ago that the Pequots deserve the burden of the blame.' *New England Frontier: Puritans and Indians, 1620–1675*, 2nd edn (New York: Norton, 1979), p. xxix.
31. The notions of the Pequots as aggressive invaders of southern New England and of their terrorization of the indigenous tribes there are challenged in N. Salisbury, *Manitou and Providence: Indians, European and the Making of New England, 1500–1675* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982), pp. 93–154 and in A. A. Cave, 'The Pequot Invasion of Southern New England: A Reassessment of the Evidence', *New England Quarterly*, 62 (1989), 27–44. The most thorough exposition of an economic interpretation of the Pequot War is F. P. Jennings, *The Invasion of America: Indians, Colonialism and the Cant of Conquest* (New York: Norton, 1976), pp. 177–227. For the argument that Puritan ideology and cultural misunderstandings were major causative factors in the war, see A. A. Cave, *The Pequot War* (Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press, 1996).
32. See, for example, Chalk and Jonassohn, *The History and Sociology of Genocide*, pp. xiv, 36; Nash, *Red, White and Black*, pp. 99–102; R. Drinnon, *Facing West: The Metaphysics of Indian Hating and Empire Building* (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1980), pp. 40–5; H. Zinn, *A People's History of the United States* (New York: HarperCollins, 2003), pp. 14–15.
33. S. T. Katz, 'The Pequot War Reconsidered', *The New England Quarterly*, 64 (1991), 206–24. Katz's arguments were challenged in M. Freeman, 'Puritans and Pequots: The Question of Genocide', *The New England Quarterly*, 68 (1995), 278–93. Freeman argued that the Pequot War was one of the many cases in which nation-destruction was part of the process of nation building, a process he regarded as inherently genocidal. See also S. T. Katz, 'Pequots and the Question of Genocide: A Reply to Michael Freeman', *The New England Quarterly*, 69 (1995), 641–9.
34. Johnson, *Wonder-Working Providence*, pp. 105–6.
35. C. Orr, ed., *History of the Pequot War: The Contemporary Accounts of Mason, Underhill, Vincent and Gardiner* (Cleveland, OH: Helman-Taylor, 1897), p. 81.
36. *Ibid.*, p. 30.
37. Johnson, *Wonder-Working Providence*, p. 168.
38. See R. Lemkin, *Axis Rule in Occupied Europe* (Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1944).
39. R. D. Karr, "'Why Should You be So Furious?' The Violence of the Pequot War', *Journal of American History*, 85 (1988), 876–909 provides a useful comparative analysis that demonstrates that the slaughter of non-combatants and the killing of prisoners of war was not uncommon in European conflicts in which one side, or both, viewed the other as less than a legitimate belligerent. However, he sidesteps the genocide issue. The burden of his argument appears to be that Indians were not victims of genocide.
40. See for example, Jennings's analysis of the Puritan 'wars of conquest' in *The Invasion of America*.
41. Chalk and Jonassohn, *The History and Sociology of Genocide*, p. 29.
42. T. Barta, 'Relations of Genocide: Land and Lives in the Colonization of Australia', in *Genocide and the Modern Age: Etiology and Case Studies of Mass Death*, eds. I. Wallimann and M. N. Dobkowski, 2nd edn (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 2000), p. 239.
43. Scalping was a war practice employed by some, but by no means all, pre-Columbian Americans. Where it was found, it operated largely as a quasi-religious ritual intended, not only to terrorize the enemy, but also to appropriate the strength and power of the fallen warrior. Scalps were given places of honour in Indian villages and sometimes formally adopted into the tribe. See J. Axtell, 'The Unkindest Cut, or Who Invented Scalping? A Case Study', and 'Scalping: The Ethnohistory of a Moral Question', in *The European and the Indian: Essays in the Ethnohistory of Colonial America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1981), pp. 16–38 and 205–44.
44. *The Acts and Resolves of the Province of the Massachusetts Bay*, 21 vols. (Boston: Massachusetts Historical Society), vol. 1, pp. 175–6; 594.
45. Churchill, *A Little Matter of Genocide*, pp. 178–88.
46. Thomas Barten, quoted in C. Van Doren and J. P. Boyd, *Indian Treaties Presented by Benjamin Franklin*, (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1938), pp. lxxxii–ii.
47. F. Anderson, *Crucible of War* (New York: Alfred K. Knopf, 2000), pp. 457–71.
48. Churchill, *A Little Matter of Genocide*, p. 185.
49. E. Lazarus, *Black Hills, White Justice* (New York: Harper Collins, 1991), p. 29.
50. Churchill, *A Little Matter of Genocide*, p. 187; L. Carranco and E. Beard, *Genocide and Vendetta: The Round Valley War of Northern California* (Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1981).
51. W. W. Newcomb, *The Indians of Texas* (Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 1961).

52. For a comprehensive view of the evolution of 'irregular war' in British North America, see J. Grenier, *The First Way of War: American War Making on the Frontier, 1607-1814* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005).
53. B. Church, *History of the Eastern Expeditions of 1689, 1690, and 1692* (Boston: Waggins and W. P. Lunt, 1867), pp. 11-12.
54. S. Brumwell, *White Devil: A True Story of War, Savagery, and Vengeance in Colonial America* (New York: Da Capo Press, 2004). Brumwell, drawing on Indian oral histories, concludes Rogers greatly exaggerated the number he killed at St. Francis. It tells us much about his mindset that he would do so.
55. Quoted in Grenier, *The First Way of War*, p. 46.
56. Quoted in G. B. Nash, *The Unknown American Revolution* (New York: Viking, 2005), p. 351.
57. Sword, *President Washington's Indian War*, p. 73.
58. Quoted in Nash, *Unknown American Revolution*, p. 387.
59. D. Svili, *Sand Creek and the Rhetoric of Extermination: A Case Study in Indian White Relations* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1989), pp. 187-9.
60. Quoted in T. G. Dyer, *Theodore Roosevelt and the Idea of Race* (Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University Press), p. 79.
61. The most authoritative and balanced study is S. Hoig, *The Sand Creek Massacre* (Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1961). W. R. Dunn, 'I Stand by Sand Creek': A Defense of Colonel John M. Chivington and the Third Colorado Cavalry (Ft. Collins, CO: Old Army Press, 1985) offers an example of the acceptance of Chivington's questionable claim that he found numerous scalps of white women and children at the Sand Creek encampment. Rogers had used the same argument to justify his indiscriminate killing of Indians at St. Francis a century earlier.
62. Captain Nathaniel Lyon, quoted in C. E. Trafzer and J. Hyer, eds, *Exterminate Them! Written Accounts of the Murder, Rape and Enslavement of Native Americans During the California Gold Rush* (East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press, 1999), p. 18.
63. D. H. King and E. R. Evans, eds, 'Memoirs of the Grant Expedition Against the Cherokees in 1761', *Journal of Cherokee Studies*, 2 (1977), 271-336.
64. B. A. Mann, *George Washington's War on Native America* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 2005).
65. Sword, *President Washington's Indian War*.
66. A. C. Isenberg, *The Destruction of the Bison* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).
67. Quotations from E. A. Fenn, 'Biological Warfare in Eastern North America', *Journal of American History*, 86 (2000), 1154-8.
68. G. E. Dowd, *War Under Heaven: Pontiac, the Indian Nations, and the British Empire* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002), p. 190.
69. *Alta California*, 6 March 1853, quoted in Trafzer and Hyer, eds, *Exterminate Them!*, p. 67.
70. D. Gookin, 'An Historical Account of the Doings and Sufferings of the Christian Indians in New England, in the Years 1675, 1676, 1677', *Transactions and Collections of the American Antiquarian Society*, 2 (1836), 419-534.
71. W. E. Washburn, *The Governor and the Rebel: A History of Bacon's Rebellion in Virginia* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1957).
72. R. Downes, *Council Fires on the Upper Ohio* (Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1940), pp. 139-40.
73. Governor John Penn to Thomas Penn, September 12, 1766, quoted in N. B. Wainright, *George Croghan: Wilderness Diplomat* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1959), p. 232.
74. C. E. Carter, ed., *Correspondence of General Thomas Gage with the Secretaries of State 1763-75*, 2 vols. (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1931), vol. I, p. 152.
75. W. H. Harrison, 'Message to the Legislature, 17 May 1807', in *Messages and Letters of William Henry Harrison*, ed. L. Esarey, 2 vols. (Indianapolis, IN: Indiana State Historical Society, 1922), vol. I, pp. 233-4.
76. Quoted in S. E. Miller, *An Ohio River Boundary? The Contested Ohio Country 1783-1795* (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Toledo, 2006), p. 80.
77. Quoted in B. Madley, 'Patterns of Frontier Genocide 1803-1910: the Aboriginal Tasmanians, the Yuki of California and the Herero of Namibia', *Journal of Genocide Research*, 6 (2004), 167-92. On genocide in California after 1848, see, in addition to Trafzer and Hyer, eds, *Exterminate Them!* and Carranco and Beard, *Genocide and Vendetta*, the following: S. F. Cook, *The Conflict between the California Indian and White Civilization* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1976); R. F. Heizer, ed., *The Destruction of the California Indians* (Santa Barbara, CA: Peregrine Smith, 1974); A. L. Hurtado, *Indian Survival on the California Frontier* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1988).
78. Quoted in Madley, 'Patterns of Frontier Genocide', 179.
79. Churchill, *A Little Matter of Genocide*, pp. 157-8, 188.
80. W. Sherman, *Forced Native Labor in Sixteenth Century Central America* (Lincoln, NB: University of Nebraska Press, 1979), p. 311.
81. Stannard, *American Holocaust*, p. 137.
82. For an excellent review of the evidence, see in addition to Cook (cited below) R. H. Jackson and E. Castillo, *Indians, Franciscans, and Spanish Colonization: The Impact of the Mission System on California Indians* (Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press, 1995).
83. Chalk and Jonassohn, *History and Sociology of Genocide*, p. 23.
84. For the most recent trends in Native American historiography, see D. A. Mihesuah, ed., *Natives and Academics* (Lincoln, NB: University of Nebraska Press, 1998) and R. Thornton, ed., *Studying Native America* (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1998).
85. The historiography of contemporary genocides in Latin America is in its formative stages. Probably the most thorough to date exposes the systematic murder of indigenous peoples by the Guatemalan military dictatorship in the early 1980s. See R. Carmack, *Harvest of Violence: The Mayan Indians and the Guatemalan Crisis* (Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1990); C. Smith, *Guatemalan Indians and the State, 1540 to 1988* (Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 1990); B. Manz, *Refugees of a Hidden War: The Aftermath of Counterinsurgency in Guatemala* (Albany, NY: State University Press of New York, 1988); G. Lovell, *A Beauty that Hurts: Life and Death in Guatemala* (Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 2000); V. Sanford, *Buried Secrets: Truth and Human Rights in Guatemala* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003); G. Grandin, 'History, Motive, Law, Intent: Combining Historical and Legal Methods in Understanding Guatemala's 1981-1983 Genocide', in *The Specter of Genocide: Mass Murder in Historical Perspective*, eds, R. Gellately and B. Kiernan (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), pp. 339-52. On other regions in Latin America, S. Davis, *Victims of the Miracle: Development and the Indians of Brazil* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977) and R. Arens, ed., *Genocide in Paraguay* (Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press, 1976).