

**UCLA**

**American Indian Culture and Research Journal**

**Title**

Who Are these Gentle People?

**Permalink**

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/31c303tj>

**Journal**

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 17(1)

**ISSN**

0161-6463

**Author**

Morris, C. Patrick

**Publication Date**

1993

**DOI**

10.17953

**Copyright Information**

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License, available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

Peer reviewed

# Who Are these Gentle People?

C. PATRICK MORRIS

---

Early in the morning of 12 October 1492, three Spanish ships settled off the beaches of San Salvador, a small island in the Caribbean, and the crew of maritime entrepreneurs scanned the spit of land before them for some confirmation that they had finally arrived at Sipangu (Japan) or one of the other rich isles of the fabled "Indies."<sup>1</sup> If the island proved to be the gateway to the East, then the captain-admiral of the small fleet, Christopher Columbus, and his royal financiers were on the verge of incalculable wealth secured by a state-sanctioned trade monopoly with those who waited on shore. On the island, groups of excited and apparently friendly, naked or near naked people, probably speaking the now-extinct Taino language, also saw something good in the arrival of these strangers from the eastern seas. They waited anxiously to greet the newcomers and exchange items in their own fashion.

Within a few years of this idyllic first meeting between European Christendom and what Columbus described as the "gentle people" of the New World, the European explorers would precipitate an international war that now has lasted five centuries and whose violent and often prophetic events have shaped much of the modern world.<sup>2</sup>

When Duane Champagne, editor of the *American Indian Culture and Research Journal*, agreed to a special volume, from an international viewpoint, on the 1992 Columbus quincentenary and the

---

C. Patrick Morris is a professor of liberal studies at the University of Washington, Bothell. In 1980-81, he received a Marshall and Fulbright Award from Norway, and a Fulbright to the Centre for Maaori Studies and Research, University of Waikato, New Zealand, in 1990.

United Nations International Year of Indigenous Peoples, I sought out scholars whose special perspectives might highlight some of the concerns of the world's indigenous peoples. These concerns have yet to be given a voice by the official, international 1992 Columbus commemoration carefully titled "The Encounter of Two Worlds."

The ten papers presented here, the majority written by scholars from indigenous communities and European "discoverer" nations, place the Columbus quincentenary in a still actively contested historical context. Although different in content and focus, the papers by Hernandez-Reguant, Montejo, and Clerici identify efforts by contemporary national governments to separate the 1992 quincentennial from its 1492 historical origins and, where possible, to reinterpret post-Columbian European expansion in terms that emphasize Western achievements over centuries of hemisphere-wide destruction. For these authors, the Columbian legacy remains the historical battleground on which most of the world's remaining 220 million indigenous peoples must continue to struggle for their historical identity and meaningful self-determination.

By way of an introductory essay to this special volume on the international implications of the Columbus 1992 quincentenary, I want to provide some historical background to the disturbing relationship that continues to exist between Indians (in fact all indigenous peoples) and the so-called European discoverer nations and their colonial descendants, and the very different and still-competing histories that have emerged from the Columbian discovery.

Because Europe's idea of discovery and its attendant views on race, culture, and religion are central to the competing meanings surrounding the 1992 quincentennial, this introductory paper will focus on (1) the meaning of discovery to the discovered; (2) the 1992 Columbian carnival; (3) indigenous responses to the quincentennial; and, finally, (4) what might have been if the quincentennial had actively involved indigenous peoples.

#### THE MEANING OF DISCOVERY TO THE DISCOVERED

Probably the worst error made by the various national and international planners of the 1992 quincentennial commemoration was their apparent assumption that there exists near-universal agreement regarding the meaning of the Columbus "discovery."

Somewhat belatedly, the various national quincentennial commissions have learned that nothing is further from the truth. Each day, new and unforeseen issues and conflicts have emerged between what one might call the Eurocolonial and the indigenous views of the quincentennial.<sup>3</sup> An example was the arrival in the Caribbean of Indian representatives from First Nations of British Columbia to find the mock Columbian fleet and "protest celebrations of the 500th anniversary of Columbus's 'discovery' . . . [and] . . . to obtain an apology from the Spanish government for the tragedy brought to America's native peoples . . . Chief Wii Seeks of the Gitskan likened the celebration to the Germans' celebrating Hitler's blitzkrieg." In an apparent effort to avoid the pursuing Indian chiefs, the newly built Columbus fleet moved quickly, only to be caught when they docked in San Juan, Puerto Rico. There the besieged Spanish consul signed a formal apology submitted by the chiefs and then gave a speech that "denounced the treatment of Canadian aboriginal people by the Canadian government."<sup>4</sup> The victorious flag of the Gitskan people now flies over the Santa Maria.

Such modern confrontations between Europeans and American Indians—and other indigenous peoples—are motivated not only by the often tragic events surrounding European "discovery" but also by the use of this fictionalized event by the European powers and their colonial descendants, to secure "legal" title to entire continents.<sup>5</sup> For example, the government of Australia still has no moral or legal claim to the southern continent other than the self-serving legal conspiracy surrounding Captain Cook's so-called rights of discovery; while the indigenous Australians have continued to be denied, until very recently, any property rights, despite what appears to be at least forty centuries of uncontested occupancy.<sup>6</sup>

By the use of what eventually became known in Western law as the "Discovery Doctrine," the United States Supreme Court, in *Johnson v. McIntosh*, 1823, permanently impaired American Indians' aboriginal title to what is now the United States. Since then, the United States, Australia, Canada, New Zealand, South Africa, and other former colonies, including several Latin American republics, have relied on various elements of the Discovery Doctrine to preserve colonial prerogatives in a postcolonial world.<sup>7</sup> As one recent summary states, "[I]nternational law did not recognise the aboriginal inhabitants of such newly discovered territories as having any legal rights that were good as against those who 'discovered' and settled in their territories."<sup>8</sup>

The European idea of discovery involved more than just land. Discovery also rationalized an emerging social Darwinism that sought to define in relative terms the physical and cultural development of "discovered" peoples. Soon indigenous peoples found their rights "legally impaired" by the colonizing powers. Quickly they were denied—ultimately for centuries—equal access to the sources of national, and later international, institutions of political, social, economic, and religious power available to all other peoples. The original Americans, the real discoverers of the New World, were not given national citizenship in the United States until 1924; the aborigines of Australia not until 1967; and not until this year were thousands of Costa Rican Indians finally granted citizenship. Similar cases abound throughout the world.<sup>9</sup> The institutionalization of inequality that resulted from "discovery" gave rise to a virulent form of racism that quickly spread around the world and today remains one of the most active legacies of Columbus.

When so-called discovered peoples resisted European efforts to dehumanize and enslave them by law, the discoverers had the legal right to instigate "just" wars against them and, if necessary, to destroy the "race" itself. During the past five centuries, European rights of discovery have provided colonizers with the legal foundations for state-sponsored acts of genocide against indigenous peoples around the world. And despite the World Court's rejection of the Discovery Doctrine in 1976, the national courts of some modern nations such as Australia, Argentina, Brazil, Canada, Colombia, Guatemala, China, Indonesia, India, New Zealand, Paraguay, Peru, Chile, the Phillipines, South Africa, the United States, and Venezuela continue to tighten this legal noose around the necks of indigenous peoples. From the segregated townships of South Africa to the nearest American Indian off-reservation town, the legal and moral implications of an imposed inequality continue to separate the descendants of the discoverer from those of the discovered.

Despite the overwhelming need to confront directly the continuing human implications of the Columbian discovery, such an effort has not been part of the official 1992 Columbus quincentenary. What, then, has the official quincentennial offered to the world?

### THE COLUMBUS CARNIVAL

Official 1992 quincentenary activities appear to have been a carefully constructed international effort to reinvigorate many of the

mythological ideals used to rationalize Western colonial expansion and domination of much of the world. Little public attention has been given to any critical appraisal of the human impact of discovery and its aftermath.<sup>10</sup>

This extraordinary multinational effort has not been cheap. Funds for official events come from so many public and private sources that the final cost for this international carnival will probably never be known. Hernandez-Reguant, in her paper in this volume, gives the figure of \$14 billion budgeted by the Spanish government alone for events beginning as early as 1981. According to one United States official, the United States set aside \$28 million under its multiyear National Endowment for the Humanities Special Columbus Quincentennial initiative. The Dominican Republic, Mexico, and Italy also have significant budgets. By the time it is all over, it is likely the cost will exceed the national budget of many developing nations.

To administer these funds and associated activities, the sponsoring governments appointed national quincentennial commissions. Also, various academic or public service organizations were enlisted to oversee official sponsorship of literally thousands of programs, some beginning more than a decade ago (see Hernandez-Reguant). An official publication was established in each country to publicize special events and programs.

Details about the Spanish and Italian quincentennials are provided in the papers by Hernandez-Reguant, "The Legend of the Encounter and the Politics of History in Spain," and by Clerici, "Italy Celebrates Columbus: The Indian Rediscovered." It appears that both nations planned to use 1992 for a variety of political and economic purposes, including restoration of national glory (see Hernandez-Reguant) and the more tangible political goal, to solve local unemployment caused by the latest recession (see Clerici).

The Italian and Spanish governments have not been unique in their efforts to mobilize the quincentennial to mend contemporary national problems. For the United States—probably the greatest economic beneficiary of the Columbian discoveries—the 1992 quincentennial has prompted mobilization of its own brand of excessive pop culture, academic and public politics, and crude monetarisms. Examples include the fraudulent sale of "official quincentennial" logos, efforts by the Texaco Oil Company to have its famous corporate (not revolutionary) circled red star emblazoned on the sails of the newly reconstructed Columbian fleet, and, finally, in the much meaner political circles of Washington,

D.C., attempts to use the quincentennial to confirm in the international arena the still triumphant centrifugal forces of a western Euro-American culture now threatened by internal debates over "politically correct" multiculturalism.

Along with the various social, economic, political, and other public uses of the quincentennial, there has been an intellectual/scholarly agenda. Spain, Italy, Mexico, the United States, and other American republics have set aside budgets to promote multiyear scholarly activities, i. e., seminars, conferences, archaeological digs, and publications. However, these events have involved a limited number of scholars promoting a limited number of fashionable "literary" ideas about a limited number of topics, with much less attention given to Indian perspectives or texts. But the most striking fact about these academic events is the almost total absence of indigenous scholars or official support for an Indian community agenda on the quincentennial. It is apparent that despite the millions being spent, something fundamental has continued to be missing from the quincentennial—the Indians themselves.

Offering no clear explanation, the national sponsors of the 1992 quincentennial activities have not actively sought Indian participation (or maybe even more telling, these national governments, even after 500 years, do not know how to involve indigenous peoples). It would appear that, to maintain an upbeat atmosphere, the sponsoring nations agreed to avoid the embarrassing "Black Legend of 1492" and, in its place, have offered what some American Indians call a carefully sanitized "White Legend of 1992." Not unlike the absurd claims by modern-day racists that the Jewish Holocaust never happened, the official 1992 quincentennial has served to diminish international awareness of the Indian Holocaust unleashed by Columbus, an event described by modern scientists as the "greatest demographic disaster in the history of mankind"—the slaughter, enslavement, and eventual diseased destruction of an estimated 20–50 million indigenous peoples throughout the Americas. Any official effort to struggle honestly and directly with the compelling truth of this statement has not been part of the 1992 quincentennial festivities.<sup>11</sup>

There is some evidence that various public agencies attempted to prevent American Indians and scholars with a critical view of the discovery from receiving public funds to present their interpretations and responses to the Columbus discovery and its aftermath. The United States National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH), for example, made it quite clear to some applicants that attempts

to include an "Indian perspective" through the NEH Columbus Quincentennial special initiative would be "difficult" to evaluate or fund.<sup>12</sup>

Lack of an active Indian presence in national and international programs suggests that the quincentennial's sponsoring countries agreed to follow the familiar historical pattern of marginalizing Indian participation in any public reconstruction of their own history. The 1992 "Encounters Between Two Worlds" has involved only one world and only one agenda—that of the European and Euro-American discoverer nations. The indigenous world of the quincentennial encounter has not been invited.

At the local level in the United States, state and city governments, museums, foundations, and other potential recipients of quincentennial funds have been quite imaginative in associating themselves with the 1992 activities—with some efforts taking rather remarkable and highly creative (commercial) directions. For the 1992 Tournament of Roses Parade in Los Angeles, officials invited a congenial living descendant of Columbus to be grand marshal. (Indian complaints resulted in an American Indian congressman from Colorado joining the parade as co-marshal.) Columbus, Ohio, has received public funds and believes it deserves special attention because of its name; the city has planned and funded a number of events to commemorate the admiral. Academic organizations and local civic groups with a street, a school, a museum, almost anything remotely related to Columbus, have received public funds for some star-spangled event. But, again, the only identifiable community not invited or involved in any substantive and meaningful way has been the Indian community.<sup>13</sup>

The extent to which national pride has been used to justify the expenditure of public monies on the quincentennial has been nothing short of ingenious, if not ingenuous. Even Japan, the fabled "Sipangu" of Columbus's charts, has managed to get itself on the agenda and is sailing its own version of Columbus's ships to various harbors around the world. It seems that everyone has been invited except the Indians.

For American Indians and other indigenous peoples, the 1992 quincentennial will be remembered for what it did not remember: the human triumph over those physical barriers of sea and land that for millennia had separated race from race, culture from culture. The breach of these physical barriers five centuries ago put into motion violent but also powerful events that have enlarged our collective sense of a multiracial, multicultural humanity.



Fortunately, there are indications that the narrow Eurocentric view of discovery and its aftermath is changing. Contemporary scholars, including indigenous scholars such as Laenui, Grinde, Gaski, Montejo, and Mahuta in this volume, are making use of still-active indigenous intellectual traditions and historical documents to reconstruct a more balanced view of indigenous cultures and the complex events surrounding European discovery and colonization. Such efforts have made the Indian and other indigenous peoples active contributors to the writing and interpreting of pre- and post-Columbian history.<sup>14</sup>

In the paper by Grinde, "The Iroquois and the Nature of American Government," an American Indian historian sets out evidence for substantive contributions by American Indians, particularly the Iroquois, to the form of federalism adopted by the United States through its Constitution. The academic debate precipitated by the injection of Indians into the authorship of this most precious of all United States historical documents is indicative of the intellectual climate surrounding scholarship related to Indians and other indigenous peoples. After 500 years, it is time we have this debate.<sup>15</sup>

Laenui's paper, "The Rediscovery of Hawaiian Nationhood," presents the largely untold story of how United States claims to imperial prerogatives were used to "legitimize" the invasion of and violent assertion of sovereignty over the once-independent nation of Hawaii.

Montejo's paper presents evidence regarding the dismissal of Indian land rights by the current Guatemalan government in order to forcibly "reorganize" the land tenure system of the Maya Indians in an effort at "pacification."

Hitchcock's paper, "The Long-term Impact of European Discovery: Human Rights, the Environment, and Development among Indigenous Peoples in Africa," outlines some of the human and environmental disasters that continue to unfold in Africa, many of which have their origins, directly or indirectly, in the European discovery.

#### INDIGENOUS RESPONSES TO THE 1992 QUINCENTENNIAL

For Indians and other indigenous peoples, the 1992 quincentennial has been problematic. According to some Indian intellectuals

and leaders in the United States, "This Columbus thing is not ours and we have little control over what is happening in 1992. It is better to remove ourselves from any official participation and organize our own activities and interpretations of 1992." As a result, Indian and various supportive non-Indian organizations have networked to coordinate the particular direction they want their activities to take during 1992. One group of Indian artists that organized the SUBMULOC (Columbus spelled backwards) Society has joined with ATLATL, another Indian art group, to organize shows, speaking engagements, and other public events to present the Indian artist's perspective on the Columbian quincentenary.<sup>16</sup> Plays written by Indians about Columbus are being performed in Indian communities.<sup>17</sup> In addition, a number of national organizations with a counterquincentennial focus have been set up and now publish newsletters and coordinate local and regional responses to quincentennial events, such as the Gitskan response mentioned earlier.

Some Indian organizations and less formal groups have organized public demonstrations to "memorialize Native peoples in sunrise ceremonies and prayers to the four directions. Our people will sound the drum at dawn for those indigenous people who did not survive the Invasion of 1492 or those five hundred years of colonization, land grabs and gold fever," declared Suzan Shown Harjo, national coordinator for the 1992 Alliance.<sup>18</sup> Many Indian leaders also see the 1992 quincentennial as a historic opportunity to press forward a pan-Indian agenda that will result in long-range, constructive political action.

These activities in the United States have been echoed in various organized activities outside the country, many of which are designed to bring attention to political and human rights issues that have been on the agenda for decades. In July 1990, 400 Indian delegates representing 120 indigenous nations and organizations met in Quito, Ecuador, to organize a hemispheric response to the quincentennial. A similar conference took place in Guatemala in October 1992. At this point, it is not clear whether either of these meetings resulted in a common agenda for action. Charles Hale (see appendix) has translated some of the documents that have emerged from Indian efforts to create a continental response to 1992. In his paper entitled "A New Partnership for Indigenous Peoples: Can the United Nations Make a Difference," Russel Barsh, who has worked for years on international issues related to indigenous peoples, sets out the initiatives the United Nations is

taking to respond positively to the 1992 quincentennial. Of special importance to any international perspective is the agreement by the United Nations to declare 1992-93 the "International Year of Indigenous Peoples," a step that will certainly shift the international political agenda toward many of the historic land, natural resource, and human rights issues ignored by the official 1992 quincentennial. The United Nations actions may prove to be the most positive and lasting international response to the 1992 hullabaloo.

In the Gaski paper published here, it is evident that even northern and eastern Europe are not excluded from the legal and moral issues raised by the 1992 quincentennial. In Norway, Sweden, Finland, and the former Soviet Union, Sami peoples have had to deal with the northern expansion of Indo-European groups and, as a result, have found themselves isolated from the legal and political processes that have marginalized their culture. For the Sami, the quincentennial of 1992 is important because it highlights a European hegemony that continues to determine their fragile legal identity within several modern nation-states.

#### WHAT MIGHT HAVE BEEN

Many scholars today would agree with Adam Smith that "the discovery of America, and that of a passage to the East Indies by the Cape of Good Hope, are the two greatest and most important events recorded in the history of mankind."<sup>19</sup> As the international commemoration of this identifiable turning point in world history, the 1992 Columbus quincentenary deserved an agenda worthy of its broad impact on all humanity. If nothing else, the quincentennial offered a historic opportunity for international action on a number of issues related to the current situation of Indians and other indigenous peoples around the world. Each of the quincentennial's sponsoring nations could have used its funds to address the still-unmet needs of those who continue to feel the brunt of discovery and its legacy. For example, half of the \$28 million budgeted by the United States government for the Columbus Quincentenary initiative could have been set aside to support the United Tribal College Fund, an endowment established for the Indian-controlled college movement in this country. Other discoverer nations could make similar use of their funds. It is not too late.

Besides education, the discoverer nations could use the quincentennial to establish an impartial international commission to

respond to the United Nations Martinez Cobo report, mentioned in Barsh, to create a hemispherewide agenda for positive action. Perhaps this will be realized during the United Nations' 1993 International Year of Indigenous Peoples.

As demonstrated in Mahuta's paper, "Discovery and Race Relations in New Zealand: 150 Years after the Treaty of Waitangi," indigenous peoples are pushing reluctant nation-states toward direct negotiation of long-standing grievances. If equity is to be achieved for all indigenous peoples, these issues must be addressed at both national and international levels.

For scholars, the Columbus quincentenary has stimulated greater awareness of the complex interplay between New World resources and Old World prosperity that has shaped the modern global economy and culture.<sup>20</sup> Documents do exist for an expanded synthesis of post-Columbian history, one that could include indigenous peoples as self-directed participants rather than exotic counterpoints to European global ambitions. Unfortunately, these documents are not readily available to most scholars or to the indigenous community. Instead, they remain scattered throughout the world in national and local archives, museums, churches, universities, even private collections, with much of the material still uncatalogued, untranslated, unpublished, and, according to some knowledgeable scholars, even undiscovered. Scholars concede that no firm inventory exists of texts on Indians or other indigenous peoples stored in many such collections. The documents constitute a monumental silence.<sup>21</sup> The sheer vastness of the international record overwhelms rather than informs.<sup>22</sup>

To date, there has been little in the way of a coordinated international effort to inventory and identify documents that might contribute to a more balanced view of Indians and of the history of the past five hundred years. One positive legacy that could emerge from the 1992 quincentennial is the funding of a multiyear, even decades-long, project to systematically inventory, restore, and protect documents throughout the world that relate to the events and processes of discovery, conquest, and colonization, particularly those documents that can contribute to a more balanced history of indigenous peoples since the Age of Discovery.

In addition to written documents, there are the uncollected voices of indigenous peoples. In recent years, ethnohistory has proven the usefulness of both written and oral testimony, demonstrating the value of collaboration between the historical actor and the historical writer. For indigenous peoples and scholars in

general, increased access to and identification of the historical record can contribute to the participation of indigenous people in the writing of their own history, an undertaking worthy of the 1992 commemoration.

### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Motivated by a political need for symbols of national reassurance over historical substance, the official 1992 quincentennial celebrations have not lived up to the historic moment they were designed to commemorate. For most of us, 1492 and its aftermath have determined where and how we live, even with whom we associate. It permanently and often violently changed people and communities—bringing Europeans, then Africans, and later Asians to the New World—and moved other peoples and cultures across great oceans until no land or people remained isolated from others.

The Age of Discovery is as much about the discovery of who we are as a species as it is a belated confirmation of the spherical shape of our planet. Yet, despite nearly five centuries of contact, popular understanding of Indians and other indigenous peoples remains more stereotypical than historical. Indigenous peoples remain ambiguous personae whose communal existence, even human identity, is still questioned by national laws over which they have little or no control. Instead, their identity has been determined largely by an imposed history. As illustrated in the papers by Prins and Clerici in this volume, although the European sources for the identity of the Indian are centuries old, they still have the power to affirm myth-like public stereotypes. In Europe, the Indian remains a popular comic book hero, usually portrayed as the romanticized noble savage—a positive but untruthful historical role.

The real tragedy of the 1992 quincentennial is that it has commemorated almost nothing of lasting value. What we find in the official 1992 quincentennial is another "wild west show," only bigger and more costly. And like the wild west shows of the past, the 1992 quincentennial has become an international effort to reconstruct a European version of history at the expense of Indians and other indigenous peoples.

The 1992 quincentennial's largely successful effort to ignore, deny, and even suppress the historical reality of indigenous

peoples unfortunately also suppresses everyone's awareness of the subtle hand of multicultural history that has pushed each of us toward that particular place we now occupy in the modern world. A teenager anywhere in the world today, eating pizza, with his pockets full of chocolate bars and his feet snuggled into a pair of sneakers, might be surprised to learn that, without the "discovery" and the horticultural accomplishments of American Indians, his pizza would be naked of tomato sauce, his pockets empty of chocolates, and his shoes devoid of latex. By denying the historical role of Indians and other indigenous peoples, the 1992 quincentennial rejects or fails to understand the multicultural origins of the modern world.

Finally, because indigenous peoples have been denied equal access to the official events of 1992, the discoverers and the discovered will continue to participate in separate histories, with each quincentennial commemoration constructed from the separate meanings that sustain these separate and still-contested histories. This is tragic. After five hundred years of warfare, slavery, genocide, racism, and ethnic and class violence, it is certainly time for us to close the gap of violence and ignorance that still divides the descendants of Columbus from the world's indigenous peoples. It is unacceptable for modern nations, scholars, and the general public to continue to preserve, through distorted and half-told histories, a Eurocentric view of the world that ignores our most painful failures and impedes our global struggle for universal human equality and justice.

## NOTES

1. Two of the ships were caravels, the *Pinta*, commanded by Martin Alonzo Pinzon, and the *Niña*, commanded by the other Pinzon brother, Vincent Yanez Pinzon. The *Santa Maria*, a carack, was the flagship commanded by the admiral Christopher Colón. See Samuel Eliot Morison, *Admiral of the Ocean Sea: A Life of Christopher Columbus* (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1942).

2. Adam Smith stated, "The discovery of America and that of a passage to the East Indies by the Cape of Good Hope, are the two greatest and most important events recorded in the history of mankind." See Adam Smith, *The Wealth of Nations*, ed. Edwin Cannan (London: Reprint University Paperbacks, 1961), 14.

3. Steven Burd, "Chairman of Humanities Fund Has Politicized Grants Process, Critics Charge," *The Chronicle of Higher Education* 38:17 (1992), A8-A11. The *Chronicle* provides a reasonable survey of responses.

4. See *Cultural Survival Quarterly* 16:1 (1992): 8. Other strange and at times obviously foolish efforts to join local ambitions to the Columbus hoopla include Club Med's construction of a resort on the island of San Salvador to capitalize on the quincentennial fever, and the decision of the Dominican Republic's government to build a ten-story cement mausoleum topped with a lighthouse to store Columbus's bones. See Scott Heller, "Anthropologist Examines Commemorations of Columbus' Fateful Voyage," *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 18 December 1991, A9-A11.

5. The meaning of European discovery becomes even more problematic when we try to resolve all the competing claims made by various European nations. In addition to the Spanish explorers, the English, the French, the Portuguese, the Dutch, and even the Russians used "discovery" to lay claim to vast areas of the globe. Every European nation that could put boat to water rushed to be the first to discover the front yard of some incredulous non-European. In more recent years, scholars and not-so-scholarly authors have added their own list of pre-Columbian claimants: Norsemen, Welsh and Irish priests, modern Asian and Polynesian seafarers, citizens of Mu or Atlantis, and even an occasional extraterrestrial. See Samuel Eliot Morison, *The European Discovery of America: The Northern Voyages* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1971).

6. Henry Reynolds, *The Law of the Land* (New York: Viking Penguin Inc., 1987).

7. The "Discovery Doctrine" is spelled out in its most often quoted form in the decision of chief justice John Marshall of the United States Supreme Court in the 1823 case *Johnson v. McIntosh*, cited in Getches, et al., *Federal Indian Law* (St. Paul, MN: West Publishing Company, 1978), 143-48.

8. See L. C. Green and Olive P. Dickason, *The Law of Nations and the New World* (Edmonton, Alberta: University of Alberta Press, 1989), 125-26.

9. See "First Peoples Granted Citizenship," *Cultural Survival Quarterly* 16:1 (1992): 6. It should be noted that the imposition of citizenship has its implications; i. e., European discoverer nations such as Norway used the granting of citizenship to eliminate indigenous rights to lands, language, and culture once held by independent indigenous nations.

10. Not all the structures devoted to the quincentennial will be available. One centerpiece of the celebration, the "Pavilion of the Discoveries" at the Spanish Expo '92 in Seville, was destroyed accidentally by a welder's torch. See Jane Monahan, "Montezuma's Revenge? Pavilion of the Discoveries Burns Down at Expo '92," *The Art Newspaper: The Journal of Art* 3:16 (March 1992): 1,3.

11. William M. Denevan, ed., *The Native Population of the Americas in 1492* (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1976), 7. See also Russell Thornton, *American Indian Holocaust and Survival: A Population History since 1492* (Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1987).

12. See *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 22 April 1992, cited earlier. Several articles have been published regarding the highly politicized environment at the NEH and the NEA (National Endowment for the Arts). In my own experience and in information I have collected from speaking with colleagues, the NEH certainly has not made formal or visible efforts to involve the Indian community in the quincentennial. I am convinced the organization does not know how to involve the Indian community.

13. According to a Newhouse News Service story, "Columbus, Ohio, is going all out with AmeriFlora exhibition," the exhibition is touted as "the major

event in this country to commemorate this year's 500th anniversary of Christopher Columbus' historic voyage to the New World . . . . It will be held in Columbus, Ohio, which lays claim to being the largest city in the world named for the Italian explorer." More than four million visitors were expected. The AmeriFlora exhibition included everything from an African-American Heritage Consortium to "Discover Columbus" international soccer tournaments, an air show, a marathon, even a world horseshoe tournament—but no Indians. See *The Seattle Times/Post-Intelligencer*, 22 March 1992.

14. A major "revisionist" movement under way among historians and anthropologists to produce new interpretations and broader information regarding the active role of indigenous people in the construction of their own responses to European discovery and colonization. See Francis Jennings, *The Invasion of America: Indians, Colonialism and the Cant of Conquest* (New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1975); Eric Wolf, *Europe and the People Without History* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982); Michael L. Lawson, *Dammed Indians: The Pick Sloan Plan and the Missouri River Sioux, 1944-1980* (Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1982), to mention a few).

15. One should note that the recent bicentennial of the United States Constitution also provided funds for various scholarly and public programs. To my knowledge, no public funds have been used to sponsor a program or event directed by or involving the American Indian community, despite Grindey's evidence of their intimate involvement and, more importantly—especially to contemporary Indians—addressing the use of the Constitution by the various branches of government to protect or deny the rights of American Indian tribal governments.

16. The SUBMULOC Society states in its handout that its mission is "to create a non-violent, non-destructive movement to generate a better understanding of American Indians and their many contributions to all of mankind."

17. See Ferdinand M. de Leon, "Native Americans Offset Hoopla over Columbus with Their Own Celebrations," *Seattle Times*, 5 April 1992.

18. See Susan Harjo, *Native American Studies Association Newsletter* 1:4 (Fall 1991).

19. See Adam Smith, *The Wealth of Nations*, vol. 2, ed. Edwin Cannan (London: Reprint University Paperbacks, 1961), 14.

20. Jack Weatherford's books, *Indian Givers* and *Native Roots*, set out what should have been the real Indian research agenda for the Columbus quincentenary: "How the Indians Transformed the World."

21. See Felipe Guaman Poma de Ayala (Waman Puma), *El Primer Nueva Cronica y Buen Gobierno*, critical edition of John V. Murra and Rolena Adorno, translation and textual analysis of the Quechua by Jorge L. Urioste (Mexico City: Siglo Veintino, 1980).

22. See J. H. Elliott, *The Old World and the New, 1492-1650* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1970).