

**excerpts from Ch. 4 of**  
***American Holocaust: Columbus and***  
***the Conquest of the New World***  
**by David E. Stannard**  
**1992, Oxford University Press, New York.**

**Chapter 4**

p.98

Still, Britain's people considered themselves the most civilized on earth, and before long they would nod approvingly as Oliver Cromwell declared God to be an Englishman.

p. 99

Such brutishness was beyond the English capacity for tolerance. Especially when the vulgarians in question occupied such lovely lands. So, as they had for centuries, the English waged wars to pacify and civilize the Irish. One of the more successful English soldiers in the Irish wars was the Oxford-educated half-brother of Sir Walter Raleigh, one Humphrey Gilbert-himself later knighted for his service to the Crown. Gilbert devised a particularly imaginative way of bringing the Irish to hell. He ordered that

the heddes of all those (of what sort soever thei were) which were killed in the daie, should be cutte off from their bodies and brought to the place where he incamped at night, and should there bee laied on the ground by eche side of the waie ledyng into his owne tente so that none could come into his tente for any cause but commonly he muste passe through a lane of heddes which he used ad terrorem . [10](#)

Needless to say, this "lane of heddes" leading to Gilbert's tent did indeed cause "greate terrour to the people when thei sawe the heddes of their dedde fathers, brothers, children, kinsfolke, and freinds" laid out "on the grounde before their faces." [11](#) Lest anyone think to quibble over such extreme methods of persuasion, however, the British frequently justified their treatment of the Irish by referring to the Spanish precedent for dealing with unruly natives. [12](#) ...

On his first trip to the [Baffin Island] area [Martin] Frobisher seized a native man who approached his ship in a kayak and returned with him and his kayak to England. The man soon died, however, so on his next voyage Frobisher took on board an old woman and a young woman with her child - this, after he and his men had "disposed ourselved, contrary to our inclination, something to be cruel," and destroyed an entire native village. After stripping the old woman naked "to see if she were cloven footed," they sent her on her way, but kept the young woman and child, along with a man they also had captured in a separate raid. [13](#)

-----  
p 102

By the 1560s and 1570s European militiamen were traveling throughout the southeast [U.S.], spreading disease and bloody massacre everywhere they went. Still, in the early 1570s - even after a series of devastating European diseases had attacked the Virginia Indians for more than half a decade - the Jesuit Juan Rogel, generally regarded as the most reliable of all the early Spanish commentators on this region, wrote of coastal Virginia: "There are more people here than in any of the other lands I have seen so far along the coast explored. It seemed to me that the natives are more settled than in other regions I have been." [20](#) And Father Rogel previously had lived in densely populated Florida.

-----  
...in 1596, an epidemic of measles - or possibly bubonic plague - had swept Florida, killing many native people. It may have made its way to Virginia as well, since on previous occasions the two locales had been nearly simultaneous recipients of European pestilence: in 1586, for instance, Thomas Hariot's English troops left disease and death throughout Virginia at the same time that Francis Drake had loosed some "very foul and frightful diseases" (at least one of which appears to have been typhus) among the Indians at St. Augustine; and in 1564, a six-year siege of disease and starvation began that reduced Virginia's population drastically, at the same time that a devastating plague of some sort was killing large numbers of Florida's Timucuan people. [22](#)

Invariably in the New World as in the Old, massive epidemics brought starvation in their wake, because the reduced and debilitated population were unable to tend their crops. As one Jesuit wrote of Virginia in the fall of 1570:

We find the land of Don Luis [the Spanish name given an Indian aboard ship who had been taken from Virginia to Spain some years earlier] in quite another condition than expected, not because he was at fault in his description of it, but because Our Lord has chastised it with six years of famine and death, which has brought it about that there is much less population than usual. Since many have died and many also have moved to other regions to ease their hunger [and unwittingly spread disease inland] there remain but few of the tribe, whose leaders say they wish to die where their fathers have died... They seemed to think that Don Luis had risen from the dead and come down from heaven and since all who remained are his relatives, they are greatly consoled in him....Thus we have felt the good will. They are so famished that all believe they will perish of hunger and cold this winter. [23](#)

....

p. 103

Admiration of Indian ways of living - particularly their peacefulness, generosity, trustworthiness, and egalitarianism, all of which were conspicuously absent from English social relations of the time - led to some eloquent early praise of Virginia's native people, albeit from a distinct minority of British observers. ....it is especially telling that throughout the seventeenth and on into the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, while almost no Indians voluntarily lived among the colonists, the number of whites who ran off to live with the Indians was a problem often remarked upon. After a century and a half of permanent British settlement in North America. Benjamin Franklin joined numerous earlier commentators [in such praise]... -----

p. 104

The first colonial leaders; however, would have none of this. Most of these were military men, trained in the Irish wars. Whatever they thought of the Indian way of life, they never failed to regard the Indians themselves

as peoples fated for conquest. ... For men like [John] Smith, having learned to deal with what they regarded as the savage people of Ireland was a lesson of importance when they turned their attention to the Indians; as Howard Mumford Jones once put it, the "English experience with one wild race conditioned their expectation of experience with another." [30](#)

And so, based on that experience, founding colonial leaders like Smith and Ralph Lane routinely carried out a policy of intimidation as the best means of garnering their hosts cooperation. Observing the closeness of Indian parents and children, for example, and the extraordinary grief suffered by Indian mothers and fathers when separated from offspring, Smith and Lane made it a practice to kidnap and hold hostage Indian children whenever they approached a native town. [31](#) As for those Englishmen among them who might be tempted to run off and live with the Indians, the colonial governors made it clear that such behavior would not be tolerated. For example, when in the spring of 1612, some young English settlers in Jamestown "being idell...did rone away unto the Indyan," Governor Thomas Dale had them hunted down and executed: "Some he appointed to be hanged Some burned Some to be broken upon wheles, others to be staked and Some to be shott to deathe." [32](#)

-----  
p. 105-08 ...the tone had been set decades earlier in the "lost colony" of Roanoke. There, when an Indian was accused by an Englishman of stealing a cup and failing to return it, the English response was to attack the natives in force, burning the entire community and the fields of corn surrounding it. [33](#)

Such disproportionate responses to supposed affronts was to mark English dealings with the Indian throughout the seventeenth century. Thus, in Jamestown in the summer of 1610, Governor Thomas West De la Warr requested of the Indian chief Powhatan (Wahunsonacock) that he return some runaway Englishmen - presumably to be hanged, burned, "broken upon wheles," staked, and shot to death - whom De la Warr thought Powhatan was harboring. Powhatan responded in a way that De la Warr considered unsatisfactory, giving "noe other than prowde and disdaynefull Answers." So De la Warr launched a military campaign against Powhatan headed by George Percy, the brother of the Earl of Northumberland and De la Warr's second in command. Here is Percy's own description of what he did:

Draweing my sowlldiers into Battalio placeinge a Capteyne or Leftenante att every fyle we marched towards the [Indians'] Towne....And then we fell in upon them putt some fiftene or sixtene to the Sworde and Almost all the reste to flyghte....My Lieftenantt bringeing with him the Quene and her Children and one Indyan prisoners for the Which I taxed him because he had Spared them his Answer was thatt haveinge them now in my Custodie I might doe with them whatt I pleased. Upon the same I cawsed the Indians head to be cutt of. And then dispersed my fyles Apointeing my Solwldiers to burne their howses and to cutt downe their Corne groweing aboutt the Towne. [34](#)

With the Indians thus dead or dispersed, their village destroyed, and their food supplies laid waste, Percy sent out another raiding party to do the same to another Indian town and then marched to his boats with the Indian "queen" and her children in tow. There, however, his soldiers "did begin to murmur because the quene and her Children weare spared." This seemed a reasonable complaint to Percy, so he called a council together and "it was Agreed upon to putt the Children to deathe the which was effected by Throwinge them overboard shoteinge owtt their Braynes in the water." Upon his return to Jamestown, however, Percy was informed that Governor De la Warr was unhappy with him because he had not yet killed the queen. Advised by his chief lieutenant that it would be best to burn her alive, Percy decided instead to end his day of "so mutche

Bloodshed" with a final act of mercy: instead of burning her, he had the queen quickly killed by stabbing her to death. [35](#)

From this point on there would be no peace in Virginia. Indians who came to the English settlements with food for the British (who seemed never able to feed themselves) were captured, accused of being spies, and executed. On other occasions Indians were enticed into visiting the settlements on the pretence of peace and the sharing of entertainment, whereupon they were attacked by the English and killed. Peace treaties were signed with every intention to violate them: when the Indians "grow secure upon the treatie," advised the Council of State in Virginia, "we shall have the better Advantage both to surprise them, & cutt downe theire Corne." And when at last the Indians retaliated strongly, killing more than three hundred settlers, the attack, writes Edmund S. Morgan, "released all restraints that the company had hitherto imposed on those who thirsted for the destruction or enslavement of the Indians." [36](#) Not that the restraints had ever been particularly confining, but from now on the only controversy was over whether it was preferable to kill all the native peoples or to enslave them. Either way, the point was to seize upon the "right of Warre [and] invade the Country and destroy them who sought to destroy us," wrote a rejoicing Edward Waterhouse at the time, "whereby wee shall enjoy their cultivated places.... [and] their cleared grounds in all their villages (which are situate in the fruitfulest places of the land) shall be inhabited by us." [37](#)

Hundreds of Indians were killed in skirmish after skirmish. Other hundreds were killed in successful plots of mass poisoning. They were hunted down by dogs, 'blood-Hounds to draw after them, and Mastives to seize them." Their canoes and fishing weirs were smashed, their villages and agricultural fields burned to the ground. Indian peace offers were accepted by the English only until their prisoners were returned; then, having lulled the natives into false security, the colonists returned to the attack. It was the colonists' expressed desire that the Indians be exterminated, rooted "out from being longer a people upon the face of the earth." In a single raid the settlers destroyed corn sufficient to feed four thousand people for a year. Starvation and the massacre of non-combatants was becoming the preferred British approach to dealing with the natives. By the end of the winter of 1623 the Indians acknowledged that in the past year alone as many of their number had been killed as had died since the first arrival of the British a decade and a half earlier. [38](#)

The slaughter continued. In 1624 - in a single battle - sixty heavily armed Englishmen cut down 800 defenseless Indian men, women, and children in their own village. And, of course, as elsewhere, British diseases were helping to thin out whatever resistance the Indians could hope to muster. Long before the middle of the century was reached the region's largest and most powerful Indian confederation, known to historians retrospectively as Powhatan's Empire, was "so rowted, slayne and dispersed," wrote one British colonist, "that they are no longer a nation." At the end, Powhatan's successor chief, Opechancanough, was captured. An old man now, "grown so decrepit that he was not able to walk alone...his Flesh all macerated, his Sinews slacken'd, and his Eye-lids become so heavy that he could not see," Opechancanough was thrown into a cell in Jamestown and displayed like the captive beast that the colonists thought he was. But not for long. Within two weeks a British soldier shot him in the back and killed him. [39](#)

When the first 104 English settlers arrived at Jamestown in April of 1607, the number of Indians under Powhatan's control was probably upwards of 14,000 - a fraction of what it had been just a few decades earlier, because of English, French, and Spanish depredations and disease. (Estimates of the region's native population prior to European contact extend upwards of 100,000.) By the time the seventeenth century had passed, those 104 settlers had grown to more than 60,000 English men and women who were living in and harvesting Virginia's bounty, while Powhatan's people had been reduced to about 600, maybe less. [40](#) More than 95

percent of Powhatan's people had been exterminated - beginning from a population base in 1607 that already had been drastically reduced, perhaps by 75 percent or more, as a result of prior European incursions in the region.

Powhatan's Empire was not the only Indian nation in Virginia, of course, but his people's fate was representative of that of the area's other indigenous societies. In 1697 Virginia's Lieutenant Governor Andros put the number of Indian warriors in the entire colony at just over 360, which suggests a total Indian population of less than 1500, while John Lawson, in his *New Voyage to Carolina*, claimed that more than 80 percent of the colony's native people had been killed off during the previous fifty years alone. In time, a combination plan of genocide and enslavement, as initially proposed by the colony's Governor William Berkeley, appeared to quiet what had become a lingering controversy over whether it was best to kill all the Indians or to capture them and put them to forced labor: Berkeley's plan was to slaughter all the adult Indian males in a particular locale, "but to spare the women and children and sell them," says Edmund Morgan. This way the war of extermination "would pay for itself," since it was likely that a sufficient number of female and child slaves would be captured "to defray the whole cost." [41](#)

-----  
p. 108

While "very few" of the Indians escaped this scourge [a smallpox epidemic] including "the chief sachem... and almost all his friends and kindred," Bradford reported, "by the marvelous goodness and providence of God, not one of the English was so much as sick or in the least measure tainted with this disease." ... But it was a [land] the Puritans delighted in discovering, not only because the diseases they brought with them from England left the Puritans themselves virtually unaffected, but because the destruction of the Indians by these plagues was considered an unambiguous sign of divine approval for the colonial endeavor. As the first governor of the Massachusetts Bay Colony wrote in 1634, the Puritan settlers, numbering at the time "in all about four thousand souls and upward," were in remarkably good health: "through the Lord's special providence... There hath not died about two or three grown persons and about so many children all the last year; it being very rare to hear of any sick of agues or other diseases." But, he noted in passing, as "for the natives, they are near all dead of the smallpox so as the Lord hath cleared out title to what we possess." [45](#)

-----  
p. 110

"Given ample land and a system of values by and large indifferent to material accumulation," writes a scholar of military law, "the New England tribes rarely harbored the economic and political ambitions that fueled European warfare." Instead, an Indian war usually was a response to personal insults or to individual acts of inter-tribal violence. As such, it could be avoided by "making satisfaction for the injury done" (as noted in the quotation above), but even when carried out "native hostilities generally aimed at symbolic ascendancy, a status conveyed by small payments of tribute to the victors, rather than the dominion normally associated with European-style conquest." Moreover, given the relative lack of power that Indian leaders had over their highly autonomous followers, Indian warriors might choose not to join in battle for this or that cause, and it was even common for an Indian war party on the march to "melt away as individual warriors had second thoughts and returned home." [47](#)

=====

p. 111

Commenting on indigenous warfare, anthropologist Stanley Diamond has noted that to people such as the American Indians "taking a life was an occasion," whereas warfare of the type described "is a kind of play. No matter what the occasion for hostility, it is particularized, personalized, ritualized." In contrast, by the time of the invasion of the Americas, European warfare had long since been made over into what Diamond describes as "an abstract, ideological compulsion" resulting in "indiscriminate, casual, unceremonious killing." [50](#)

p. 111-14

In contrast, needless to say, the British did very little in the way of "leaping and dancing" on the field of battle, and more often than not Indian women and children were consumed along with everyone and everything else in the conflagrations that routinely accompanied the colonists' assaults. Their purpose, after all, was rarely to avenge an insult to honor - although that might be the stipulated rationale for a battle - but rather, when the war was over, to be able to say what John Mason declared at the conclusion of one especially bloody combat: that "the Lord was pleased to smite our Enemies in the hinder Parts, and to give us their Land for an Inheritance." [53](#) Because of his readers' assumed knowledge of the Old Testament, it was unnecessary for Mason to remind them that this last phrase is derived from Deuteronomy, nor did he need to quote the words that immediately follow in that biblical passage: "Thou shalt save alive nothing that breatheth....But thou shalt utterly destroy them."

The brutish and genocidal encounter to which Mason was referring was the Pequot War. Its first rumblings began to be heard in July of 1636 - two years after a smallpox epidemic had devastated the New England natives "as far as any Indian plantation was known to the west," said John Winthrop - when the body of a man named John Oldham was found, apparently killed by Narragansett Indians on Block Island, off the Rhode Island Coast. [54](#) Although he held position of some importance, Oldham was not held in high regard by many of the English settlers - he had been banished from Plymouth Colony and described by its Governor Bradford as "more like a furious beast than a man" - and those whites who found his body had proceeded to murder more than a dozen Indians who were found at the scene of the crime, whether or not they were individually responsible. [55](#) Even in light of the colonists' grossly disproportionate sense of retribution when one of their own had been killed by Indians, this should have been sufficient revenge, but it was not. The colonists simply wanted to kill Indians. Despite the pledge of the Narragansetts' chief to mete out punishment to Oldham's murderers - a pledge he began to fulfill by sending 200 warriors to Block Island in search of the culprits - New England's Puritan leaders wanted more.

Led by Captain John Endicott, a heavily armed and armored party of about a hundred Massachusetts militiamen soon attacked the Block Island Indians. Their plan was to kill the island's adult males and make off with the women and children; as with Governor Berkeley's later scheme in Virginia, the venture would pay for itself since, as Francis Jennings puts it "the captured women and children of Block Island would fetch a tidy sum in the West Indies slave markets." [56](#) The Indians scattered, however, realizing they had no hope against the colonists' weapons and armor, so the frustrated soldiers, able to kill only an odd few Narragansetts here and there, had to content themselves with the destruction of deserted villages. "We burn and spoiled both houses and corn in great abundance," recalled one participant. [57](#)

From Block Island the troops headed back to the mainland where, following the directions of their colony's governor, they sought out a confrontation with some Pequot Indians. The Pequots, of course, had nothing to do

with Oldham's death (the excuse for going after them was the allegation that, two years earlier, some among them may have killed two quarrelsome Englishmen, one of whom had himself tried to murder the Governor of Plymouth Colony), so when the soldiers first appeared along the Pequot's coastline the Indians ran out to greet them. As Underhill recalled: "The Indians spying of us came running in multitudes along the water side, crying, what cheere, Englishmen, what cheere, what doe you come for: They not thinking we intended warre, went on cheerfully untill they come to Pequeat river." [58](#) It soon became evident to the Pequots what the soldiers had come for, even if the cause of their coming remained a mystery, so after some protracted efforts at negotiation, the Pequots melted back into the forest to avoid a battle. As they had on Block Island, the troops then went on a destructive rampage, looting and burning the Indians' villages and fields of corn.

Once the Massachusetts troops left the field and returned to Boston, the Pequots came out of the woods, made a few retaliatory raids in the countryside, and then attacked nearby Fort Saybrook. Casualties were minimal in all of this, as was normal in Indian warfare, and at one point - presumably feeling that their honor had been restored - the Pequots fell back and asked the fort's commander if he felt he had "fought enough." The commander, Lieutenant Lion Gardiner, made an evasive reply, but its meaning was clear: from that day forward there would be no peace. Next, the Pequots asked if the English planned to kill Indian women and children. Gardiner's reply was they "they should see that hereafter." [59](#)

For a time small troubles continued in the field, while in Hartford the Connecticut General Court met and declared war against the Pequots. John Mason was appointed commander of the Connecticut troops. Rather than attack frontally, as the Massachusetts militia had, Mason led his forces and some accompanying Narragansetts (who long had been at odds with the Pequots) in a clandestine assault on the main Pequot village just before dawn. Upon realizing that Mason was planning nothing less than a wholesale massacre, the Narragansetts dissented and withdrew to the rear. Mason regarded them with contempt, saying that they could "stand at what distance they pleased, and see whether English Men would now fight or not." Dividing his forces in half, Mason at the head of one party, Underhill leading the other, under cover of darkness they attacked the unsuspecting Indians from two directions at once. The Pequots, Mason said, were taken entirely by surprise, their "being in a dead indeed their last Sleep." [60](#)

The British swarmed into the Indian encampment, slashing and shooting at anything that moved. Caught off guard, and with apparently few warriors in the village at the time, some of the Pequots fled, "others crept under their Beds," while still others fought back "most courageously," but this only drove Mason and his men to greater heights of fury. "We must burn them," Mason later recalled himself shouting, whereupon he "brought out a Fire Brand, and putting it into the Mattas with which they were covered, set the Wigwams on Fire." [61](#) At this, Mason says, "the Indians ran as Men most dreadfully Amazed":

And indeed such a dreadful Terror did the Almighty let fall upon their Spirits, that they would fly from us and run into the very Flames, where many of them perished.... [And] God was above them, who laughed his Enemies and the Enemies of his People to Scorn, making them as a fiery Oven: Thus were the Stout Hearted spoiled, having slept their last Sleep, and none of their Men could find their Hands: Thus did the Lord judge among the Heathen, filling the Place with dead Bodies! [62](#)

It was a ghastly sight-especially since we now know, as Francis Jennings reminds us, that most of those who were dying in the fires, and who were "crawling under beds and fleeing from Mason's dripping sword were women, children, and feeble old men." [63](#) Underhill, who had set fire to the other side of the village "with a traine of Powder" intended to meet Mason's blaze in the center, recalled how "great and doleful was the

bloody sight to the view of young soldiers that never had been in war, to see so many souls lie gasping on the ground, so thick, in some places, that you could hardly pass along. Yet, distressing though it may have been for the youthful murderers to carry out their task, Underhill reassured his readers that sometimes the Scripture declareth women and children must perish with their parents. Just because they were weak and helpless and unarmed, in short, did not make their deaths any less a delight to the Puritan's God. For as William Bradford described the British reaction to the scene:

It was a fearful sight to see them thus frying in the fire and the streams of blood quenching the same, and horrible was the stink and scent thereof; but the victory seemed a sweet sacrifice, and they gave the praise thereof to God, who had wrought so wonderfully for them, thus to enclose their enemies in their hands and give them so speedy a victory over so proud and insulting an enemy. [65](#)

Added the Puritan divine Cotton Mather, as he celebrated the event many years later in his *Magnalia Christi Americana* : In a little more than one hour, five or six hundred of these barbarians were dismissed from a world that was burdened with them. Mason himself counted the Pequot dead at six or seven hundred, with only seven taken captive and seven escaped. It was, he said joyfully, the just Judgment of God. [66](#)

-----  
p.114-15

From then on the surviving Pequots were hunted into near-extirmination. Other villages were found and burned. Small groups of warriors were intercepted and killed. Pockets of starving women and children were located, captured, and sold into slavery. If they were fortunate. Others were bound hand and foot and thrown into the ocean just beyond the harbor. And still more were buried where they were found, such as one group of three hundred or so who tried to escape through a swampland, but could make little haste, by reason of their Children, and want of Provision, said Mason. When caught, as Richard Drinnon puts it, they were literally run to ground, murdered, and then tramped into the mud or buried in swamp mire. [68](#)

The comparative handful of Pequots who were left, once this series of massacres finally ended, were parceled out to live in servitude. John Endicott and his pastor, for example, wrote to the governor asking for a share of the captives, specifically a young woman or girl and a boy if you thinke good. [69](#) The last of them, fifteen boys and two women, were shipped to the West Indies for sale as slaves, the ship captain who carried them there returning the next year with what he had received in exchange: some cotton, some salt, some tobacco, and Negroes, etc. The word Pequot was then removed from New England's maps: the river of that name was changed to the Thames and the town of that name became New London. [70](#) Having virtually eradicated an entire people, it now was necessary to expunge from historical memory any recollection of their past existence. [71](#)

Some, however, remembered all too well. John Mason rode the honor of his butchery to the position of Major General of Connecticut's armed forces. And Underhill, as Drinnon notes, put his experience to good use in selling his military prowess to the Dutch. On one subsequent occasion with his company of Dutch troops Underhill surrounded an Indian village outside Stamford, set fire to the wigwams, drove back in with saber thrusts and shots whose who sought to escape, and in all burned and shot five hundred with relative ease, allowing only about eight to escape - statistics comparable to those from the Pequot fort. [72](#)

Meanwhile, the Narragansetts, who had been the Pequots' rivals, but who were horrified at this inhuman carnage, quietly acknowledged the English domination of the Pequots' lands - their widowed lands, to

borrow a phrase from Jennings. That would not, however, prove sufficient. The English towns continued to multiply, the colonists continued to press out into the surrounding fields and valleys. The Narragansetts' land, and that of other tribes, was next.

To recount in detail the story of the destruction of the Narragansetts and such others as the Wampanoags, in what has come to be known as King Philip's War of 1675 and 1676, is unnecessary here. Thousands of native people were killed, their villages and crops burned to the ground. In a single early massacre 600 Indians were destroyed. It was, says the recent account of two historians, 'a seventeenth-century My Lai' in which the English soldiers 'ran amok, killing the wounded men, women, and children indiscriminately, firing the camp, burning the Indians alive or dead in their huts.' A delighted Cotton Mather, revered pastor of the Second Church in Boston, later referred to the slaughter as a 'barbecue.' [73](#)

-----  
p.116-

The pattern was familiar, the only exception being that by the latter seventeenth century the Indians had learned that self-defense required an understanding of some English ideas about war, namely, in Francis Jennings' words: 'that the Englishmen's most solemn pledge would be broken whenever obligation conflicted with advantage; that the English way of war had no limit of scruple or mercy; and that weapons of Indian making were almost useless against weapons of European manufacture. These lessons the Indians took to heart, so for once the casualties were high on both sides. [75](#) There was no doubt who would win, however, and when raging epidemics swept the countryside during the peak months of confrontation it only hastened the end.

Once the leader of the Indian forces, 'a doleful, great, naked, dirty beast,' the English called him, was captured - and cut in pieces - the rest was just a mop-up operation. As one modern celebrant of the English puts it: 'Hunting redskins became for the time being a popular sport in New England, especially since prisoners were worth good money, and the personal danger to the hunters was now very slight.' [76](#) Report after report came in of the killing of hundreds of Indians, 'with the loss only of one man of ours,' to quote a common refrain. Equally common were accounts such as that of the capture of 'about 26 Indians, most Women and Children brought in by our Scouts, as they were ranging the Woods about Dedham, almost starved.' All this, of course, was 'God's Will,' says the British reporter of these events, 'which will at last give us cause to say, How Great is his Goodness! and how great is his Beauty!' [77](#) As another writer of the time expressed the shared refrain, 'thus doth the Lord Jesus make them to bow before him, and to lick the Dust.' [78](#)

-----  
By the beginning of the eighteenth century the indigenous inhabitants of New England, and of most other northeastern Indian lands, had been reduced to a small fraction of their former number and were living in isolated, squalid enclaves. Cotton Mather called these defeated and scattered people 'tawny pagans' whose 'inaccessible' homes were now nothing more than 'kennels.' [82](#) And Mather's views, on this at least, were widely shared among the colonists. The once-proud native peoples, who had shown the English how to plant and live in the difficult environs of New England, were now regarded as animals, or at most, to quote one Englishwoman who traveled from Boston to New York in 1704, as 'the most salvage of all the salvages of that kind that I have ever Seen.' [83](#)

It had started with the English plagues and ended with the sword and musket. The culmination, throughout the larger region, has been called the Great Dispersal. Before the arrival of the English - to choose an example further north from the area we have been discussing- the population of the western Abenaki people in New Hampshire and Vermont had stood at about 12,000. Less than half a century later approximately 250 of these people remained alive, a destruction rate of 98 percent. Other examples from this area tell the same dreary tale: by the middle of the seventeenth century, the Mahican people - 92 percent destroyed; the Mohawk people - 75 percent destroyed; the eastern Abenaki people - 78 percent destroyed; the Maliseet-Passamaquoddy people - 67 percent destroyed. And on, and on. Prior to European contact the Pocumtuck people had numbered more than 18,000; fifty years later they were down to 920 - 95 percent destroyed. The Quiripi-Unquachog people had numbered about 30,000; fifty years later they were down to 1500 - 95 percent destroyed. The Massachusetts people had numbered at least 44,000; fifty years later they were down to barely 6000 - 81 percent destroyed. [84](#)

-----  
p.119-121

As Richard Drinnon has shown in his book *Facing West: The Metaphysics of Indian-Hating and Empire Building*, America's revered founding fathers were themselves activists in the anti-Indian genocide. George Washington, in 1779, instructed Major General John Sullivan to attack the Iroquois and "lay waste all the settlements around... that the country may not be merely overrun but destroyed," urging the general not to "listen to any overture of peace before the total ruin of their settlements is effected." Sullivan did as instructed, he reported back, "destroy[ing] everything that contributes to their support" and turning "the whole of that beautiful region," wrote one early account, "the character of a garden to a scene of drear and sickening desolation." The Indians, this writer said, "were hunted like wild beasts" in a "war of extermination," something Washington approved of since, as he was to say in 1783, the Indians, after all, were little different from wolves, "both being beasts of prey, tho' they differ in shape." [89](#)

And since the Indians were mere beasts, it followed that there was no cause for moral outrage when it was learned that, among other atrocities, the victorious troops had amused themselves by skinning the bodies of some Indians "from the hips downward, to make boot tops or leggings." For their part, the surviving Indians later referred to Washington by the nickname "Town Destroyer," for it was under his direct orders that at least 28 out of 30 Seneca towns from lake Erie to the Mohawk River had been totally obliterated in a period of less than five years, as had all the towns and villages of the Mohawk, the Onondaga, and the Cayuga. As one of the Iroquois told Washington to his face in 1792: "to this day, when that name is heard, our women look behind them and turn pale, and our children cling close to the necks of their mothers." [90](#)

They might well have clung close to the necks of their mothers when other names were mentioned as well - such as Adams or Monroe or Jackson. Or Jefferson, for example, who in 1807 instructed his Secretary of War that any Indians who resisted American expansion into their lands must be met with "the hatchet." "And...if ever we are constrained to lift the hatchet against any tribe," he wrote, "we will never lay it down till that tribe is exterminated, or is driven beyond the Mississippi," continuing: "in war, they will kill some of us; we shall destroy all of them." These were not off remarks, for five years later, in 1812, Jefferson again concluded that white Americans were "obliged" to drive the "backward" Indians "with the beasts of the forests into the Stony Mountains"; and one year later still, he added that the American government had no other choice before it than "to pursue [the Indians] to extermination, or drive them to new seats beyond our reach." Indeed, Jefferson's writings on Indians are filled with the straightforward assertion that the natives are to be given a simple choice - to be "extirpate[d] from the earth" or to remove themselves out of the Americans' way. [91](#) Had these same words been enunciated by a German leader in 1939, and directed at European Jews, they would

be engraved in modern memory. Since they were uttered by one of America's founding fathers, however, the most widely admired of the South's slaveholding philosophers of freedom, they conveniently have become lost to most historians in their insistent celebration of Jefferson's wisdom and humanity.

In fact, however, to the majority of white Americans by this time the choice *was* one of expulsion or extermination, although these were by no means mutually exclusive options. Between the time of initial contact with the European invaders and the close of the seventeenth century, most eastern Indian peoples had suffered near-annihilation levels of destruction; typically, as in Virginia and New England, 95 percent or more of their populations had been eradicated. But even then the carnage did not stop. One recent study of population trends in the southeast, for instance, shows that east of the Appalachians in Virginia the native population declined 93 percent between 1685 and 1790 - that is, *after* it already had declined by about 95 percent during the *preceding* century, which itself had followed upon the previous century's whirlwind of massive destruction. In eastern North and South Carolina the decline between 1685 and 1790 was 97 percent - again, following upon two earlier centuries of genocidal devastation. In Louisiana the 1685-1790 figure for population collapse with 91 percent, and in Florida 88 percent. As a result, when the eighteenth century was drawing to its close, less than 5000 native people remained alive in all of eastern Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Louisiana combined, while in Florida - which alone contained more than 700,000 Indians in 1520 - only 2000 survivors could be found. [92](#)

Overwhelmingly, these disasters were the result of massively destructive epidemics and genocidal warfare, while a small portion of the loss in numbers derived from forced expulsion from the Indians' traditional homelands.

-----

p. 121-22

From the precipice of non-existence, the Cherokee slowly struggled back. But as they did, more and more white settlers were moving into and onto their lands. Then, in 1828 Andrew Jackson was elected President. The same Andrew Jackson who once had written that "the whole Cherokee Nation ought to be scourged." The same Andrew Jackson who had led troops against peaceful Indian encampments, calling the Indians "savage dogs," and boasting that "I have on all occasion preserved the scalps of my killed." The same Andrew Jackson who had supervised the mutilation of 800 or so Creek Indian corpses - the bodies of men, women, and children that he and his men had massacred - cutting off their noses to count and preserve a record of the dead, slicing long strips of flesh from their bodies to tan and turn into bridle reins. The same Andrew Jackson who - after his Presidency was over - still was recommending that American troops specifically seek out and systematically kill Indian women and children who were in hiding, in order to complete their extermination: to do otherwise, he wrote, was equivalent to pursuing "a wolf in the hammocks without knowing first where her den and whelps were." [96](#)

-----

p. 123-24

Soon the forced relocation, what was to become known as the Trail of Tears, began under the direction of General Winfield Scott. In fact, the "relocation" was nothing less than a death march - a Presidentially ordered death march that, in terms of the mortality rate directly attributable to it, was almost as destructive as the Bataan Death March of 1942, the most notorious Japanese atrocity in all of the Second World War. [101](#) About 22,000

Cherokee then remained in existence, 4000 of whom had already broken under the pressures of white oppression and left for Indian Territory. Another thousand or so escaped and hid out in the Carolina hills. The remaining 17,000 were rounded up by the American military and herded into detention camps - holding pens, really - where they waited under wretched and ignominious conditions for months as preparations for their forced exile were completed. James Mooney, who interviewed people who had participated in the operation, described the scene:

Under Scott's orders the troops were disposed at various points throughout the Cherokee country, where stockade forts were erected for gathering in and holding the Indians preparatory to removal. From these, squads of troops were sent to search out with rifle and bayonet every small cabin hidden away in the coves or by the sides of mountain streams, to seize and bring in as prisoners all the occupants, however or wherever they might be found. Families at dinner were startled by the sudden gleam of bayonets in the doorway and rose up to be driven with blows and oaths along the weary miles of trail that led to the stockade. Men were seized in their fields or going along the road, women were taken from their wheels and children from their play. In many cases, on turning for one last look as they crossed the ridge, they saw their homes in flames, fired by the lawless rabble that followed on the heels of the soldiers to loot and pillage. So keen were these outlaws on the scent that in some instances they were driving off the cattle and other stock of the Indians almost before the soldiers had fairly started their wondrous in the other direction. Systematic hunts were made by the same men for Indian graves, to rob them of the silver pendants and other valuables deposited with the dead. A Georgia volunteer, afterward a colonel in the Confederate service, said: "I fought through the civil war and have seen men shot to pieces and slaughtered by thousands, but the Cherokee removal was the cruelest work I ever knew."

[102](#)

An initial plan to carry the Cherokee off by steamboat, in the hottest part of the summer, was called off when so many of them died from disease and the oppressive conditions. After waiting for the fall season to begin, they were then driven overland, in groups upwards of about a thousand, across Tennessee, Kentucky, Illinois, and Missouri. One white traveler from Maine happened upon several detachments from the death march, all of them suffering extremely from the fatigue of the journey, and the ill health consequent upon it:

The last detachment which we passed on the 7th embraced rising two thousand Indians.... [W]e found the road literally filled with the procession for about three miles in length. The sick and feeble were carried in wagons - about as comfortable for traveling as a New England ox cart with a covering over it - a great many ride on horseback and multitudes go on foot - even aged females, apparently nearly ready to drop into the grave, were traveling with heavy burdens attached to the back - on the sometimes frozen ground, and sometimes muddy streets, with no covering for the feet except what nature had given them.... We learned from the inhabitants on the road where the Indians passed, that they buried fourteen or fifteen at every stopping place, and they make a journey of ten miles per day only on an average. [103](#)

Like other government-sponsored Indian death marches, this one intentionally took native men, women, and children through areas where it was known that cholera and other epidemic diseases were raging; the government sponsors of this march, again as with the others, fed the Indians spoiled flour and rancid meat, and they drove the native people on through freezing rain and cold. Not a day passed without numerous deaths from the unbearable conditions under which they were forced to travel. And when they arrived in Indian Territory many more succumbed to fatal illness and starvation.

All told, by the time it was over, more than 8000 Cherokee men, women, and children died as a result of their expulsion from their homeland. That is, about half of what then remained of the Cherokee nation was liquidated under Presidential directive, a death rate similar to that of other southeastern peoples who had undergone the same process - the Creeks and the Seminoles in particular. Some others who also had been expelled from the lands of their ancestors, such as the Chickasaw and the Choctaw, fared better, losing only about 15 percent of their populations during their own forced death marches. [104](#) For comparative purposes, however, that "only" 15 percent is the approximate equivalent of the death rate for German combat troops in the closing year of World War Two, when Germany's entire southern front was collapsing and its forces in the field everywhere were being overwhelmed and more than decimated. The higher death rate of the Creeks, Seminoles, and Cherokee was equal to that of Jews in Germany, Hungary, and Rumania between 1939 and 1945. [105](#) And all these massacres of Indians took place, of course, only after many years of preliminary slaughter, from disease and military assault, that already had reduced these peoples' populations down to a fragment of what they had been prior to the coming of the Europeans.

-----  
p.125-127

...there is the case of the Moravian Delaware Indians who had converted to Christianity, as demanded by their white conquerors, in order to save their lives. It didn't matter. After destroying their corn and reducing them to starving scavengers, American troops under Colonel David Williamson rounded up those tribal members who were still clinging to life and, as reported after the events,

assured them of sympathy in their great hunger and their intention to escort them to food and safety. Without suspicion ... the Christians agreed to go with them and after consultations, hastened to the Salem fields to bring in their friends. The militia relieved the Indians of their guns and knives, promising to restore them later. The Christians felt safe with these friendly men whose interest in their welfare seemed genuine. Too late they discovered the Americans' treachery. Once defenseless, they were bound and charged with being warriors, murderers, enemies and thieves .... After a short night of prayer and hymns ... twenty-nine men, twenty-seven women, and thirty-four children were ruthlessly murdered. Pleas, in excellent English, from some of the kneeling Christians, failed to stop the massacre. Only two escaped by feigning death before the butchers had completed their work of scalping. [107](#)

Massacres of this sort were so numerous and routine that recounting them eventually becomes numbing - and, of course, far more carnage of this sort occurred than ever was recorded. So no matter how numbed - or even, shamefully, bored - we might become at hearing story after story after story of the mass murder, pillage, rape, and torture of America's native peoples, we can be assured that, however much we hear, we have heard only a small fragment of what there was to tell. The tale of the slaughter at Wounded Knee in South Dakota is another example too well known to require detailed repeating here, but what is less well known about that massacre is that, a week and a half before it happened, the editor of South Dakota's *Aberdeen Saturday Pioneer* - a gentle soul named L. Frank Baum, who later became famous as the author of *The Wizard of Oz* - urged the wholesale extermination of all America's native peoples:

The nobility of the Redskin is extinguished, and what few are left are a pack of whining curs who lick the hand that smites them. The Whites, by law of conquest, by justice of civilization, are masters of the American continent, and the best safety of the frontier settlements will be secured by the total annihilation of the few remaining Indians. Why not annihilation? Their glory has fled, their spirit

broken, their manhood effaced; better that they should die than live the miserable wretches that they are.  
[108](#)

Baum reflected well the attitudes of his time and place, for ten days later, after hundreds of Lakota men, women, and children at Wounded Knee had been killed by the powerful Hotchkiss guns (breech-loading cannons that fired an explosive shell) of the Seventh Cavalry, the survivors were tracked down for miles around and summarily executed - because, and only because, the blood running in their veins was Indian. Fully three miles from the scene of the massacre we found the body of a woman completely covered with a blanket of snow, wrote one eyewitness to the butchery, and from this point on we found them scattered along as they had been relentlessly hunted down and slaughtered while fleeing for their lives. ... When we reached the spot where the Indian camp had stood, among the fragments of burned tents and other belongings we saw the frozen bodies lying close together or piled one upon another. [109](#) Other women were found alive, but left for dead in the snow. They died after being brought under cover, as did babies who were found alive under the snow, wrapped in shawls and lying beside their dead mothers. [110](#) Women and children accounted for more than two-thirds of the Indian dead. As one of the Indian witnesses - a man named American Horse, who had been friendly to the American troops for years - recalled:

They turned their guns, Hotchkiss guns, etc., upon the women who were in the lodges standing there under a flag of truce, and of course as soon as they were fired upon they fled. ... There was a woman with an infant in her arms who was killed as she almost touched the flag of truce, and the women and children of course were strewn all along the circular village until they were dispatched. Right near the flag of truce a mother was shot down with her infant; the child not knowing that its mother was dead and still nursing, and that especially was a very sad sight. The women as they were fleeing with babes were killed together, shot right through, and the women who were very heavy with child were also killed. ... After most all of them had been killed a cry was made that all those who were not killed or wounded should come fort and they would be safe. Little boys who were not wounded came out of their places of refuge, and as soon as they came in sight a number of soldiers surrounded them and butchered them there. ... Of course it would have been all right if only the men were killed; we would feel almost grateful for it. But the fact of the killing of the women, and more especially the killing of the young boys and girls who are to go to make up the future strength of the Indian people, is the saddest part of the whole affair and we feel it very sorely. [111](#)

Four days after this piece of work the *Aberdeen Saturday Pioneer's* editor Baum sounded his approval, asserting that we had better, in order to protect our civilization, follow it up. ... and wipe these untamed and untamable creatures from the face of the earth. [112](#)

\\

pp. 128-29

Sometimes it was raw slaughter, sometimes it was the raging fire of exotic introduced disease. But, year in and year out, in countless places across the length and breadth of the continent, the scene of desolation described by one observer of events in western Canada was repeated over and over again:

In whatever direction you turn, nothing but sad wrecks of mortality meet the eye; lodges standing on every hill, but not a streak of smoke rising from them. Not a sound can be heard to break the awful

stillness, save the ominous croak of ravens, and the mournful howl of wolves fattening on the human carcasses that lie strewn around. It seems as if the very genius of desolation had stalked through the prairies, and wreaked his vengeance on everything bearing the shape of humanity. [115](#)

Or we can speak of statistics. They are, on the surface, less emotional evidence, and are simple to enumerate. Take Illinois, for example. Between the late seventeenth and late eighteenth century the number of Illinois Indians fell by about 96 percent; that is, for every one hundred Illinois Indians alive in 1680, only four were alive a century later. That massive destruction was the result of war, disease, and despair - despair in the face of apparently imminent extinction from a siege the likes of which cannot be imagined by those who have not endured it. A fragmentary selection of examples from every corner of the continent - in addition to the instances already discussed - tells the same depressing tale over and over again. The Kansa people of northeast Kansas suffered about the same level of devastation as the Illinois, though stretched over a somewhat longer period of time: it took a bit more than a century and a half - from the early eighteenth century to the late nineteenth century for the Kansa population to fall to 4 percent of its former size. A higher rate of collapse has been calculated for the ten tribes of Kalapuya Indians of Oregon's Willamette Valley: for every hundred Kalapuya alive prior to Western contact, about 25 or 30 remained alive in the late eighteenth century; only five were left by the late 1830s; and only one was left at the close of the nineteenth century. In Baja, California up to 60,000 Indians were alive at the end of the seventeenth century; by the middle of the nineteenth century there were none. Further north in California, the Tolowa people's population had collapsed by 92 percent after fifty years of Western contact. In less than half a century, between 1591 and 1638, two out of three people in northwestern Mexico died. In western Arizona and eastern New Mexico, within fifty years following European contact at least half of the Zuni, two-thirds of the Acoma, and 80 percent of the Hopi people had been liquidated. In Delaware, half the Munsee tribe was wiped out in the thirty-five years between 1680 and 1715. Two-thirds of New York's Huron nation were killed in a single decade. In Oklahoma, 50 percent of the Kiowa people died in a period of just two years. Ninety percent of the Upper Missouri River Mandan died in less than a year. From a population of up to 20,000 in 1682, the Quapaw people of the lower Mississippi and Arkansas River valleys were reduced in number to 265 by 1865 - a 99 percent destruction rate. In Alaska, in part because of its vastness and the relative remoteness of its population centers, statistics are less clear. However, as a detailed recent study shows, from the earliest days of Western contact Aleut and other native peoples were systematically exterminated - first by Russians, later by Americans - when they weren't being destroyed by introduced epidemics of smallpox, typhoid, measles, or influenza (which carried away as much as a third of the region's population in individual assaults), and by the lethal gifts of syphilis and tuberculosis, which rotted away more slowly from within. [116](#)

Controlled studies of tribal populations across the Lower Mississippi Valley, Central New York, and the Middle Missouri region replicate these patterns: drastic and often catastrophic population crashes, occasionally plunging to extinction levels, occurred repeatedly. [117](#) In all these cases - and in literally hundreds more of equal magnitude - the observed population collapses occurred *after* previous population declines that are known to have happened, but whose numbers went unrecorded. Thus, even figures of 95 and 98 and 99 percent destruction may time and again be too low. For this same reason, many entire tribes will never even be mentioned in lists of Indian population decline because they disappeared before any whites were around to record their existence for posterity. In 1828, for example, the French biologist Jean Louis Berlandier traveled through Texas and noted that of fifty-two Indian nations recorded by members of the La Salle expedition a century and a half earlier only three or four nations remained. But we will never know how many of Texas's native peoples or tribes were wiped out by the swarms of violence and deadly infectious disease that arrived from Europe, by way of Spanish troops, before La Salle's expedition appeared upon the scene. For when he

was in Louisiana in 1682, LaSalle repeatedly questioned whether the maps and chronicles he had inherited from the earlier De Soto expedition were accurate, since they referred to the presence of large numbers of Indian peoples and populations that LaSalle could not find, because they already had long since been destroyed. [118](#)

=====

Sand Creek and politics of Genocide, extermination and massacre

p. 129-134

Among all these instances of horror visited upon America's native peoples, however, one episode perhaps stands out. It occurred in eastern Colorado in November of 1864, at a small and unarmed Cheyenne and Arapaho village known as Sand Creek. It is not that so many Indians died there. Rather, it is how they died - and the political and cultural atmosphere in which they died - that is so historically revealing. It is, moreover, representative in its savagery of innumerable other events that differ from it only because they left behind less visible traces.

Colorado at this time was the quintessence of the frontier west. Various incidents had earlier raised tensions between the Indians there and the seemingly endless flow of white settlers who came as squatters on Cheyenne and Arapaho lands. As tempers flared, so did the settlers' rhetoric, which became inflamed with genocidal threats and promises. During the year preceding the incident that has come to be known as the Sand Creek Massacre, a local newspaper, the *Rocky Mountain News*, launched an incendiary campaign that urged the Indians' extermination. "They are a dissolute, vagabondish, brutal, and ungrateful race, and ought to be wiped from the face of the earth," wrote the *News's* editor in March of 1863. In that year, of twenty-seven stories having anything at all to do with Indians, ten went out of their way to urge extermination. [119](#)

The following year was election time in Colorado. In addition to political offices that were up for grabs, a constitution was on the ballot that would have opened the door for statehood - something that was not especially popular with most settlers. The faction allied with the *Rocky Mountain News* (which included the incumbent governor) supported statehood and apparently perceived political gain to be had in whipping up hatred for the Indians. As a rival newspaper put it, the pro-statehood forces believed that if they "cooked up" enough settler fear of the Indians they would be able to "prove [to the voters] that only as a state could Colorado get sufficient troops to control her Indians." While the election year wore on, stories in the *News* continued to stir those fears: wild rumors of Indian conspiracies were heralded as fact; any violence at all between whites and Indians was reported as an Indian "massacre." [120](#)

The public and the military began taking up the chant. After a skirmish between Indians and soldiers in which two soldiers died, the military replied by killing twenty-five Indians. "Though I think we have punished them pretty severely in this affair," stated the troops' commander, "yet I believe now is but the commencement of war with this tribe, which must result in exterminating them." More skirmishes followed. Groups of Indians, including women and children, were killed here and there by soldiers and bands of vigilantes. To many whites it had become abundantly clear, as the *News* proclaimed in August of 1864, that the time was at hand when the settlers and troops must "go for them, their lodges, squaws and all." [121](#)

Then, at last, the excuse was at hand. A family of settlers was killed by a group of Indians - which Indians, no one knew, nor did anyone care. The governor issued an emergency proclamation: regiments of citizen soldiers

were authorized to form and to kill any and all hostile Indians they could find. Their compensation would be whatever horses and other property they may capture, and, in addition, [the Governor] promises to use his influence to procure their payment by the general government. In effect, this was an official government license to kill any and all Indians on sight, to seize their horses and other property, and then-after the fact- to claim they had been hostile. In the event that this point might be missed by some, the governor's journalistic ally, the *News*, urged all out extermination against the red devils, making no distinction between those Indians who were friendly and those who were not. With identical intent the governor issued another proclamation - a clarification: the evidence was now conclusive, he declared, that most of the Indians on the Plains were indeed hostile; it was, therefore, the citizens' and the military's right and obligation - for which they would be duly paid - to pursue, kill, and destroy them all. [122](#)

This, then was the mood and the officially sanctioned setting when about 700 heavily armed soldiers, under the command of a former Methodist missionary (and still an elder in the church), Colonel John Chivington, rode into Sand Creek village. Several months earlier Chivington, who that year was also a candidate for Congress, had announced in a speech that his policy was to kill and scalp all, little and big. Nits make lice, he was fond of saying - indeed, the phrase became a rallying cry of his troops; since Indians were lice, their children were nits - and the only way to get rid of lice was to kill the nits as well. Clearly, Colonel Chivington was a man ahead of his time. It would be more than half a century, after all, before Heinrich Himmler would think to describe the extermination of another people as the same thing as delousing. [123](#)

The air was cold and crisp, the early morning darkness just beginning to lift, when they entered the snowy village on November 29. The creek was almost dry, the little water in it crusted over with ice, untouched yet by the dawn's first rays of sun. The cavalymen paused and counted well over a hundred lodges in the encampment. Within them, the native people were just stirring; as had been the case with the Pequots in Connecticut, more than 200 years earlier - and with countless other native peoples across the continent since then - the village was filled almost entirely with women and children who had no inkling of what was about to happen. Most of the men were away on a buffalo hunt. One of the colonel's guides, Robert Bent, later reported that there were about 600 Indians in camp that morning, including no more than thirty-five braves and some old men, about sixty in all. The rest were women and children. [124](#)

A few days before riding into the Indian camp Colonel Chivington had been informed that the village at Sand Creek could be taken with a small fraction of the troops at his command, not only because most of the Cheyenne men were away on the hunt, but because the people had voluntarily disarmed themselves to demonstrate that they were not hostile. They had turned in all but their essential hunting weapons to the commander at nearby Fort Lyon. Technically, the colonel was informed, the government considered the Indians at Sand Creek to be harmless and disarmed prisoners of war. Witnesses later reported that Chivington - who just then had been going on at length about his desire for taking Indian scalps - dismissed this news, drew himself up in his chair, and replied: Well, I long to be wading in gore. [125](#)

His wish was soon fulfilled. As Chivington and his five battalions moved into the village that morning, two whites who were visiting the camp tied a tanned buffalo hide to a pole and waved it to signal the troops that this was a friendly town. They were met with a fusillade of gunfire. Then old chief Black Kettle, the principal leader of the Cheyenne, tied a white flag to a lodge pole, and above that he tied an American flag that had been given him by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs. He gathered his family around him and he held the pole high - again, in an effort to show the American soldiers that his was not a hostile camp. He kept calling out to his people not to be frightened, Robert Bent's brother George recalled, that the camp was under protection

and there was no danger. Then suddenly the troops opened fire on this mass of men, women, and children, and all began to scatter and run.Ó [126](#)

The massacre was on. Chivington ordered that cannons be fired into the panicked groups of Indians first; then the troops charged on horseback and on foot. There was nowhere for the native people to hide. The few Cheyenne and Arapaho men in camp tried to fight back, and Robert Bent says they "all fought well," but by his own count they were outnumbered twenty to one and had virtually no weapons at their disposal. Some women ran to the riverbank and clawed at the dirt and sand, frantically and hopelessly digging holes in which to conceal themselves or their children. From this point on it is best simply to let the soldiers and other witnesses tell what they did and what they saw, beginning with the testimony of Robert Bent: [127](#)

After the firing the warriors put the squaws and children together, and surrounded them to protect them. I saw five squaws under a bank for shelter. When the troops came up to them they ran out and showed their persons, to let the soldiers know they were squaws and begged for mercy, but the soldiers shot them all....There were some thirty or forty squaws collected in a hole for protection; they sent out a little girl about six years old with a white flag on a stick; she had not proceeded but a few steps when she was shot and killed. All the squaws in that hole were afterwards killed, and four or five bucks outside. The squaws offered no resistance. Every one I saw dead was scalped. I saw one squaw cut open with an unborn child, as I thought, lying by her side. Captain Soule afterwards told me that such was the fact. ... I saw quite a number of infants in arms killed with their mothers.

I went over the ground soon after the battle [reported Asbury Bird, a soldier with Company D of the First Colorado Cavalry]. I should judge there were between 400 and 500 Indians killed. ... Nearly all, men, women, and children were scalped. I saw one woman whose privates had been mutilated.

The bodies were horribly cut up [testified Lucien Palmer, a Sergeant with the First Cavalry's Company C] skulls broken in a good many; I judge they were broken in after they were killed, as they were shot besides. I do not think I saw any but what was scalped; saw fingers cut off [to get rings off them], saw several bodies with privates cut off, women as well as men.

Next morning after the battle [said Corporal Amos C. Miksch, also of Company C], I saw a little boy covered up among the Indians in a trench, still alive. I saw a major in the 3rd regiment take out his pistol and blow off the top of his head. I saw some men unjointing fingers to get rings off, and cutting off ears to get silver ornaments. I saw a party with the same major take up bodies that had been buried in the night to scalp them and take off ornaments. I saw a squaw with her head smashed in before she was killed. Next morning, after they were dead and stiff, these men pulled out the bodies of the squaws and pulled them open in an indecent manner. I heard men say they had cut out the privates, but did not see it myself.

I saw some Indians that had been scalped, and the ears were cut off of the body of White Antelope [said Captain L. Wilson of the First Colorado Cavalry]. One Indian who had been scalped had also his skull all smashed in, and I heard that the privates of White Antelope had been cut off to make a tobacco bag out of. I heard some of the men say that the privates of one of the squaws had been cut out and put on a stick.

The dead bodies of women and children were afterwards mutilated in the most horrible manner [testified David Louderback, a First Cavalry Private]. I saw only eight. I could not stand it; they were cut up too much ... they were scalped and cut up in an awful manner. ... White Antelope's nose, ears, and privates were cut off.

All manner of depredations were inflicted on their persons [said John S. Smith, an interpreter], they were scalped, their brains knocked out; the men used their knives, ripped open women, clubbed little children, knocked them in the head with their guns, beat their brains out, mutilated their bodies in every sense of the word...worse mutilated than any I ever saw before, the women all cut to pieces. ... [C]hildren two or three months old; all ages lying there, from sucking infants up to warriors.

In going over the battle-ground the next day I did not see a body of man, woman, or child but was scalped, and in many instances their bodies were mutilated in the most horrible manner - men, women, and children's privates cut out, & c. [reported First Lieutenant James D. Cannon of the New Mexico Volunteers]. I heard one man say that he had cut out a woman's private parts and had them for exhibition on a stick; I heard another man say that he had cut the fingers off an Indian to get the rings on the hand. . . . I also heard of numerous instances in which men had cut out the private parts of females and stretched them over the saddle-bows, and wore them over their hats while riding in the ranks....I heard one man say that he had cut a squaw's heart out, and he had it stuck up on a stick.

Once the carnage was over, and the silence of death had descended on the killing-field, Colonel Chivington sent messages to the press that he and his men had just successfully concluded "one of the most bloody Indian battles ever fought" in which "one of the most powerful villages in the Cheyenne nation" was destroyed. There was exultation in the land. "Cheyenne scalps are getting as thick here now as toads in Egypt," joked the *Rocky Mountain News*. "Everybody has got one and is anxious to get another to send east." [128](#)

Outside of Colorado, however, not everyone was pleased. Congressional investigations were ordered, and some among the investigators were shocked at what they found. One of them, a senator who visited the site of the massacre and "picked up skulls of infants whose milk-teeth had not yet been shed," later reported that the concerned men of Congress had decided to confront Colorado's governor and Colonel Chivington openly on the matter, and so assembled their committee and the invited general public in the Denver Opera House. During the course of discussion and debate, someone raised a question: Would it be best, henceforward, to try to "civilize" the Indians or simply to exterminate them? Whereupon, the senator wrote in a letter to a friend, "there suddenly arose such a shout as is never heard unless upon some battlefield - a shout almost loud enough to raise the roof of the opera house - 'EXTERMINATE THEM! EXTERMINATE THEM!'" [129](#)

The committee, apparently, was impressed. Nothing ever was done to Chivington, who took his fame and exploits on the road as an after-dinner speaker. After all, as President Theodore Roosevelt said later, the Sand Creek Massacre was "as righteous and beneficial a deed as ever took place on the frontier." [130](#)

+++++

pp. 142-146

By 1845 the Indian population of California was down to no more than a quarter of what it had been when the Franciscan mission were established in 1769. That is, it had declined by at least 75 percent during seventy-five

years of Spanish rule. In the course of just the next twenty-five years, under American rule, it would fall by another 80 percent. The gold rush brought to California a flood of American miners and ranchers who seemed to delight in killing Indians, miners and ranchers who rose to political power and prominence - and from those platforms not only legalized the enslavement of California Indians, but, as in Colorado and elsewhere, launched public campaigns of genocide with the explicitly stated goal of all-out Indian extermination.

Governmentally unsanctioned enslavement of the Indians began as soon as California became an American possession and continued for many years. It seemed an excellent idea in a land where free labor was in short supply and white wages were high. Moreover, as whites who had lived in the southern United States repeatedly asserted, California's Indians - who already had suffered a savage population loss at the hands of the Spanish - "make as obedient and humble slaves as the negroes in the south," wrote one former New Orleans cotton broker. In fact, they were even better than Blacks, claimed a ranch owner in 1846, because they accepted "flagellation with more humility than negroes." [160](#)

Indian docility was believed to be particularly assured "when caught young." So a thriving business in hunting and capturing Indian children developed. Newspapers frequently reported sightings of men driving Indian children before them on back-country roads to the slave markets in Sacramento and San Francisco. As with black slaves in the South, prices varied "according to quality," said the *Ukiah Herald*, but they sometimes climbed as high as two-hundred dollars each. Bargains could be had in some areas, however, as "Colusa County in 1861 [where] Indian boys and girls aged three and four years old were sold at fifty dollars apiece." Especially "good little" Indians - or, as the *Sacramento Daily Union* described them, "bright little specimens" - might even fetch a straight trade for a horse. Given the shortage of women in California during these early years of white settlement, "a likely young girl" might cost almost double that of a boy, because, as the *Marysville Appeal* phrased it, girls served the double duty "of labor and of lust." [161](#)

Not surprisingly, the parents of these valuable children could be a problem. The prospect of losing their beloved offspring to slave traders, said the *Humboldt Times*, "has the effect of making Indians very shy of coming into the Reservations, as they think it is a trick to deprive them of their children." [162](#) And, indeed, it often was. Thus inconvenienced, the slave traders had to pursue their prey into the hills. There, when they cornered the objects of their desire, reported the California Superintendent of Indian Affairs in 1854, they frequently murdered the troublesome parents as they were gathering up the children, a tactic that allowed the slavers to sell their little charges as "orphans" without possibility of contradiction. [163](#)

Should Indian adults attempt to use the California courts to bring such killers to justice, they invariably were frustrated because the law of the land prohibited Indians from testifying against whites. Even some otherwise unsympathetic settler newspapers observed and protested this situation (to no avail), since in consequence it encouraged and legalized the open-season hunting of Indians. As one San Francisco newspaper put it in 1858, following the unprovoked public murder of an Indian, and the release of the known killer because the only eyewitnesses to the event were native people: the Indians "are left entirely at the mercy of every ruffian in the country, and if something is not done for their protection, the race will shortly become extinct." [164](#)

Nothing was done, however, and so enslavement and murder, carried out by entrepreneurial and genocide-minded whites, continued on for many years. One of the more well-known incidents, described in Theodora Kroeber's popular *Ishi in Two Worlds*, occurred in 1868. Part of a series of massacres of Yahi Indians, in which ultimately all but one member of this tiny fragment of a tribe were scalped and murdered, this particular assault is distinguished by the perverse concern shown by one of the attackers for the bodies of his victims: "As

he explained afterwards, [he] changed guns during the slaughter, exchanging his .56-caliber Spencer rifle for a .38-caliber Smith and Wesson revolver, because the rifle "tore them up so bad," particularly the babies. [165](#)

It would be a mistake, however, to think of the destruction of California's Indians - or most of the Indians of the Americas - as the work of renegades. As early as 1850 the first session of the California legislature passed a law entitled "Act for the Government and Protection of Indians" that in fact did little more than give the imprimatur of legality to the kidnapping and enslavement of native people. Among other provisions, the law provided for the forced indenture of any Indian child to any white person who could convince a justice of the peace that the child in his possession had not been obtained by force. Justices of the peace were easily convinced, especially if the abducted child's parents had been murdered or terrorized into silence and were therefore not on hand to provide contradictory testimony. In 1860 the legislature expanded the law, extending the duration of terms of forced service and permitting the law's use to cover adult Indians as well as children.

The problem the whites were facing by this time, and that the new legislation was intended to address, was a shortage of Indian labor. About ten thousand of the rapidly dwindling numbers of Indians had been put to forced labor legally, under the provisions of the 1850 and 1860 laws (many more, of course, were enslaved without going through the niceties of a justice of the peace's approval), but this was nothing compared with the thousands who had been killed. [166](#) The shortage of menial workers, despite large numbers of Mexican, Hawaiian, and Asian contract laborers in California, led the *Humboldt Times* to champion the 1860 enslavement law while exclaiming in an editorial: "What a pity the provisions of the law are not extended to greasers, Kanakas, and Asiatics. It would be so convenient to carry on a farm or mine, when all the hard and dirty work is performed by apprentices!" [167](#)

Considering the California legislature's concern for cheap - indeed, slave - labor in the 1850s, it would in retrospect seem mindless for the lawmakers simultaneously to encourage the destruction of that same Indian labor force. But that is precisely what happened. Because some Indians, who in the late 1840s had been driven into the mountains by marauding slave catchers, were thereby forced to poach on white-owned livestock for their existence, the governor of California in his 1851 message to the legislature announced the necessity for a total eradication of the natives: "the white man, to whom time is money, and who labors hard all day to create the comforts of life, cannot sit up all night to watch his property," Governor Peter Burnett said; "after being robbed a few times he becomes desperate, and resolves upon a war of extermination." Such a war to annihilate the Indians had already begun by then, Burnett recognized, but, he added, it must "continue to be waged between the races until the Indian becomes extinct." A year later the governor's successor to that office, John McDougal, renewed the charge: if the Indians did not submit to white demands to relinquish their land, he said, the state would "make war upon the [Indians] which must of necessity be one of extermination to many of the tribes." [168](#)

This straightforward advocacy of genocide by the highest American officials in the land emerged in a cultural milieu that habitually described the California Indians as ugly, filthy, and inhuman "beasts," "swine," "dogs," "wolves," "snakes," "pigs," "baboons," "gorillas," and "orangutans," to cite only a few of the press's more commonly published characterizations. Some whites gave the Indians the benefit of the doubt and declared them to be not quite animals, but merely "the nearest link, of the sort, to the quadrupeds" in North America, while others not inclined to such lofty speculations said that simply touching an Indian created "a feeling of repulsion just as if I had put my hand on a toad, tortoise, or huge lizard." [169](#) The eradication of such abominable creatures could cause little trouble to most consciences.

Between 1852 and 1860, under American supervision, the indigenous population of California plunged from 85,000 to 35,000, a collapse of about 60 percent within eight years of the first gubernatorial demands for the Indians' destruction. By 1890 that number was halved again: now 80 percent of the natives who had been alive when California became a state had been wiped out by an official policy of genocide. Fewer than 18,000 California Indians were still living, and the number was continuing to drop. In the late 1840s and 1850s one observer of the California scene had watched his fellow American whites begin their furious assault upon [the Indians], shooting them down like wolves, men, women and children, wherever they could find them, and had warned that this war of extermination against the aborigines, commenced in effect at the landing of Columbus, and continued to this day, [is] gradually and surely tending to the final and utter extinction of the race. While to most white Californians such a conclusion was hardly lamentable, to this commentator it was a major concern - but only because the extermination policy [has] proved so injurious to the interests of the whites. That was because the Indians' labor, once very useful, and, in fact, indispensable in a country where no other species of laborers were to be obtained at any price, and which might now be rendered of immense value by pursuing a judicious policy, has been utterly sacrificed by this extensive system of indiscriminate revenge.

[170](#)

...

As had happened in Virginia two hundred years earlier - and as happened across the entire continent during the intervening years - between 95 and 98 percent of California's Indians had been exterminated in little more than a century. And even this ghastly numerical calculation is inadequate, not only because it reveals nothing of the hideous suffering endured by those hundreds of thousands of California native peoples, but because it is based on decline only from the estimated population for the year 1769 - a population that already had been reduced savagely by earlier invasions of European plague and violence. Nationwide by this time only about one-third of one percent of America's population - 250,000 out of 76,000,000 people - were natives. The worst human holocaust the world had ever witnessed, roaring across two continents non-stop for four centuries and consuming the lives of countless tens of millions of people, finally had leveled off. There was, at last, almost no one left to kill.

-----

---

## Notes to Chapter 4

10. Nicholas P. Canny, 'The Ideology of English Colonization: From Ireland to America,' *William and Mary Quarterly*, Third Series, 30 (1973), 582.
11. Ibid.
12. Ibid., 593-95.
13. From the account of the voyage by Dionise Settle in Richard Hakluty, *The Principal Navigations, Voyages, Traffiques & Discoveries of the English Nation*, Volume Five (London: J.M. Dent & Sons, Ltd., 1907), pp. 144-45.

20. Letter of Juan Rogel to Francis Borgia (28 August 1572) in Clifford M. Lewis and Albert J. Loomie, eds., *The Spanish Jesuit Mission in Virginia, 1570-1572* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press for the Virginia Historical Society, 1953) p. 111
22. Henry F. Dobyns, *Their Number Become Thinned: Native American Population Dynamics in Eastern North America* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1983), p. 292.
23. Letter of Luis de Quiros and Jean Baptista de Segura to Joan de Hinistroso (12 September 1579), in Lewis and Loomie; eds., *The Spanish Jesuit Mission in Virginia* , pp. 89-90.
30. Howard Mumford Jones, *O Strange New World: American Culture - the Formative Years* (London: Chatto and Windus, Ltd., 1964), pp. 170-71.
31. See, for example, Ralph Lane, "An Account of the Particularities of Employments of the Englishmen Left in Virginia," in David B. Quinn, ed., *The Roanoke Voyages, 1584-1590* (Cambridge: Hakluyt Society, 1955), Vol. One, p. 262.
32. George Percy, "A Trewe Relacyon of the Proceedinges and Occurrentes of Momente which have hapned in Virginia," *Tyler's Quarterly Historical and Genealogical Magazine* , 3 (1922), 280.
33. On this, and on the Roanoke settlement in general, see Edmund S. Morgan, *American Slavery-American Freedom: The Ordeal of Colonial Virginia* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1975), pp. 25-43.
34. Percy, "A Trewe Relacyon," 271.
35. *Ibid.*, 272-73
36. Morgan, *American Slavery-American Freedom* , p. 99.
37. Edward Waterhouse, *A Declaration of the State of the Colony and Affaires in Virginia* (London, 1622), p. 23.
38. James Axtell, "The rise and Fall of the Powhatan Empire," in Axtell, *After Columbus, Essays in the Ethnohistory of Colonial North America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988) pp. 218-19. For an example of colonists poisoning the Indians - in this case killing about 200 people in a single incident - see Robert Bennett to Edward Bennett, "Bennetes Welcome," [9 June 1623], *William and Mary Quarterly* , 2nd Series, 13 (1933), 122.
39. *Ibid.*, pp. 219, 221.
40. The number of Indians under Powhatan's control in 1607 comes from Axtell, "Rise and Fall of the Powhatan Empire," p. 190. The reference to a population of more than 100,000 prior to European contact is in J. Leitch Wrigth, Jr., *The Only Land They Knew: The Tragic Story of the Indians in the Old South* (New York: Free Press, 1981), p. 60. The colonist population at the end of the seventeenth century - estimated at 62,800 - is from Morgan, *American Slavery - American Freedom* , p. 404. The number of Powhatan people at the century's close is based on a multiplier of four times the number of Powhatan bowmen estimated in Robert Beverly, *The*

*History and Present State of Virginia [1705]* , ed. Louis B. Wright (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1947), pp. 232-33.

41. Morgan, *American Slavery - American Freedom* , p. 233; Gwenda Morgan, "The Hegemony of the Law: Richmond County, 1692-1776" (Doctoral dissertation, John Hopkins University, 1980), Chapter One.

45. John Winthrop to Sir Nathaniel Rich, May 22, 1634, in Everett Emerson, ed., *Letters from New England* (Amherst; University of Massachusetts Press, 1976), pp. 115-16.

47: Adam J. Hirsch, "The Collision of Military Cultures in Seventeenth Century New England," *Journal of American History* , 74 (1988), 1190.

50. Stanley Diamond, *In Search of the Primitive: A Critique of Civilization* (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books, 1974), pp. 156-57. Las Casas had said much the same thing of the wars waged among themselves by the peoples of the Indies, describing them as "little more than games played by children." Bartolome de Las Casas, *The Devastation of the Indies: A Brief Account* , translated by Hermia Briffault (New York: Seabury Press, 1974), p. 43. There are, of course, exceptions to this as to other generalizations. It is worth noting, therefore, that warfare in the Great Plains area could on occasion be highly destructive, as is evident in the remains from an early fourteenth-century battle that took place in what is now south-central South Dakota. The archaeological and osteological data on those remains are most thoroughly discussed in P. Willey, *Prehistoric Warfare on the Great Plains: Skeletal Analysis of the Crow Creek Massacre Victims* (New York: Garland Publishing, 1990).

53. John Mason, *A Brief History of the Pequot War* (Boston: Kneeland & Green, 1736), p. 21

54. On the smallpox epidemic, see John Winthrop, *Winthrop's Journal* , ed. James Kendall Hosmer (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1908), Volume One, pp. 118-19.

55. Richard Drinnon, *Facing West: The Metaphysics of Indian Hating and Empire Building* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1980), pp. 35-45, provides a concise and powerful description of the Pequot War. My account is drawn from Drinnon and from that of Francis Jennings, *The Invasion of America: Indians, Colonialism, and the Cant of Conquest* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1975), pp. 202-27. Another account, with some provocative interpretations, is in Ann Kibbey, *The Interpretation of Material Shapes in Puritanism: A Study of Rhetoric, Prejudice, and Violence* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), pp. 92-120. For differing views on Oldham's reputation, compare Drinnon, p. 37 and Jennings, p. 206.

56. Jennings, *Invasion of America* , p. 210.

57. Underhill, John, *Newes from America ; or, A New and Experimentall Discoverie of New England* (London,1638),p.7.

58. Ibid., p. 9.

59. Jennings, *Invasion of America* , p. 212.

60. Mason, *Brief History* , p. 7.

61. Ibid., p. 8.
62. Ibid., pp. 9-10.
63. Jennings, *Invasion of America* , p. 222.
64. Underhill, *Newes from America* , pp. 39-40.
65. Bradford, *Of Plymouth Plantation* , p. 296.
66. Cotton Mather, *Magnalia Christi Americana; or, The Ecclesiastic History of New-England* [1702] (New York: Russell & Russell, 1967), Volume Two, p. 558; Mason, *Brief History* , p.10
68. Drinnon, *Facing West* , p. 45
69. Ibid., p. 47
70. Ronald Sanders, *Lost Tribes and Promised Lands: The Origins of American Racism* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1978), pp. 339-40. For a stimulating analysis of the complex relationship between imperialism and place-naming, see Paul Carter, *The Road to Botany Bay: An Exploration of Landscape and History* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1988), passim, but esp. pp. 63-68, 326-31.
71. So close to totality was the colonists' mass murder of Pequot men, women, and children that it is now popularly believed that all the Pequots in fact were exterminated. Some, however, found their way to live among neighboring tribes, and in time to resurrect themselves as Pequots. For discussion of these matters, including the state of the Pequot nation today, see Laurence M. Hauptman and James D. Wherry, eds., *The Pequots in Southern New England: The Fall and Rise of an American Indian Nation* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1990).
72. Drinnon, *Facing West* , pp. 46-47.
73. Richard Slotkin and James K. Folsom, eds., *So Dreadful a Judgment: Puritan Responses to King Philip's War, 1676-1677* (Middletown, Conn.: Wesleyan University Press, 1978), p. 381.
75. Jennings, *Invasion of America* , p. 227.
76. Douglas Edward Leach, *Flintlock and Tomahawk: New England in King Philip's War* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1958), p. 237.
77. *A True Account of the Most Considerable Occurrences that have Hapned in the Warre Between the English and the Indians in New England* (Londong, 1676), pp. 7-9.
78. Ibid., p. 6.
82. Cotton Mather, *Fair Weather* (Boston, 1692), p. 86.

83. Sarah Kemble Knight, *The Journal of Madam Knight* (Boston: David R. Godine, 1972), pp. 21-22.
84. Dean R. Snow and Kim M. Lamphear, "European Contact and Indian Depopulation in the Northeast: The Timing of the First Epidemics," *Ethnohistory*, 35 (1988), p. 24, Table 1.
89. Quoted in Drinnon, *Facing West*, pp. 331-32, 65.
90. Ibid., p. 332; Peter S. Schmalz, *The Ojibwa of Southern Ontario* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1991), p. 99; Anthony F.C. Wallace, *The Death and Rebirth of the Seneca* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1970), pp. 141-44.
91. Drinnon, *Facing West*, pp. 96, 98, 116; Ronald T. Takaki, *Iron Cages: Race and Culture in 19th-Century America* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1979), pp. 61-65.
92. For the 1685 to 1790 figures, see Peter H. Wood, "The Changing Population of the Colonial South: An Overview by Race and Region, 1685-1790," in Peter H. Wood, Gregory A. Waselkov, and M. Thomas Hatley, eds., *Powhatan's Mantle: Indians in the Colonial Southeast* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1989), p. 38.
96. Takaki, *Iron Cages*, pp. 96, 102.
101. Of the 10,000 or so Americans who were victims of the Bataan Death March, 4000 survived to the end of the war, meaning that about 6000, or 60 percent, died on the march or during the subsequent three years of imprisonment. As noted in the text, about 8000 of the approximately 17,000 Cherokee who began that death march died on the Trail of Tears and in the immediate aftermath - about 47 percent. The comparison is incomplete, however, because, unlike the Bataan situation, no one knows how many Cherokee died during the next three years of reservation imprisonment - and also because, again, unlike the Bataan death march, the Cherokee death march included many thousands of women and children. For Bataan, see Donald Knox, *Death March: The Survivors of Bataan* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1981).
102. Mooney, *Historical Sketch of the Cherokee* [1900] (Chicago: Aldine Publishers, 1975), p. 124.
103. In Grant Foreman, *Indian Removal: The Emigration of the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1932), pp. 305-306.
104. Russell Thornton, "Cherokee Population Losses During the Trail of Tears: A New Perspective and a New Estimate," *Ethnohistory*, 31 (1984), 289-300.
105. Peter Calvocoressi, Guy Wint, and John Pritchard, *Total War: Causes and Courses of the Second World War*, Revised Second Edition (New York: Pantheon Books, 1989), p. 523; Raul Hilberg, *The Destruction of the European Jews* (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1961), p. 670.
107. Quoted in Schmalz, *The Ojibwa of Southern Ontario*, p.99-100.

108. *Aberdeen Saturday Pioneer*, Aberdeen, South Dakota, December 20, 1891; quoted in Elliot J. Gorn, Randy Roberts, and Terry D. Bilhartz, *Constructing the American Past: A Source Book of a People's History* (New York: HarperCollins, 1991), p. 99.
109. Charles A. Eastman, *From the Deep Woods to Civilization* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1916), pp. 111-12.
110. James Mooney, "The Ghost Dance Religion and the Sioux Outbreak of 1890," in *Fourteenth Annual Report of the United States Bureau of Ethnology* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1896), Part Two, p. 877.
111. *Ibid.*, p. 885.
112. Quoted in Gorn, Roberts, and Bilhartz, *Constructing the American Past*, p. 99.
115. In H.R. Schoolcraft, *Historical and Statistical Information Respecting the History, Condition, and Prospects of the Indian Tribes of the United States* (Philadelphia: Lippincott, Grambo & Co., 1851), Volume Two, p. 258.
116. Russell Thornton, *American Indian Holocaust and Survival: A Population History Since 1492* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1987), pp. 86-89, 124-25, 126-27; Robert T., Boyd, "Another Look at the Fever and Ague of Western Oregon," *Ethnohistory*, 22 (1975), 135-54 (for data on the Kalapuyan not covered in Thornton); Harry Kelsey, "European Impact on the California Indians, 1530-1830," *The America*, 41 (1985), 510; Russell Thornton, "Social Organization and the Demographic Survival of the Tolowa," *Ethnohistory*, 31 (1984), 191-92; Daniel T. Reff, "Old World Diseases and the Dynamics of Indian and Jesuit Relations in Northwestern New Spain, 1520-1660," in N. Ross Crumrine and Phil C. Weigand, eds., *Ejidos and Regions of Refuge in Northwestern Mexico* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1987), p. 89; Steadman Upham, *Polities and Power: An Economic and Political History of the Western Pueblo* (New York: Academic Press, 1982), pp. 39-43; Robert S. Grumet, "A New Ethnohistorical Model for North American Indian Demography," *North American Archaeologist*, 11, (1990), 29-41; Francis Jennings, *The Ambiguous Iroquois Empire* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1984), p. 88. John C. Ewers, "The Influence of Epidemics on the Indian Populations and Cultures of Texas," *Plains Anthropologist*, 18 (1973), 104, 109; Robert Fortune, *Chills and Fever: Health and Disease in the Early History of Alaska* (Anchorage: University of Alaska Press, 1989), pp. 89-122, 161-78, 199-264, 301-14.
117. Ann F. Ramenofsky, *Vectors of Death: The Archaeology of European Contact* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1987), pp. 42-136.
118. Jean Louis Berlandier, *The Indians of Texas in 1830*, ed., John C. Ewers (Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1969); Wood, "Changing Population of the Colonial South," p. 74.
119. David Svaldi, *Sand Creek and the Rhetoric of Extermination: A Case Study in Indian-White Relations* (New York: University Press of America, 1989), pp. 149-50.
120. *Ibid.*, pp. 155-58.

121. Ibid., p. 172.

122. Ibid., pp. 171, 237.

123. Ibid., p. 291; Himmler is quoted in Robert Jay Lifton, *The Nazi Doctors: Medical Killing and the Psychology of Genocide* (New York: Basic Books, 1986), p. 477. Although Chivington made the phrase famous, it must be said that it did not originate with him. At least a few years earlier one H.L. Hall in California, who made a living killing Indians, refused to take other whites with him to massacres he had arranged unless they were willing to kill every Indian woman and child encountered, because, he liked to say, "a nit would make a louse." On one occasion, Hall led a group of whites in the mass murder of 240 Indian men, women, and children because he believed one of them had killed a horse. See, Lynwood Carranco and Estle Beard, *Genocide and Vendetta: The Round Valley Wars of Northern California* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1981), chapter four.

124. Quoted in Stan Hoig, *The Sand Creek Massacre* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1961), p. 192.

125. Svaldi, *Sand Creek and the Rhetoric of Extermination* , p. 291; Hoig, *Sand Creek Massacre* , p. 137.

126. Quoted in Hoig, *Sand Creek Massacre* , p. 150.

127. The following accounts are from subsequent testimony and affidavits provided by witnesses to and participants in the massacre. The full statements are contained in U.S. Congressional inquiry volumes, including *Report on the Conduct of the War* (38th Congress, Second Session, 1865), but excerpts are printed as an appendix in Hoig, *Sand Creek Massacre* , pp. 177-92. The portion of George Bent's testimony that follows immediately is not included in Hoig's appendix, but is quoted in Dee Brown, *Bury My Heart at Wounded Knee* (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1970), p. 88.

128. Svaldi, *Sand Creek and the Rhetoric of Extermination* , pp. 298-99.

129. Ibid., pp. 187-88.

130. Quoted in Thomas G. Dyer, *Theodore Roosevelt and the Idea of Race* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1980), p. 79.

160. Quoted in Hurtado, *Indian Survival on the California Frontier* , pp. 74-75.

161. Rawls, *Indians of California: The Changing Image* (Norman: University of California Press, 1984), p. 96-97; Robert F. Heizer, ed., *They Were Only Diggers: A Collection of Articles from California Newspapers, 1851-1866, on Indian and White Relations* (Ramona, Calif.: Ballena Press, 1974), p. 1.

162. Heizer, *They Were Only Diggers* , p. 1.

163. Hurtado, *Indian Survival on the California Frontier* , p. 145.

164. Robert F. Heizer, ed., *The Destruction of California Indians: A Collection of Documents from the Period 1847 to 1865 in Which Are Described Some of the Things that Happened to Some of the Indians of California* (Santa Barbara: Peregrine Smith, 1974), p. 279.

165. Theodora Kroeber, *Ishi in Two World: A Biography of the Last Wild Indian in North America* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1961), pp. 84-85.

166. The estimate of the number of Indians indentured under the laws of 1850 and 1860 comes from Heizer, ed., *Destruction of California Indians* , p. 219.

167. Quoted in Rawls, *Indians of California*, p. 93.

168. Quoted in Hurtado, *Indian Survival on the California Frontier* , pp. 134-36.

169. Rawls, *Indians of California*, pp. 190-201.

170. Quoted in Rawls, *Indians of California* , pp. 132-33.

---

back to [AIM's main page](#)