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Although it is rarely recognized in mainstream historical work, contact between Native People and Europeans coming to America has had a profound and continuing effect on western political thought and practice, and upon American life more generally. The Indigenous people in North America in different forms, and to differing degrees, practiced inclusive participatory democracy, in collaborative societies in which every individual needed to be respected because all contained a holy spirit – the Great Mystery was in all things – all beings. Moreover the multiplicity of spirits existing within the Great Mystery were a unity in diversity that as a basic principle enhanced the functioning of inclusive participatory democracy. Human beings were seen as essentially good, but needing an appropriate experiential education to develop their character and abilities. As is well documented by Grinde, Johansen, Weatherford, Donohue, Pratt, and others, the first three hundred years of close contact between many Europeans coming to the “New World” and Indians had a profound impact on many of them, contributing to the development of an American Identity, different in many aspects from the ways of seeing dominant in Europe, in what became the United States. Moreover, contact with Indians brought about a significant shift in western political and social thought that continues to shape governmental structure, function and policy, with ongoing broader effects on social and other aspects of life, across the western world and beyond.

I. TRADITIONAL AMERICAN INDIAN POLITICS AND SOCIETY

Europeans coming to the Americas in general, and North America in particular, interacted with tribal and band societies that were extremely harmonious and democratic, providing mutually supportive relationships and a high quality of life for virtually all of their members. The more than 500 Indian nations in what now make up the United States were each unique in the details of their quite varied cultures, but shared a common set of core values. These basic values, applied in different ways by each people, and by the same people in changing circumstances, provided the basis for good lives in well functioning societies.

Traditional Native American societies enjoyed a generally high quality of life, with virtually no poverty or crime, and mechanisms to provide for those who were not well off. They furnished a great deal of emotional and physical support for people from extended family members and a sufficient variety of choices of social roles so that almost everyone could find acceptance and develop self-esteem. The virtues of these societies are attested to in numerous ethnographies and commentaries.

In terms of governance, Indian nations, in different ways and to different degrees decided extremely democratically through a variety of consensus decision making processes. The basis of this was the
principle of respect, for all people, and indeed for all that is. In ceremony, and in making decisions, often all sat in a circle. Each place in the circle had a different quality and a different way of seeing to contribute to the whole, so that each person or group needed to be heard. There is no circle without each of the individual places, but the places have no meaning without the context of the circle as a whole, which frames the interconnections that constitute the proper flowing of the circle. The Comanche state the fundamental principles as relationships, responsibility, reciprocity, redistribution. Thus out of the nature of relationship, and the relationships everyone is in, flows a set of mutual responsibilities, which involve a reciprocity – not just of things, but of actions and concerns – which brings the redistribution necessary to continually recreate balance and harmony. In terms of decision making, everyone affected by a decision had a right to be heard, and no decision could be made until everyone agreed, or at least acquiesced. Leaders, who were chosen for their good character and fine qualities appropriate to their function, acted primarily as facilitators helping the group or community reach consensus. As highly respected people, they had influence, but could not make decisions. They could only act administratively with the support of the community.

Thus, Native American tribes and bands functioned with a politics somewhat different in character than has been accepted by the main stream of Western political theory as seen in Machiavelli and Hobbes, with its main thrust the finding consensus. Power was an important resource for doing this, but it was not the central element for determining "the authoritative allocation of values" (or for determining "who gets what, when, where, how"). Moreover, power in traditional American Indian tribal and band societies was only partly a vehicle for control. It was also a source of empowerment. Tribal and band politics have very important cooperative elements along with competitive aspects. At the heart of this politics is a set of communal relationships based upon mutual respect, emphasizing both the community and the individual, so that in a very important sense the whole is equal to the part. The participatory democratic nature of Native American society, with its strong emphasis on both individual freedom (or rights) and the good of the whole being realized through inclusive participation (what Benjamin Barber calls strong democracy) can be seen in the traditional functioning of some of the Indian nations that would have been known to European political thinkers of the Sixteenth to Eighteenth Centuries, such Locke and Rousseau.

Trigger, for example, describes the traditional ways of the Wendot, more widely known as the Huron, living around Lakes Huron and Erie. The Huron were a confederation of several tribes, numbering 30,000-40,000 people in 1634. They lived partially intermingled with each other in settlements of up to 2,000 people consisting of a central town and surrounding villages. Their social organization included a clan structure. In each community each clan segment had two formal chiefs, Yarihawa (literally, "he is a great voice"), who were chosen from among the men of the clan lineage that held the right to serve in that office. Their primary functions were to announce decisions arrived at by a process of consensus formation that involved discussion by all the adult men and women of their group, and to facilitate the discussion process. Chiefs could advise and persuade, but they could not decide. No action could be taken until it had been acceded to by every person who was affected by it. In practice that meant that decision making tended to be inclusive of the concerns of everyone involved. To reach consensus on a proposal, the group would continue to modify it to take into account each person's concerns until
almost everyone supported the decision, and the few who did not, having been heard and seeing nothing to gain by further discussion, accepted the view of the group.

The chief's first duty was to assist his own group to come to a consensus and then to represent his people in negotiating with the chiefs of other groups. Trigger states,

> **Huron Chiefs had no constitutional authority to coerce their followers or force their will on anyone. Moreover, individual Huron were sensitive about their honor and intolerant of external constraints, and friends and relatives would rally to the support of someone who believed himself insulted by a chief. Overbearing behavior by a chief might, therefore, encourage a violent reaction and lead to conflicts within or between lineages. In the long run, chiefs who behaved arrogantly or foolishly tended to alienate support and would be deposed by their own lineages. The ideal Huron chief was a wise and brave man who understood his followers and won their support by means of his generosity, persuasiveness, and balanced judgement.**

The two chiefs of each clan segment at the local level were the civil chief and the war chief. The civil or peace chiefs, who were primary, were concerned with matters of everyday life from settling disputes, and arranging feasts, dances and games to negotiating foreign treaties. The separation of peace and war chiefs, with the primacy of the civil chiefs, is typical of many tribes. Among the Cheyenne for example, a chief of one of the military societies, upon becoming one of the 44 peace chiefs, would have to resign his chieftainships of the military society. This primacy of civilian over military leadership is similar to the emphasis in the U.S. Constitution of the President, a civilian, being Commander and Chief over the military. It may well be that the older tribal practice is the basis, or at least a contributing source, for the U. S. practice.

The national government of each Huron tribe consisted of a council made up of chiefs of the clan segments in each community (with one exception, the Tahontaenrat Tribe who lived in a single settlement, so that their community and national governments were the coterminous). The Confederacy Council appears to have been composed of the civil chiefs of the various national councils. The national and confederacy councils had no power to compel the groups whom their members represented. Their function was to develop consensus through dialog and mutual exchange among all the parties involved in the matters they considered. In order for the decisions of these councils to be effective, they had to be accepted by the constituents of the chiefs. This meant that national and confederacy affairs were discussed by citizens at the local level to a far greater extent than is true in modern federal republican governments, with the result that chiefs were usually far more representative than elected representatives are today.

Underlying Huron politics was a culture that balanced strong concern for individual (person, family, clan, etc.) autonomy with a strong equalitarian moral sense for the good of all (family, clan, tribe, etc.) and respect for the views of others. Thus there was an abhorrence for compelling actions by anyone. But, at the same time, both by upbringing and ongoing experience, Huron people were very sensitive to others and to the pressures of public opinion. If one acted improperly, one would lose honor, and
eventually, needed economic and other support if she or he went too far. In the Huron case, as in the case of many (but not all) native North American peoples, this meant that, through honoring generosity, no one was allowed to be either poor or rich. Similarly, though certain political and social positions of authority might belong to certain clans or clan segments (but were filled on the basis of perceived merit within that clan or segment), authority, and hence power, was widely dispersed so that individual offices carried limited authority. This worked to keep effective the primary limitation on power: public opinion. This widespread arrangement in traditional North America is somewhat similar in effect, though it is less formal and more extensive, than the later use of the combination of separation of powers, checks and balances, and direct and indirect elections by the framers of the U.S. Constitution, were influenced by the Indian practice (both directly, and indirectly, through influential English thinkers such as John Locke, who clearly incorporated Indian ideas and practice in their theory, as is developed below).

Quite similar to the Huron were their relatives and neighbors to the south, the Hodenosaunee, Six Nations, or Iroquois. Their governance from the individual village long house, through the clan segment, village and nation to the confederacy was almost identical to that of the Huron, except for a difference in the procedure by which the Six Nation Confederacy reached consensus. Lewis Henry Morgan describes their government as extremely democratic.\textsuperscript{13}

\textit{such was the spirit of the Iroquois system of government, that the influence of the inferior chiefs, the warriors and even the women would make itself felt, whenever the subject itself aroused a general public interest.}

And there was considerable interest in public affairs by an active citizenry,\textsuperscript{14}

\textit{In council, public transactions of every name and character were planned, scrutinized and adopted...It may be said that the life of the Iroquois was spent either in the chase, on the war path, or at the council fire.}\textsuperscript{15}

No event of any importance ever transpired without passing under the cognizance of one of these councils.

\textit{Sachems [primary chiefs: “Counselors of the People”], chiefs and warriors, women and even children, deserted their hunting grounds and woodland seclusions, and taking the trail, literally flocked to the place of council. When the day arrived, a multitude had gathered together, from the most remote and toilsome distance, but yet animated by an unyielding spirit of hardihood and endurance.}\textsuperscript{16}

All of this combined a strong bond of community with the utmost respect for the rights of the individual,

\textit{The spirit which prevailed in the nation and in the confederacy was that of freedom. The people appear to have secured to themselves all the liberty which the hunter state rendered desirable. They fully}
appreciated its value, as evidenced by the liberality of their institutions. The red man was always free from political bondage, and, more worthy still of remembrance, his “free limbs never wore a shackle.” His spirit could never be bowed in servitude. In the language of Charlevoix, the Iroquois were “entirely convinced that man was born free, that no power on earth had any right to make any attempts against his liberty, and that nothing could make him amends for its loss.” It would be difficult to describe any political society, in which there was less oppression and discontent, more of individual independence and boundless freedom.17

This spirit of freedom in inclusive, participatory, societies was the general pattern in indigenous North America. The Muscogee, or Creek, Confederacy that extended over much of what is now the U.S. South East, though exhibiting some difference in the details of government and social organization, functioned fundamentally in the same manner.18 Like the leagues to the north, The Muscogee confederacy was primarily organized for peaceful interaction among highly autonomous communities. Not all of the people of the confederacy were Muscogee, as the basis for membership was respect for all people, for maintaining harmony and balance with nature and within the community, and for following the basic Muscogee ways. From a Muscogee perspective, there were around 33 major regional subdivisions of the confederacy, but as some of these had entered the confederacy as sizable tribes, with their own subdivisions, it would be more accurate to say that there were more than 100 major regions in the confederacy, which operated on the basis of consensus decision making after full discussion among numerous interlinked councils.

Beginning at the local level, authority was widely dispersed with each of the clans having specialized functions. Elder women and men had their own highly respected bodies. In addition, by a psychological–personality selection, men were divided into white sticks and red sticks, to carry out civil and military/police leadership functions, following the consensus of their communities. As was typically the case in pre-Columbian North America, local communities were generally autonomous. Matters of general Muscogee interest, were decided by councils at the confederacy level, which rotated their meetings around Muscogee country to maintain a broad inclusiveness and balance of input over time.

In their own unique ways, the smaller tribes functioned on the same general basis of participatory democracy, but without the need for confederacy level decision making. This was the general pattern all over the Americas at the time of European contact, except in the instances of national decision making of a few of the very large nations south of what is now the United States, that were beginning to become states, as Locke recognized in differentiating between “the two great empires of Peru and Mexico” and the fully participatory tribes.19 Yet even these “empires”, such as those of the Aztecs, Maya and Inca tended to act cooperatively, and inclusively with respect for individual people an groups, and their opinions, especially at the local level.20

In considering the smaller Indian nations, the Chiricahua Apache of the Southwest, for example, who were well known to the Spanish, lived in small bands, each with its own with consensus based
They lived by hunting, gathering, raiding and agriculture. Each band, and within it, each local group, was guided by one or more recognized leaders assisted by a number of subordinates. In essence the way in which leadership functioned among the Apaches was typical for the precontact Americas generally, although there are differences in detail in different Indian nations, such as whether eligibility for a position was limited to members of certain clans, societies or other groups, and just how leaders were chosen and removed.

For the Chiricahua, important decisions were made at band or local group meetings at which all adults were present and male heads of households usually spoke to represent their families, though wives and unmarried sons and daughters might contribute to the discussion. Typical of band and tribal societies, a man would become a leader if enough people respected him sufficiently to give him their loyalty, and he would maintain that leadership role only so long as he maintained that respect and loyalty. People dissatisfied with a local or band leader could simply move away to another band or group. As in many bands and tribes, being of good family was an advantage in gaining the respect necessary to become a leader, and a leader was almost always the head of an extended family. But the primary basis of leadership was being respected for ability and good qualities, as demonstrated by his achievements. He must be wise, respectful of others, able in war, capable in managing his own and his family’s affairs, and generous. Thus wealth was an aspect of qualification for leadership: as a sign of ability and as a source of the generosity that leaders were expected to exhibit, in hosting prominent people, putting on feasts, and in providing for those less well off.

For the Chiricahua Apache, as with tribes and bands in the Americas generally, the functions of a leader included being an advisor in community affairs, a facilitator in collective decision making, and a peacemaker in disputes and the settlement of wrongs. In addition, as the Apache and some other tribal societies did not divide civil and military functions among distinct leaders, a Chiricahua leader served in war as well as in peace. While leaders could command in combat, they had no power of control in civil governance beyond what was supported by public opinion. To the extent that they were respected and were persuasive (a quality contributing to respect), leaders exercised influence in the forming of community views. Even as a peacemaker, when deviant acts or major disputes occurred, they only had the authority of mediators. Since the Chiricahua needed each other’s help in a variety of economic and social activities (as is normally the case in band and tribal societies), the main pressure for following social norms, including reaching settlement in a trouble case, was the pressure of public opinion (in which women played an important role, as was virtually universally the case in traditional Indian societies). Thus leaders were under continuing scrutiny to act well and had to be concerned for the interests and views of the members of the community. In particular, the band leader needed to listen carefully and take into account the advice of the local group leaders. They, in turn, had to be especially responsive to leading heads of families, who were obligated to be responsive to the adult members of their families. Thus power and influence were widely disbursed in Chiricahua society, as in Indian societies in general. Respected elders had the most political influence, but this influence and respect itself rested upon the opinions of the community members at large in a culture which emphasized respect for all community members (and indeed all beings). This is typical in tribal societies, including among those...
known by Europeans, the more dispersed Ojibwa, living largely in single families engaged in hunting and gathering in the woodland and lake country of what is now the Northern Midwest and adjacent Canada, the hunting and gathering Utes of the Rocky Mountains and the Yakama of the Pacific North West Coast.

Thus, over all, American Indian nations were almost always extremely democratic and equalitarian, with leaders acting as facilitators and advisors, and a wide dispersion of power in very participatory societies. The large “empires” of Mexico and Peru, that were moving toward becoming states, were partial exceptions, and as even the Maya and the Aztecs largely adhered to the general pattern of inclusive participatory democracy, and there were some others, one of which proves the rule. It is reported that not too long before the arrival of Europeans on the east coast of what is now the United States, the Ani’-Kutan’I, or priests, of the Cherokee, whose function was to insure the proper timing and carrying out of the nation’s annual cycle of ceremonies, began to gain more general power and authority. As they did so, they became increasingly arrogant, violating the democratic and equalitarian sensibilities of the people. Thus, a popular conspiracy developed, and when one of the Ani’-Kutan’I abducted the wife of one of the younger leaders of the conspiracy, the people rose up and massacred most of the priests, restoring their traditional participatory culture.

It is important to note that the egalitarian nature of Native American societies was based upon a respect for difference (which some call the principle of “place”), a unity through diversity that to differing degrees and ways across the many Indian nations, provided for a high level of equality, while allowing for differences in role and prestige. Whereas in hierarchical social systems, differences of function tend to be marked by significant differences in status, participatory systems tend to minimize status differences. This was notably the case in the relations of men and women in many tribes and bands who carried out their largely separate functions with a high degree of autonomy. So that while the lives and functions of men and women were different in many respects, the relations between the genders was usually that of balanced reciprocity. Among the Haudenosaunee, for example, only men served as chiefs (sachems) on the intertribal council, but women held considerable power. In certain clans, the women, speaking through the Clan Mother, nominated the chiefs and had the power to remove them for misconduct. In some tribes women served as chiefs, but regardless of their formal role, women in traditional Native American societies held sway over their own affairs and wielded great influence in public affairs, where they often served as the conscience of the community.

**The Impact on Europeans of Early Contact**

For the relatively few Europeans coming in the first century to what was for them “a new world,” that ecologically was for them a new place, in which they were in the midst of a large number of Indigenous people with whom they regularly interacted, and who attempted to educate the newcomers to Native ways until European numbers became too large, living in their new location was a profound experience. The effects of contact with Indigenous people on coming to America had a wide range of effects in a virtually every area of the immigrants living, that had wide impacts on Europe and the rest of the world as well, over time. This included finding a wide variety of, for them, new plants, that Native people showed them the use of, leading to a culinary and medical revolution, as these plants spread from the Americas, so that today a very large portion of the world’s vegetable food is of “New
World” origin, while a great deal of the medication in use around the planet sprang from the Americas. In addition, the exportation of huge amounts of resources from the colonies to its west to the old countries, together with the Europeanization of some Indian ideas, is widely credited with greatly assisting the rise of the un-Native American rise of capitalism. The impact of the experience of contact was necessarily different for different people. Human beings are continually engaged in a dialogue with their ongoing experience of all kinds, through the lens of the impact on their changing nature and world view of their previous experience. This experience encompasses what people perceive directly from all their own outer and inner senses (and processes), and from the input they receive from others in the way of information, attitude, ideas, worldview etc., over time leading to collective ways of seeing, knowing, understanding, etc, that constitutes culture. While culture is an ever changing and individually varying system, in most instances it tends to be long lasting and slowly evolving. The often subtle, yet profound, effects of cultural interaction on people have been personally experienced by this author. When my then wife, a fledgling anthropologist, and I were about to embark on fieldwork, we were cautioned by an experienced colleague that while we had been extensively educated to be aware, and respectful, of the foreign culture we were entering, we also needed to note that even our limited one year emersion in it would change us in ways that we would not be aware of, and that we needed to be prepared for some resulting confusion and disorientation on our return. A phenomenon that, indeed, we experienced. Going further, one might say, that we are all anthropologists, and that ever changing life is the field, in which we are especially heavily impacted by intercultural interactions. Thus most of the few Europeans who came at first, largely remaining in their own social groups, but interacting regularly with Indians, some of whom lived with them, who taught them much about the practicalities of living in their new place, while attempting to teach them their cultural ways, only changed slowly and to limited degrees. Yet these changes were profound, as exemplified with the resulting rise of a distinctly American literature, beginning at the beginning in New England, in 1650, with the first important piece of literature, William Bradford, History of Plymouth Plantation. As Donohue demonstrates, “When Massachusetts Natives met English settlers in 1620, literary events took place. The American Indian oral tradition confronted English-speaking immigrants and changed their discursive propensities. As the English-speaking immigrants wrote, they produced a new literature that would eventually be designated American, and … American literature is different from the continental British. It is a literature that reveals an American Indian presence, a characteristic that British literature does not have. American Indian words, characters and actions entered America’s written work at contact, and these words, characters and actions have become part of a continuing European American literary tradition. Remove the Indians, and the literature is no longer American.” Some of evidence of the cultural impact is evident from the some 2000 American Indian words in American English, including the word “caucus”, reflecting the democratizing effects of Indianization of Europeans and European Americans in North America, as is the continuing existence a huge number of Native American Place Names in the United States and throughout the Americas. The cultural impact of European, and later Euto-American, contact with Native Americans was so broad that it even impacted sports and games, encompassing a continuation, in modified forms, of the sacred Native American stick
game we know today as lacrosse, which inspired the independent reinvention of the ancient Indigenous ball court game we now call basketball (which initially included lacrosse strategies), gave rise to ice and field hockey, and through introducing the rubber ball to Europeans, impacted every game across the world that uses a bouncing ball.41

Some Europeans and Euro-Americans were so greatly changed that they quite willingly became Indians, accepting adoption which was a regular tribal practice.42 As Hector St. John Crevecoeur said in 1782, in *Letters of an American Farmer*, “There must be in their [the Indians’] social bond something singularly captivating, and far superior to anything to be boasted among us; for thousands of Europeans are [have become] Indians, and we have no example of even one of those Aborigines having from choice become Europeans.”43

Meanwhile, a sizable minority of European immigrants to their “new world”, while remaining European – or rather becoming Euro-American - took on a considerable number of Indigenous ways of seeing and acting, as is Documented by Scott Pratt in *Native Pragmatism*.44 A good example is Roger Williams, as he shows in his book *A Key Into the Language of America*, written in 1643, in which he sets out that his conversations with Narragansett leader Miantonomi, at that vulnerable point in his life in 1635 when he had just been banished from the Massachusetts Bay Colony for criticizing its policies. Williams had long association with Native people and knew many of their stories. Williams conversation with Miantonomi focuses on stories dealing with cannibals, those who are different and potentially dangerous, with the tales and the discussion emphasizing the need, in an uncertain world, to act inclusively with them, to be tolerant, and so far as possible to harmonize one’s relationship with those who may be disruptive (and on the deeper level, with all people, all beings). This is not always possible, sometimes one has to fight or exclude someone, but this is a last resort, so that one’s main object is to be inclusive, work to create and restore harmony.45 On the surface, this sounds like Thomas Hobbes fundamental law of Nature, “everyman ought to endeavor peace, as far as he has hope of obtaining it; and when he cannot obtain it that he may seek and use all helps and advantages of war.”46 But while there is a point of overlap, The Native perspective is much more encompassing than Hobbes. And Williams internalized much of the Native view in his approach to tolerance put into play in Providence, and expressed by him in more developed form in *The Bloudy Tenent of Persecution*, his treatise on “heathens,” *Christening Make Not Christians*, his defense of “soul liberty,” *The Examiner Defended in a Fair and Sober Manner*, and his critique of Quakerism, *George Foxx Digged out of his Burrowes*.47

A later, important, example of the many who were significantly influenced by interaction with Indians is Benjamin Franklin.48 Franklin had considerable interaction – including diplomacy – with Indians over a long period of time, which slowly acculturated him to many Indigenous ways of thinking. By 1764, as shown in his writing in *The Narrative of the Late Massacre in Lancaster County, of a Number of Indians, Friends of this Province*, Franklin had gained a respect for diversity, consistent with Native principles of relationship and place, that went well beyond mere tolerance, considering difference to be a good thing when harmonized with the whole. This was demonstrated later in Franklin’s participation in co-authoring the declaration of Independence, not only as a statement of fundamental freedom, but related to that, of the principle of place encompassing difference, and thus the propriety of a community
to be sovereign, and assert that sovereignty. Among the many other major figures of the founding of the United States who were similarly Indianized to various, significant, extents were Jefferson, Adams, Washington, and Paine. Indeed, during the Sixteenth, Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries, Europeans coming to the Americas, and especially the British and French in North America, directly experienced extremely democratic societies, with high qualities of political and social life among many native tribes. Not only did they see small villages and bands functioning effectively on the basis of inclusive consensus decision making, with mutual respect and support of community members, but also large confederations of thousands of people, such as those of the Iroquois, Huron and Muscogee, that functioned extremely democratically, balancing respect for the individual and individual freedom with concern for the whole (family, clan, band, tribe, etc.). This had a profound effect on the social and political thinking, particularly concerning freedom, of numerous Euro-Americans. Indian symbols were widely used by the colonists, including for political purposes, as exemplified by the Sons of Liberty dressing as Mohawk Indians in the Boston Tea Party action denouncing the British government placing a high tax on tea. “Clearly, by the beginning of the American Revolution, Europeans and their colonial kin had built up complex—and often contradictory—impression of the Haudenosaunee (and of all American Indians), a rich tapestry involving all the arts and literature and intertwined with nearly every aspect of Eighteenth Century Life.”

The Considerable Effect of Contact in Europe

At the same time, during the first two centuries of European contact with Indians in the Americas, numerous reports from Europeans coming to the Americas were quickly and widely disseminated and discussed in the “Old World,” creating a profound impact on European thought, particularly in the realm of politics and society, at a time of openness to, and shortly, actual, change. Contact took place just as the Renaissance was spreading from Italy to France and the rest of Europe, political change was in progress with power centralizing to kings in nation building—in response creating an openness for democratic thinking—while corruption in the Catholic Church and other institutions was bringing both movements for reform within the church, and the reformation. During the same period great economic change was occurring, partly fueled by resources coming from the new world; and together with the rise of western science and the beginnings of the industrial revolution, driving the rise of capitalism and the growth of the middle class, creating pressures for political change, including openings for democracy as well as shifts in the thrust of public policy. While many of the reports on the peoples of the Americas, and the interpretations of them in Europe, were overly positive, overly negative, or otherwise to greater or lesser degrees inaccurate, they had a profound effect in Europe, especially on promoting the idea of freedom, which was the most dominating result of the reports, in spite of the negative views of Indians that circulated in Europe.

The positive reports began with Christopher Columbus’ first impression in his diary of the Native people he encountered, “They are loving people, without coverture….They love their neighbors as themselves, and their speech is the sweetest and gentlest in the world.” But the old world view of conquest, that began so cruelly with him, was also set into his first contact entry, “I could conquer the
whole of them with fifty men, and govern them as I pleased…” And, “I determined to pass none of these islands without taking possession, because being once taken, it would answer for all times.”

A leading theme in many of the many reports of the Americas that spread rapidly and widely in Western Europe was that of liberty. Brandon’s survey of these reports presents numerous examples, such as Lery’s account from his own observation, “They have neither kings or princes, and consequently each is more or less as much of a great lord an the other,” and Macer, on the basis of what he had heard an read, “They do not recognize a King or any superior, and will not subject themselves to the orders of anyone. Each there is King, master and Lord.” Going further, Acosta, one of the best informed Americanists of his day, stated, “A number of peoples and nations of the Indies have never suffered Kings nor Lords of an absolute and sovereign sort. They live in common and create and ordain certain Captains and Princes for certain occasions only, during which time they obey their rule, Afterward, these leaders return to their ordinary status. The greatest part of the New World governs itself in this fashion….”

From very early on, important Western European thinkers began reflecting ideas from the New World in their writing. Sir Tomas Moore, wrote *Utopia*, the work of fiction intended as a critique of early Sixteenth-Century English society, in 1519. The book, which is largely responsible for his being well known to this day, tells of a fictitious society in South America, taking many of the ideas for the book from Amerigo Vespucci’s two accounts of his voyages to the Americas (1497-1502) which were published in the first 5 years of the Sixteenth Century. Indeed Moore tells the story as a conversation he had with one of the “24 Christians” Vespucci left to maintain a base on the Brazilian coast, who had traveled to the isle of Utopia. In describing the society of Utopia, Moore, though clearly not describing an actual Indian society, is quite consistent with Vespucci’s accounts (which Moore says were “common reading everywhere”), in which Vespucci states of the aboriginal Americans, “Each is a master of himself. They have neither king nor master, nor do they obey anybody; For they live in their individual liberty.” “Their dwellings are in common” They live communally. “Neither do they have goods of their own, but all things are held in common.” Thus Moore’s traveler to Utopia, Raphael Hythloday says, with reference to European society,

*as long as there is any property, and while money is the standard of all other things, I cannot think that a nation can be governed either justly or happily: not justly because the best things will fall to the share of the worst men; nor happily because all things will be divided among a few (and even these are not in all respects happy), the rest being left to be absolutely miserable. Therefore when I reflect on the wise and good constitution of the Utopians – among whom all things are so well governed, and with so few laws; where virtue has its due reward, and yet there is such an equality, that every man lives in plenty – when I compare them with so many other nations that are still making new laws, and can never bring their constitution to a right regulation, where not withstanding everyone has his property;...*
In setting out the governance of Utopia, Moore applies American Indian inclusive participatory democratic principles, along the lines of Hodenosaunee and Huron traditional society, discussed above. Each 30 families in a municipality annually elected a representative (earlier called “Syphogrant,” later “philarch”), numbering 200, and above them (not stated how chosen) senators (once “Tranibor,” later “arch philarch”). The representatives chose the Prince, who served for life, unless removed for cause, from among four nominated by the people of the four divisions of the city. The senators meet in council every third day, or more often, with the prince and a different pair of representatives at each session, to discuss the business of the community. To promote thoughtfulness on the issues, a matter introduced at one session, would have to wait until the next meeting to begin being considered, and it must be considered in three separate meeting before being finally decided. Important issues are sent by the council to the representatives who discuss it with the families they represent, and some matters are taken up by the people as a whole at a general assembly.

Similarly, reflecting the communitas and reciprocity that was the general practice of “New World” native communities, in Utopia everyone worked – but because all worked, only a short, six hour work day was needed, leaving time for public discussion, education and recreation – while everyone was provided what they needed, beginning with the sick and infirm. Thus Moore contributed directly to the rise of socialism, as seen in those Marx later called utopian socialists, most notably Owen, who launched the cooperative movement, or guild socialism, that launched the cooperative movement of worker and consumer cooperatives, a major element in the rise of contemporary employee participation and ownership, and later the scientific socialism of Marx and others, as well as the Anarchist tradition.

Karl Kautsky, much later commented of Moore, “His socialism makes him immortal.” And, “As a socialist he was ahead of them all [his contemporaries].” Thus Kropokin, in Mutual Aid, and Engels, in The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State, have early chapters on Native Americans relevant traditional practice. But in assisting the rise of socialism and anarchism, Moore was not alone. The positive view of American Indians living “without thine and mine” was wide spread, with the term “anarchy,” meaning without government, coined by Louis Armond de Lom d’arce, Baron Lahontan, who wrote several short books on the Huron based on his journeys to Canada from 1683-1694, which made him a celebrity in Europe, and source for other writers and play writes. This whole thrust by Moore and others, though, was also a root of the political and social ideas that constitute Franklin Roosevelt’s New Deal Liberalism, at least partially via such Indian impacted thinkers as Rousseau (discussed in detail below).

Numerous other writers in the first three centuries of contact also reflected upon aboriginal American ways, especially on liberty, including, Montaigne, in his Essays, Rabelais, Ronsard, and even Shakespeare (briefly in The Tempest), among many others. Montaigne, whose Essays were published in 1580, in his essay “On Cannibals”, appears to show some influence from Moore, beginning his discussion of Native Americans, as did Moore, by saying he had met someone who had been to Brazil, and, in Montaigne’s case, later, Indians themselves, though he was hindered by a poor translator). But while Montaigne, like his predecessor, holds up society based on Indigenous principles to criticize contemporary European society, which Montaigne finds corrupt, and misguided by its terrible religious wars, his tone and approach are different than Moore’s. Montaigne, who Rousseau tells us said of “the
savages of America, whose simple and natural mode of government Montaigne preferred, without hesitation, not only to the laws of Plato, but to the most perfect vision of government philosophy can suggest....”\(^71\) says in the Preface of the *Essays*, “If I might have been among those nations that are said to live still under the sweet liberty of the first laws of nature, I assure you that I would very willingly paint myself all over and go naked.”\(^72\) He considered the Indigenous peoples to be the “Antarctic [opposite] of France,”\(^73\) still in a naturally virtuous state, without the corruption into which he believed European Societies had fallen, saying,

\>
I do not believe from what I have been told about this people, that there is anything barbarous or savage about them, except that we call barbarous anything that is contrary to our own habits... These people are wild in the same way we say that fruits are wild, when nature has produced them by herself and in her ordinary way; whereas, in fact, it is those we have artificially modified, and removed from the common order, that we ought to call wild.\(^74\)

How easy it would have been to turn to good account minds so innocent and so eager to learn, which had, for the most part, made such good natural beginnings! On the contrary, we have taken advantage of their innocence and inexperience to bend them more easily to treachery, lust covetousness, and to every kind of inhumanity and cruelty, on the model and after the example of our own manners.\(^75\)

Montaigne finds the Indigenous Americans to live harmoniously, finding their freedom in collaborative relations.

\>
If of the same age they generally call each other brothers; those who are younger are called children, and the old men are fathers to all the rest. They leave to their heirs the undivided possession of their property, to be held in common, with no other title than the plain one which nature bestows on her creatures when she brings them into the world.\(^76\)

\>
The inhabitants of the kingdom of Mexico were rather more civilized and more advanced than the other nations of those parts.\(^77\)

\>
As for pomp and magnificence, which were the cause of my entering on this discourse, neither Greece, nor Rome, nor Egypt has any work to compare, either for utility, or difficulty, or grandeur; with that road, to be seen in Peru, which was constructed by the kings of that country and led from the city of Quito to Quisco – a distance of 900 miles....\(^78\)

\>
The astonishing magnificence of the cities of Cuzco and Mexico, and among many similar things, that the king’s garden in which all the trees
and fruit, and all the plants were fashioned out of gold to the same size and in the same order as they would have in any ordinary garden; also animals in his private apartments, which were modeled after every kind that lived in his land or his seas; and, in addition, the beauty of their workmanship in precious stones, feathers, cotton and painting: all these things show they were no way inferior to us in industry either. But as to religious conduct, obedience to the law, goodness, liberality, loyalty, and honest dealing, it was greatly to our advantage that we had not so much as they. By excelling us in these virtues, they ruined, sold and betrayed themselves.79

. . . . . . . . . . .

They are still governed by natural laws and very little corrupted by ours. They are in such a state of purity that it sometimes saddens me to think we did not learn of them earlier, at a time when there were men who were better able to appreciate them then we. I am sorry that Lycurgis did not know them, for I think what we have seen of these people with our own eyes surpasses not only the pictures with which poets have illustrated the golden age, and all their attempts to draw mankind in the state of happiness, but the ideas and the very aspirations of philosophers as well. They could not imagine an innocence as pure and simple as we have actually seen; nor could they believe that our society might be maintained with so little artificiality and human organization.

This is a nation, I should say to Plato... How far from perfection would he find the Republic that he imagined: “men fresh from the hands of the gods.”80

Clearly, from what is known from ethnographies and what appears fairly accurate in some early reports (some of which Montaigne appeared to know, and sometimes drew from fairly accurately), in these essays Montaigne often overstates the actual virtues of Indigenous peoples of the Americas, and while correct on some basic general principles, and at times accurate on some details, he is often incorrect on other details, including what was omitted from the last quote. To what extent the magnification of the virtues of these societies, and particularly of what he perceived the extent of their superiority over those of Europe was a literary device to strengthen his argument, is tangential to the discussion of his influence in furthering a strong general perception in Europe, particularly in France, at the time, and with his assistance, later.

However, while the main thrust of discussion in Europe in the first centuries after contact was in favor of the new idea of liberty, not all commentators were positive, and those in the establishment, threatened by the idea, were resistant.81 Among those with a negative view of Indians, was Thomas Hobbes, paranoid of disorder, who had said that when the revolution came in England he was amongst the first to flee. Thus for Hobbes, his misimpression was that traditional life in America was a terrible
anarchy, the remedy for which was an emphasis on the authority of the sovereign (of whatever form of regime) – so long as the sovereign was able to protect the citizen. But on this issue, Hobbes reflects one of two major points of change from contact first seen in his writings. He is sometimes called the first liberal for asserting that since the first law of nature is self-preservation, every person has a corresponding set of rights to protection from being killed. Normally, for Hobbes one must look to the sovereign for protection of that set of rights to life. But if the ability of the sovereign to continue to provide that protection comes into question then each person has the right to continue to follow their sovereign, or choose another.\(^{82}\)

The second shift in European thought resulting from contact that is first voiced by Hobbes is the change from the classical view going back to Plato and Aristotle that nature is in the telos, the ideally most developed form of something (e.g. the nature of the acorn is in the perfect oak tree), to nature being found in an original state of nature, which, for Hobbes, human beings need to overcome through forming societies through irrevocable (unless the sovereign collapses or is destroyed) social compacts. From this perspective, whether one, as Hobbes, sees human beings in their original state as bad, or as those, such as Rousseau, who saw people as naturally good, but subject to being degraded or corrupted by negative experience, Indians were seen either as being in (Hobbes) or close to (Rousseau) the state of nature. A reflection of this, even today, is that one of the main kinds of places for the study and provision about Indigenous peoples are museums of natural history. As with most of the shifts in European thought coming with contact with Native Americans, contact is only one, though an extremely important, source of the shift. In the case of the transformation of the idea of nature, another factor is the development of western science, which was a very important part of Hobbes thinking.\(^{83}\)

The largest shift in European political thinking begins with John Locke’s assertion of inalienable rights in his Second Treatise on Government, in 1690, in which he provides a basis for upholding the English Great Revolution and restoration, which goes well beyond Hobbes very narrow and exceedingly limited set of rights coinciding with his law of self-preservation.\(^{84}\) Prior to Locke (and in a very limited sense Hobbes) western society did not recognize rights as being natural or inalienable. The dominant view was that rights should be granted to people, but that it was up to the sovereign to do so. Similarly, while the idea the social contract was ancient, being expressed by Plato in The Crito, the people had no right to enforce the contract.\(^{85}\) The rise of the idea of inalienable rights arose directly from contact with the spread of the idea of freedom, which is first expressed by Locke, who read extensively about Indians and met with some of them who came to England, and whose writing in the Second Treatise is filled with references to Indigenous Americans, as is developed below.

The shift in European thought that came with contact also included a shift in the myth of the golden age in Europe, originally one that involved living well in an ordered state, but did not include freedom for the people, which came as a direct result of contact.\(^{86}\) Based upon his theory of inalienable rights, Locke is also the first modern western theorist to pose a philosophical basis for democracy, at a time of democratic movements in Europe. At the time of Locke’s writing, except for a few scattered city states (including Rousseau’s Geneva, and some Italian city states), democracy was rare in Europe, so that democratic inspiration came partly from accounts of ancient Greece and Rome, revived with the Renaissance. The main source of democratic inspiration came from Europeans who went to the
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Americas, and especially the British and French in North America, who directly experienced extremely democratic societies, with high qualities of political and social life among many native tribes. Not only did they see small villages and bands functioning effectively on the basis of inclusive consensus decision making, with mutual respect and support for community members, but also large confederations of thousands of people, such as those of the Iroquois, Huron and Muscogee, that functioned extremely democratically, balancing respect for the individual and individual freedom with concern for the whole (family, clan, band, tribe, etc.), as set out above.

The Impact of American Indian Politics and Society Upon John Locke

A cursory examination of John Locke’s Second Treatise on Civil Government shows numerous direct references to American Indians (in sections #9, #14, #25, #29, #41, #43 #46, #49, #65, #102, #105 #108, #184), as well as many indirect references to them. Moreover, many of Locke’s ideas are similar to, or seem to echo, practices of peoples in the Americas, though on many points there are differences of varying degrees between what Locke proposes, or considers an important principle, and practices in the Americas. It is always difficult to know exactly what influenced an author’s thinking. Indeed, few, if any of us, can state precisely what all the influences have been in the development of our own thought, although we may have a clear memory of certain impacts upon our views or way of seeing. But even then, if there were not already something in our thinking, feeling or experience to open us to be influenced in a certain way, in most cases we would not be open to an idea or event having the effect on our thinking, that we might later give it.

I attempt here to make an educated estimate, from what is said in the Second Treatise, of where Locke may have been given insights and ideas from the experiences of Native North (and to a lesser degree Central and South) America, where he may find Native American experiences good examples in arguing for ideas that he may already have had, or which may have been strengthened by reports from the “New World” or the conversations he had with Indians who came to England, and where Locke’s references to Indians are indicative either of a disagreement with some aspect of their ways, or a belief that those ways were not applicable to European life in his era or circumstance. It needs to be noted that the project of trying to trace influences is complex and uncertain, and raises some interesting issues as to whether some ideas were transferred to a person, and if so what the transmission process was (obvious or subtle), or whether the ideas were developed independently, and a wave of expression or trend in which that independent thought occurred provided a space in which that related independent thought might receive notice and have a significant impact. Robert Owen’s guild socialism and education ideas, mentioned above, for example, which fit very well with clearly American Indian influenced French thinking of his era, are said to be his own development, and not the result of his exposure to ideas of others.

Perhaps the most fundamental point in this enquiry is the way in which Locke develops his whole theory of what constitutes legitimate government in the Second Treatise. Having disposed of Filmer’s arguments for the divine right of kings in Chapter I, Locke presents the basis of his theory in Chapter II, “Of The State of Nature,” by asserting that it is the original state of mankind in its natural, pre-societal, condition (rather than in its ultimate or most developed condition) that is the foundation for all societies and governments. Although there have always been speculations about the pre-societal state of human
beings and concerning how societies arose (e.g. In Book III of Plato’s Republic, and Book I of Aristotle’s Politics), the focus on a “state of nature” as the bases for understanding people in society and the legitimacy of government is a post contact with Indians idea, first developed in political philosophy by Hobbes. While there are likely a number of sources for this development (including the rise of natural science with which Hobbes was concerned), there would appear to be a very direct connection between the launching of extensive interaction with peoples living close to nature in the Americas, and the introduction of that concern in political thought, as this would provide a great deal of information about what people were originally like and what the purpose of society is. Indeed, as has been shown above, it is know that there was a great deal of interest in American Indian ways and society in Europe as well as among Europeans in America beginning from the Fifteenth Century.

It seems clear that Locke believes that “Indians in the woods of America,” as he refers to them in his second reference to them, in Chapter II, in #14, were close to, but not in the state of nature. In that section, he is meeting the objection that there never were “any men in such a state of nature,” by arguing “that since all princes and rulers of ‘independent’ governments all through the world are in a state of nature [in relation to each other], it is plain that the world never was, nor will be without numbers of men in that state.” Thus he makes no claim, where he would logically do so, if it was his belief, that Indians were in the state of nature. Yet his discussion shows them to be close enough to the original state (in comparison with European societies), to provide a good deal of information about it. For example, in Chapter V. “Of Property,” in #36 he says, “For, supposing a man or family, in the state they were at first, peopling of the world by the Children of Adam or Noah, let him plant in some inland vacant places of America.” And in #49, “Thus, in the beginning all of the world was America, and more so than it is now.”

The closeness of Indians to the natural state for Locke, will be made clearer as this discussion unfolds. Indication that this was a widely held view by Europeans is still evident in Native Americans being considered “primitive” people, meaning first people, and being called “savage” by some, meaning partly, or wholly, prior to society. It is significant that, to the current time, museums of ”natural history” have been engaged in studying Indians (as exemplified by the American Museum of Natural History in New York’s anthropology department and publishing and presenting displays about them. Indeed, until the recent launching of the National Museum of the American Indian at the Smithsonian Institution, the place to go to find out about Indians, was its Museum of Natural History.

In contrast to Hobbes, Locke describes the state of nature as “a state of perfect freedom” and, “A state also of equality, wherein all the power and jurisdiction is reciprocal (in #4),” “But though this be a state of liberty, yet it is not a state of license (In #6).” He tells us (in #15), “I, moreover affirm, that all men are naturally in that state, and remain so till, by their own consents, they make themselves members of some politic society,...” He adds, in Ch. 4, “of Slavery,” (In #14), “The natural liberty of man is to be free from any superior power on earth, and not to be under the will or legislative authority of man, but to have only the law of Nature for his rule. The liberty of man in society is to be under no other legislative power but that established by consent in the commonwealth, nor under the dominion of any will, or restraint of any law, but what that legislative shall enact according to the trust put in it.”
While the idea that the establishment of, and continued life in, a society involves a social contract is very old, and can be found, for instance, in Socrates conversation with the laws of Athens in Plato’s, *Crito*, that man is by nature free, possessing inalienable rights, and could only be governed by his consent, however, was a post contact idea in Europe, not asserted until the “Great Revolution.” Although it may have some other roots, it was completely reflective of American Indian society of the time, as indicated above. Thus American Indian experience is most likely a most important, if not the primary, source for Locke’s view that human beings are naturally free, and can legitimately be governed only by their consent. Indeed, the use of consensus decision making by native Americans is an active expression of that principle. Locke does not require what he saw as the more developed governments of his day to decide by consensus. He only requires that everyone consent to the decision making process, which he prefers to be representative on the basis of majority vote (Ch. VII-X). But it is essential, in his view, that government do nothing, in normal domestic affairs, that is not by the consent of the governed, and, furthermore, nothing that violates inalienable rights (Ch. XI).

If people living under a government are unhappy with it, Locke tells us that they are free to move to another, or to unclaimed land, at least until they have explicitly consented to be a member of a commonwealth. That someone might move to another country, if they objected to the laws of the nation where they are living, is an idea that can be found in Western thought at least as far back as Socrates discussion with the Laws of Athens in Plato’s *Crito*. It was not so strongly asserted, however, until Locke, who would have been quite aware that moving to, or forming, a new community because of dissatisfaction with where one was living, was a common Indian practice, in agreement with the notions of human freedom that Locke shares with Indigenous Americans. At the very least, it would seem that the Native American examples strengthened Locke’s views on this issue. Here, as in a number of other matters, however, Locke does not go so far as Native people. For Locke does say that the right to move can be lost when one explicitly pledges allegiance to a “commonwealth” (a regime operating by consent of the governed), where Indians commonly did not assert such a limitation (in what Locke likely considered their less civilized condition).

For Locke, “the great and chief end, therefore, of men uniting into commonwealths and putting themselves under government, is the preservation of their property, to which in the state of nature there are many things wanting (Ch. 9, #124).” He defines the “property” of people as consisting of “their lives, liberties and estates (#123).” In discussing estate in Chapter V, “Of Property, ” he says that, in the state of nature everything is owned in common, with the law of nature allowing everyone to take from nature what they need to live, for, “The fruit or venison which nourishes the wild Indian, who knows no enclosure, and is still a tenant in common, must be his-i.e., a part of him, that another can no longer have any right to it, before it can do him any good for the support of his life. (#25).” The limit is that in the state of nature, nature’s law prohibits anyone from taking from nature more of anything than they can use, in order that there be enough for everyone (#30, #31). This was precisely the native practice in the Americas, which Locke refers to. For while there could be bad winters or other naturally hard times, Indians generally saw that nature provided plenty for a decent life, if one took only what one needed, and did not waste.
But with the invention of money, in itself a convention or contract (#36, #47), for Locke it became possible and desirable to move beyond the subsistence society of pre-Columbian America. On this point Locke, setting a philosophical basis for capitalism, is critical of native ways, as he sees laboring for economic development, including widespread tilling of land, as a duty.

_There cannot be a clearer demonstration of anything than several great nations of the Americas are of this, who are rich in land and poor in all the other comforts of life; whom Nature, having furnished as liberally as any other people with materials of plenty—i.e., a fruitful soil, apt to produce abundance what serve for food, raiment, and delight; yet, for want of improving it by labor, have not one hundredth part the conveniences we enjoy, and a king of a large and fruitful territory there feeds, lodges, and is clad worse than a day laborer in England (#41)._  

In making this critique Locke is understanding of the subsistence existence of native peoples, even as he asserts the necessity of human beings evolving to what he believes to be a higher level of economic development.

_And as different degrees of industry were apt to give men possessions in different proportions, so this invention of money gave them the opportunity to continue and enlarge them. For supposing an island, separate from all possible commerce from the rest of the world [America?], wherein there were but a hundred families, but there were sheep horses and cows, with other useful animals, wholesome fruit, and land for corn for a hundred thousand times as many, but nothing in the island, either because of its commonness or perishableness, fit to supply the place of money. What reason could anyone have there to enlarge his possession beyond the use of his family, and a plentiful supply to its consumption, either in what their own industry produced, or they could barter for like perishable, useful commodities with others (#48)?_

“Thus in the beginning, all the world was America, and more so than it is now (#49).”

So it is that on a number of points, Locke uses what he knows of the Americas (though his knowledge is not always accurate) in developing a theory of human development, on which he also draws upon biblical and other history as sources. In addition to the above example of economic evolution, Locke refers to Indians in showing the natural state of the family, and the limited extent of “paternal power,” which for Locke is really the parental duty to nourish and educate children until they have attained reason and can govern themselves.“

_So little power does the bare act of begetting give a man over his issue, if all his care ends there, and this be all the title he hath to the name and authority of a father. And what will become of this paternal power in that part of the world where one woman hath more than one husband at a time? Or in those parts of America where, when the_
husband and wife part, which happens frequently, the children are left to the mother, follow her, and are wholly under her care and provision (#65).

Thus Indian examples are important to Locke in showing no natural political authority stems from fatherhood, or parenthood, and that women, in principle, have the same fundamental rights as men; though, consistent with the British legal tradition, not necessarily in practice.

But the husband and the wife, though they have but one common concern, yet having different understandings, will unavoidably sometimes have different wills too. It therefore being necessary that the last determination (i.e., the rule) should be placed somewhere, it naturally falls to the man’s share as the abler and the stronger. But this, reaching to the things of their common interest and property, leaves the wife in the full possession of what by contract is her peculiar right, and at least gives the husband no more power over her than she has over his life; the power of the husband being so far from that of an absolute monarch that the wife, has in many cases, a liberty to separate from him where natural right or their contract allows it, whether that contract be made by themselves in the state of Nature or by the custom or laws of the country they live in, and the children, upon such separation, fall to the father or mother’s lot as such contract does determine (#82).

Drawing upon reports from the Americas, biblical accounts and ancient European histories, Locke asserts that early societies were often formed,

by the uniting together of several men, free and independent one of another, amongst whom there was no natural superiority or subjection. And if Josephus Acosta’s word may be taken, he tells us that in many parts of America there was no government at all. “There are great and apparent conjectures,” says he, “that these men (speaking of those of the empire of Peru), for a long time had neither kings nor commonwealths, but lived in troops, as they do today in Florida-the Cherquanas [Cherokees], those of Brazil, and many other nations, which have no certain kings, but, as on occasion is offered in peace or war, they choose their captains as they please (#102).”

Locke states that in early times,

where a family was numerous enough to subsist by itself [and it should be noted that in the Americas and elsewhere, tribes generally functioned as extended families], and continued entire together, without mixing with others, as it often happens, where there is much land and few people, the government commonly began in the father....He was
fitted to be trusted: paternal affection secured their property and interest under his care, and the custom of obeying him in their childhood made it easier to submit to him than any other...Or where several families met and consented to continue together, it is not to be doubted that but they used their natural freedom to set up whom they judged the ablest and most likely to rule over them. Conformable hereunto we find the people of America, who - living out of the reach of the conquering swords and spreading domination of the two great empires of Peru and Mexico-enjoyed their own natural freedom, though, caeteris paribus, they commonly prefer the heir of their deceased king; yet, if they find him any way weak or incapable, they pass him by, and set up the stoutest and bravest man for their ruler (#105).

Quite correctly, Locke saw that tribal leaders, or “kings” were quite limited in their power.

Thus we see that the kings of the Indians, of America, which is still a pattern of the first ages of Asia and Europe, whilst the inhabitants were too few for the country, and want of people and money gave men no temptation to enlarge their possessions of land or contest for wider extent of ground, are little more than generals of their armies; and though they command absolutely in war, yet at home, and in time of peace, they exercise very little dominion, and have but a moderate sovereignty, the resolutions of peace and war being ordinarily in the people, or in a council, though the war itself, which admits not of pluralities or governors, naturally evolves into the king's sole authority [as Locke goes on to say was also the case in ancient Israel] (#109).

Yet, when ambition and luxury, in future ages, would retain and increase the power, without doing the business for which it was given, and aided by flattery, taught princes to have distinct and separate interests from their people, men found it necessary to examine more carefully the original and rights of government, and to find out ways to restrain the exorbitances and prevent the abuses of that power, which they have entrusted in another's hands, only for their own good, they found was made use of to hurt them (#111).

Locke’s entire theory of legitimate government rests upon his view of human beings in the state of nature, and his analysis of their development from nature into society. It is clear, that while they are not the only source of his thinking, American Indians contributed significantly to Locke’s ideas about freedom and representative government. Since Locke: had an exceedingly strong and direct influence upon the U.S. founders, continues to be the most influential single political thinker upon political ideas in the U.S., and remains a seminal thinker in the development of political thought in the West generally,
indigenous American influences upon Locke alone would be sufficient to have a major impact upon Western political thought and practice. Their direct influence, however, has been much wider in its impact, as can be seen by an examination the writing of Jean Jacques Rousseau.

The Impact of American Indian Politics and Society Upon John Jacques Rousseau

Rousseau writes somewhat differently, according to the context of his concern, both amongst writings, and in different places with in the same work, contributing to the range of interpretations that have been given to his views. I will focus here, primarily upon the *Social Contract*, with some reference to *A Discourse on the Origins of Inequality* and to *A Discourse on the Arts and Sciences*. As a developmental thinker, he was concerned with nature both in relation to the original state of mankind and in relation to what it was at least ideally possible for people to achieve, in order to overcome the depredation into which he thought much of society had fallen. Thus he states at the beginning of the Social Contract, “I mean to enquire if, in the civil order, there can be any sure and legitimate rule of administration, men being as they are, and laws as they might be (p. 3).” To understand the original state and what could be gleaned there of human nature, as well as the whole course of human development, Rousseau enquired extremely widely. The histories of Rome and Greece and of other ancient societies, along with more contemporary developments were given much consideration. He also delved into what he could find of native peoples, most particularly accounts from the Americas, which are frequently referred to in the three writings considered here, and very occasionally from Africa. His beginning point for all of this, was his experience as a citizen of the free city of Geneva, a participatory democracy small enough for all its citizens to know and care about each other: a naturally good condition that he felt had been lost in most of Europe.

For Rousseau, the problem of establishing legitimate government was to create and maintain a social contract that retained the natural liberty and freedom of men within the civic order. A reading of the *Social Contract* shows Rousseau to be passionate about liberty. If we ask what precisely consists the greatest good of all, which should be the end of every system of legislation, we shall find it reduce itself to two main objects, liberty and equality (Bk. II, Ch. XI, p. 49). To renounce liberty is to renounce being a man, to surrender the rights of humanity and even its duties. For him who renounces everything no indemnity is possible. Such a renunciation is incompatible with man’s nature; to remove all liberty from his will is to remove all morality from his acts. Finally, it is an empty and contrary convention that sets up, on one side, absolute authority, and on the other, unlimited obedience (Bk. I, Ch. IV, p. 9).

That liberty was natural, Rousseau saw in Indians of the Americas, following what has been described of their societies above:

*The American savages, who go naked, and live entirely on the products of the chase, have always been impossible to subdue. What yoke, indeed, can be imposed on men who need nothing (A Discourse on the Arts and Sciences, “The First Part,” p 147, footnote 1)?*
So savage man will not bend his neck to the yoke to which civilized men submits without a murmur; but prefers the most turbulent state of liberty to the most peaceful slavery....when I behold numbers of naked savages, that despise European pleasures, braving hunger, fire, the sword, and death, to preserve nothing but their independence, I feel that it is not for slaves to argue about liberty (A Discourse on the Origin of Inequality, “The Second Part,” p. 256).

Where for Locke, the way to protect natural liberty within society was through a social contract setting up limited government, under which citizens gave up certain rights to representative decision by the government, for Rousseau,

The problem is to find a form of association which will defend and protect with the whole common force the person and goods of each associate, and in which each, while uniting himself with all, may still obey himself alone, and remain as free as before.

This is the fundamental problem of which the Social Contract provides the solution.

These clauses, properly understood, may be reduced to one—the total alienation of each associate, together with all his rights, to the whole community; for in the first place, as each gives himself absolutely, the conditions are the same for all; and, this being so, no one has interest in making them burdensome to others (Bk. I, Ch. VI, pp. 13-14).

For this to be the case, the people had to be the sovereign, being extremely involved in the affairs of the state, and making all legislative decisions directly by their own vote, without intervening representatives. This required a good quality decision making process, so that the result would be the “general will,” and not the subverted “will of all” (Bk. I, Ch. VII, Bk. II, Ch, I, III and IV, Bk. III, Ch. XII-XV).

This very participatory politics Rousseau learned of from his own Geneva, from ancient history and from reports of indigenous Americans.

I dare not speak of those happy nations who did not even know the name of many vices which we find difficult to suppress; the savages of America, whose simple and natural mode of government Montaigne preferred, without hesitation, not only to the laws of Plato, but to the most perfect vision of government philosophy can suggest....(A Discourse on the Arts and Sciences, “The First Part” p. 153, footnote 1).

As we have seen in our brief overview of traditional Indian governance, Native American nations enjoyed what Rousseau required: an extremely active citizenry, concerned about every aspect of community affairs, deciding with the participation of everyone concerned. There were, however, two differences between Indian politics and the functioning “sovereign” of Rousseau. First, in Indian
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societies decisions were generally made by some sort of consensus, to the point of unanimous consent, where Rousseau called for majority vote, except on important matters where a greater level of agreement might be required (Bk. IV, Ch. II, p. 106). Second, Indian nations were organized as tribes, and did not have the strength of sovereignty that constituted Rousseau’s state, which would have run counter to Indian sensibility in limiting individual (whether person, family or other grouping) freedom, except on special occasions, such as the later buffalo hunts of plains tribes, after the coming of the horse, where coordinated hunting was enforced to prevent the herd from being stampeded away before the bulk of the hunters could descend upon the buffalo.98

Never-the-less, several fundamental aspects of the way in which Rousseau would have participatory decision making function are in agreement with the way American Indian democracy functioned, as was generally the case with tribal societies, including those discussed in ancient histories that Rousseau makes frequent reference to (including in Bk. III, Ch XII, p. 90, where he says, “If we went back to the earliest history of nations, we should find that most ancient governments, even those of monarchical form, such as the Macedonian and Frankish, had similar councils [of the whole people regularly deciding public issues]”). Some of these practices continued in post-tribal democracies, such as in Rome, which Rousseau discusses at length. Thus, in these cases, it is hard to say which of these sources had what degree of influence upon his thinking. It seems likely that they often interacted with each other, with current reports from America often providing depth of insight to points developed from ancient history, as well as reinforcing some of those views.

For example, Rousseau is very concerned about the development and maintenance of democratic culture (Bk. II, Ch. III, VII-X and XII; Bk. III, Ch. IV, V, XIV and XV; Bk. IV, Ch. I, II, IV, VII and VIII), and about public opinion as a major force in governance.

Along with these three kinds of law goes a fourth, most important of all, which is not graven on tablets of marble or brass, but on the hearts of citizens. This forms the real constitution of the State, takes every day new powers, when other laws decay or die out, restores them or takes their place, keeps a people in the ways it was meant to go, and insensibly replaces authority by the force of habit. I am speaking of morality, of custom, above all of public opinion; a power unknown to political thinkers, on which none the less the success of everything depends. With this the great legislator [founder] concerns himself in secret, though he seems to confine himself to particular regulations; for these are only the arc of the arch; while manners and morals, slower to rise, form in the end its immovable keystone (Bk. II, Ch. VI, p. 53).

In a republic the public voice hardly ever rises to the highest positions men who are not enlightened and capable, and such as to fill them with honor;... The people is far less often mistaken in its choice than the prince;... (Bk. III, Ch. VI, p. 72).
The better the constitution of a State is, the more do public affairs encroach on private in the minds of the citizens. Private affairs are even of much less importance, because the aggregate of the common happiness furnishes a greater proportion of that of each individual, so that there is less for him to seek in particular cares. In a well ordered city every man flies to the assemblies: under a bad government no one cares to stir a step to get to them, because no one is interested in what happens there, because it is foreseen that the general will not prevail, and lastly because domestic cares are all absorbing. Good laws lead to the making of better ones; bad ones bring about worse. As soon as any man says of the affairs of the State, What does it matter to me? The State may be given up for lost (Bk. II, Ch. XV, pp. 93-94).

As we have seen, in traditional American Indian communities, the people were extremely involved with public affairs, often making great efforts to attend public discussions, where they participated enthusiastically. For leaders, the people choose those with the best qualities for the position, and in honoring them made them strong role models. Indian societies were quite flexible to changing conditions, applying their basic values in new ways according to changes of circumstance. The basic values were maintained, first, through the teachings of respected elders, who provided wisdom in how to apply them to new conditions; and second by the women of the community, individually as mothers, but especially “grandmothers” (a role played by any elder women in the community who might encounter children, or adults who were their juniors, and were called “Grandmother,” and in one sense were considered to be so related, even though they might not be related by blood), and by the collective voice of women, led, by their elders.

Rousseau recognizes this role for women in a well working participatory society, saying of the women of Geneva, that they are “the chaste guardians of our morals, and the sweet security for our peace, exerting on every occasion the privileges of the heart and of nature, in the interests of duty and virtue (A Discourse on the Origin of Inequality, “Dedication to the Republic of Geneva,” p. 187). More important, Rousseau, perceiving that. “The most ancient of all societies, and the only one that is natural, is the family (Bk. I, Ch. II, p. 4),” saw in tribal relations the closeness of extended family in which everyone was aware of, and enjoyed their relationship to everyone else, with its interlocking set of obligations and affinities of the heart. This perception of oneness of the citizenry, that he also speaks of as a virtue of a small community, is an important element, for him, in a well working, strong, participatory state, that needs to avoid divisive differences of wealth (Bk. II, Ch. XI) and religion (Bk. IV, Ch. VIII).

As to the role that religion, or spirituality, played in maintaining and supporting well working Indian nations, Rousseau had so many evidences, from various sources, of the function of religion playing an essential role in the maintenance of the state, that the aboriginal American examples likely only confirmed already strongly held conclusions. The interesting thing, is that in dealing with the problem of the multiplicity of religions of his own time, he, knowingly or unknowingly, followed the same principles that guided traditional Indian people in dealing with diversity (though likely for partially
different reasons). In the final chapter, before concluding *The Social Contract*, on “Civil Religion (Bk. IV, Ch. VIII, p.140),” he says that, “tolerance should be given to all religions that tolerate others, so long as their dogmas contain nothing contrary to the duties of citizenship.” This is in complete agreement with the principles of respect and of the circle, which though stated differently by different people, were widely accepted across pre-Columbian America. First, as all people, all beings, and indeed all things, are alive with spirit, and are all related, everyone and everything is worthy of respect. Second, each person is born into a different place in the circle of life or being. The places in the circle have no meaning without the context of the whole circle, but there is no circle without each individual place, which has its own quality and way of seeing. Thus no decision can be made without hearing from everyone. While no one can completely understand the whole, in order to live well, one needs to come to know something of all the places.

When it came to leadership and administration (which Rousseau called “government”), he approved the fact that Indian communities, along with tribally oriented ancient societies generally, chose their best and most experienced people as leaders, whether formally or by informal consensus.

> The first societies governed themselves aristocratically. The heads of families took counsel together on public affairs. The young bowed without question to the authority of experience. Hence such names as priests, elders, senate, and gerontes. The savages of North America govern themselves in this way even now, and their government is admirable.

> There are then three sorts of aristocracy-natural, elective and hereditary. The first is only for simple peoples; the third is the worst of all governments; the second is the best, and is aristocracy properly called (Bk. III, Ch. V, p. 67).

Rousseau recognized that direct democracy, alone, was best suited for small nations. Understanding that the Europe of his age required large countries, he hinted at some possible solutions for adapting his participatory principles for government (the only regime he accepted as legitimate, in principle) to large nations. He states,

> if the State cannot be reduced to the right limits, there is still one resource; this is to allow no capital, to make the seat of government move from town to town, and to assemble by turn in each the Provincial Estates of the Country (Bk. III, Ch. XIII, p. 91).

This was the way in which the Muscogee (or Creek) Nation, of what is now the Southeastern United States, decided federation affairs (and it is essentially representative of the practice of traditional tribal federations). By doing so, they assured a balance of participation over time and maintained the principle of equal respect for people everywhere, as Rousseau appears to have been aware. Thus, this first method is related to the second that he only hints at in Book III, Chapter XV, when he says, “I will show later on how the external strength of a great people may be combined with a convenient polity and good order of a small state.” He continues in a footnote,
I had intended to do this in a sequel to this work, when in dealing with external relations I came to the subject of confederations. The subject is quite new, and its principles have still to be laid down (pp. 96-97).

Leagues of cities, as alliances and trading networks, had long been used in Europe by Rousseau’s time, and city states had sometimes set up colonies that either had a degree of autonomy or were essentially independent allies who paid tribute to the country of origin. But fully democratic federations, such as those of the Muscogee, Huron and Six Nations, were not known to Europeans prior to their coming to the “New World.” Benjamin Franklin and others of the U.S. Founders saw the merit of federating as Indian nations had, first proposing the Albany Plan of Union for the British Colonies, and then putting the idea into practice, first under the Continental Congress and the Articles of Confederation, and later with the federalism of the Constitution. There is no question that, on this point Native Americans had a profound effect upon Western political thought and practice.103

There are a number of comments that Rousseau makes in A Discourse on the Origin of Inequality about people at the earliest times in the state of nature that do not accurately describe Indians. For example, he states,

Now savage man, being destitute of every species of intelligence, can have no passions save those of the latter kind: his desires never go beyond his physical wants. The only goods he recognizes in the universe are food, a female and sleep, the only evils he fears are pain and hunger (The First Part, p. 210).

And shortly afterwards,

His soul, which nothing disturbs, is wholly wrapped up in the feeling of its present existence, without any idea of the future, however near at hand; while his projects, as limited as his views, hardly extend to the close of the day (The First Part, p. 211).

These statements, clearly do not fit Indian people of the Fifteenth Century, who valued wisdom and planned carefully for the future, as far as the seventh generation to come, as Rousseau would agree. These descriptions are Rousseau’s View of the earliest times in the state of nature, “before men had so multiplied that the natural produce of the earth was no longer sufficient for their support (The First Part, p. 212).” He clearly sees Indians at a later stage, and not even of the later stages of the state of nature, but somewhat beyond it, for he says the “Caribbeans, who have as yet least of all deviated from the state of nature...(The First Part, p, 229).”

But in viewing Indians at the time they first became widely known to Europeans, most of Rousseau’s observations of them were correct, contributing significantly to his political thought; sometimes largely by themselves, and at other times to various extents in combination with his knowledge of other tribal societies and later democratic societies. Rousseau, among many in France in his day interested in the idea of liberty coming from Indigenous Americans, was the most influential thinker for the French Revolution, whose battle cry of “Liberty, Equality, Fraternity,” comes directly for him, and he has continued to have a tremendous impact on the unfolding of Western philosophy and political and social thinking, including upon the rise of the political and social views that in the United States are associated
with Franklin Roosevelt’s New Deal Liberalism. Thus through Rousseau, as well as via Locke, American Indians have had a considerable impact upon western philosophy and political thinking about politics and society, and much of this has come back to impact views and events in the United States. Moreover, the rise of the idea of freedom, particularly as it was transmitted by Locke was so strongly received in the west that it changed the framework of discussion, ever since causing a great many of those favoring privilege to make their arguments in terms of freedom, by interpreting the concept to mean freedom to use one’s money and property as one wishes, to the point that in the case of *Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission* the court majority effectively said that money is speech, and one has the right to spend as much as they wish in expressing their opinion (thus freedom in elections could be seen as approaching “one dollar one vote,” rather than “one person one vote”).

**The Impact of Contact on the Development of American Political Institutions**

The development of democratic institutions in what became the United States was strongly influenced by Indigenous Americans almost from the first moment that colonists landed in North America. The Plymouth colonists, living in close contact with the Wampanoags witnessed their first of innumerable Indian meetings and soon adopted that form of governance for themselves, with Governor Bradford acting primarily as moderator and influential elder, while also adopting the Wampanoag system of land rights or ownership, which was different from the British. When Bradford sought to increase his own authority by having the community meeting elect two assistants to the governor, a number of the older planters moved to other towns, who also adopted the town meeting, which was codified in Massachusetts in the General Court (Cambridge) of Ordinance of 1635/6 for the regulations of towns. While the town meeting form of local government was primarily a New England development, the use of elected governing bodies throughout the colonies, though less participatory than representation among the various tribes and tribal federations in the British colonial areas, clearly was reflective of the tribal practices, whatever British or other European elements it embodied. Moreover, the more democratic practice of recall, introduced by progressives into a number of U.S. state governments in the late Nineteenth and early Twentieth Centuries were precisely Indian practices, as exemplified by the Hodenosaunee practice of the clan mothers (following consultation with the community) having the authority to remove leaders from office for cause. Similarly, initiative, referendum and equal suffrage also have Indian origins.

The Plymouth Colony also became the first European experience with Indian federation, when a few days after the Pilgrims landed, Samoset and Squanto arranged with Massasoit for the adjacent Wampanoags to include Plymouth in the Native federation of which they were a member. The colonists were closely familiar with numerous Native federations throughout the territory they inhabited, and many were impressed with the idea of federation. For example, William Penn, who thought highly of Indian governance, in the 17th century, proposed an outline “A Plan for the Union of the Colonies in America,” stemming from his observations of Native politics. In 1744 Onondaga Chief Canasatego and Speaker of the Hodenosaunee recommended to a colonial meeting in Lancaster, PA that the colonies would be stronger if they formed a federation like that of the Hodenosaunee, which would simplify, and thus improve, Hodenosaunee – colony relations. Benjamin Franklin, who was
well acquainted with the Hodenosaunee, and had engaged in diplomacy with numerous Indian nations, proposed the Albany plan of Union of the colonies in 1754. Based on the Albany Plan of Union, with leaders of the Hodenosaunee taking part in the initial discussions, and several of the delegates to Continental Congress saying in the debate that they were proposing a union of the former colonies based on the Hodenosaunee federation, the Articles of confederation were established with a strong legislature, representing the people through the states, and a weak executive consisting of a committee, while all decisions of the Congress required unanimous expressed consent – all very much along the lines of the Hodenosaunee and other Indigenous American federations. The governments of most of the states in the early years of U.S. independence, similarly functioned with weak governors and strong legislatures reflecting the governance of all the tribes in and around the former colonies and beyond. Indeed, indicative that the Native model of government to a considerable extent adopted by the former colonies was wide spread across the Indian Nations of North America, is that in considering options for the Navajo Nation to return to operating under traditional values, in 2008, the last of four options proposed by the Dine Policy Institute at the request of the Speaker of the Navajo Nation Council looked very much like the Articles of Confederation and the state governments of the time by replacing the Navajo Nation President with an 11 member Executive Board, leaving the Council nearly as-is, with the exception of adding 12 non-voting delegates specifically dedicated to certain social subgroups and non-profit organizations, and decentralizing more authority to the 110 chapters through reorganizing agency councils, with the decentralization addressing the gender issue by balancing the men, predominately in positions in the central government, with the women who are the preponderance of leaders in chapters and the growing numbers of nongovernmental organizations.

The Declaration of Independence directly reflected Indian ways in declaring that “all men are created equal and endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights,” but did so through the influence of John Locke in quoting him in declaring, in one version, that these rights are to “life, liberty and property,” and modifying that in another draft to “life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.” The various governments of the United States under the Articles of Confederation operated with a fair amount of democracy, but less than that of the Indian Nations. To begin with, outside of town meetings legislatures were less participatory than their Native equivalents, as elected representatives generally functioned with more autonomy from, and less consultation with, their constituents than was the case of Indian leaders, while women did not have the vote, and some states practiced permanent slavery with the children of slaves continuing to be slaves (compared to some tribes which might temporarily make some captives essentially slaves, until they could earn citizenship – not through financial purchase, but by demonstrating their good character).

The founders of the U.S. Constitution, in reaction to what they perceived as difficulties with the Articles of Confederation, in drafting the new document decreased the amount of democracy, as only the members of the House of Representatives were directly elected, and the checks and balances, which less fully distributed power than the wide dispersion of authority in Indian nations, tended to further reduce the voice of the people. At the same time, the opening of the Preamble to the Constitution, “We the People”, clearly is a statement of democracy commensurate with Native tradition, and there is
indication that it may well have been taken from a Hodenosaunee document. It is reported that one of the drafters brought with him a description of the Hodenosaunee constitution. And Franklin indicated the Native influence in the document in saying, “We have gone back to ancient history… all around Europe, but find none of their constitutions suitable to our circumstances.”

The Preamble itself is a good statement of the traditional purposes of governance of the Indigenous nations of the East Coast of the U.S. at the time of the first European colonists arrival. The Constitution continued the federalism of the of the Articles, but even by strict interpretation, greatly strengthened the powers of the national government over those of the states, which more directly represented the people, by granting the Congress a set of powers in domestic as well as foreign affairs (Article I, Section 8), and providing for a strong, hierarchical executive branch headed by a single President (Article II). There are several direct references to Indians, but these are not indications of Native influence, so much as setting out means for relating with them: in commerce (Article I, Section 8, 3), by diplomacy (which might include exercising military force) in the treaty (Article II, Section 2, 1) and war powers (Article 1, Section 8, 11 and Article II, Section 2, 2), and in providing for the entrance of new states into the Union which could include territory from the acquisition of Indian land (Article IIV, Section 3), and recognizing Indian Nation sovereignty, in part by not taxing citizens of Indian tribes (Article I, Section 3).

**Continued Impact in the Nineteenth Century and Beyond**

Indian influence upon western thought, both direct and indirect did not cease with the Eighteenth Century. It has already been mentioned that the entire anarchist and socialist tradition has Native American roots, and Marx was strongly impacted by Locke and Rousseau’s learnings about American Indians (later confirmed by Morgan’s reports of the Seneca), from which he developed much of his view of human nature. Throughout the 19th Century, there was much interest in the United States in traditional Native America. For instance, American Indian ways inspired the progressive work of Tammany Hall in New York (named after the Delaware chief Tammany), while feminist leaders, such as Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Matilda Joslyn Gage presented detailed descriptions of the role of women in Six Nation society to argue that nonsexist society was well precidented. It would seem no accident that John Dewy, writing in North America, was strongly focused both upon experience and democracy, as were the native people of this content. Wilshire shows that the thought of Emerson and Thoreau, and the later American pragmatists all have roots in Native American experience. Erick Erikson developed his groundbreaking theory of stages of human child development, completed in the 1950s, from observing Oglala Lakota and Yurok child rearing practices. The U.S. environmental movement, particularly in the 1990s, illustrated direct American Indian influence, and built upon the Indigenous emphasis on retaining balanced relations with the natural environment, in advertisements – such as one showing an Indian in a canoe crying on seeing polluted waters – and by such events as the April 1992 environmental gathering in Penn Valley Park, in Kansas City, where recycled items were placed in the shape of a huge turtle, representing the many tribes referring to North America as Turtle Island.

The world of the Twenty-First Century, more and more, is developing ways of seeing and thinking that are congruent with that of the first peoples of this hemisphere, making their ways increasingly relevant.
to contemporary life,\textsuperscript{126} so that current mainstream thinking and practice is moving further and further to mirror American Indian principles and understandings in the entire range of fields from the development of quantum mechanics in physics and ecological thinking in biology and environmental policy, through the rising of holistic thinking and interdisciplinary analysis, the movement for women's equality and the spawning of multiculturalism and mutually respectful approaches to diversity, to the growing running of organizations democratically, more common engaging in consensus decision making in dispute resolution and policy creation, and the increasing concern for restorative justice. Thus, it would seem wise, not only for American Indians, but for all of us, to become more knowledgeable and honoring of traditional native ways. It would seem that to move ahead well, this needs to be an age, not of dominance, but rather of integration,\textsuperscript{127} in which we all respectfully learn from each other.
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IN THE NAME OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST
Whereas, Most Christian, High, Excellent, and Powerful Princes, King and Queen of Spain and of the Islands of the Sea, our Sovereigns, this present year 1492, after your Highnesses had terminated the war with the Moors reigning in Europe, the same having been brought to an end in the great city of Granada, where on the second day of January, this present year, I saw the royal banners of your Highnesses planted by force of arms upon the towers of the Alhambra, which is the fortress of that city, and saw the Moorish king come out at the gate of the city and kiss the hands of your Highnesses, and of the Prince my Sovereign; and in the present month, in consequence of the information which I had given your Highnesses respecting the countries of India and of a Prince, called Great Can, which in our language signifies King of Kings, how, at many times he, and his predecessors had sent to Rome soliciting instructors who might teach him our holy faith, and the holy Father had never granted his request, whereby great numbers of people were lost, believing in idolatry and doctrines of perdition. Your Highnesses, as Catholic Christians, and princes who love and promote the holy Christian faith, and are enemies of the doctrine of Mahomet, and of all idolatry and heresy, determined to send me, Christopher Columbus, to the above-mentioned countries of India, to see the said princes, people, and territories, and to learn their disposition and the proper method of converting them to our holy faith; and furthermore directed that I should not proceed by land to the East, as is customary, but by a Westerly route, in which direction we have
hitherto no certain evidence that any one has gone. So after having expelled the Jews from your dominions, your Highnesses, in the same month of January, ordered me to proceed with a sufficient armament to the said regions of India, and for that purpose granted me great favors, and ennobled me that thenceforth I might call myself Don, and be High Admiral of the Sea, and perpetual Viceroy and Governor in all the islands and continents which I might discover and acquire, or which may hereafter be discovered and acquired in the ocean; and that this dignity should be inherited by my eldest son, and thus descend from degree to degree forever. Hereupon I left the city of Granada, on Saturday, the twelfth day of May, 1492, and proceeded to Palos, a seaport, where I armed three vessels, very fit for such an enterprise, and having provided myself with abundance of stores and seamen, I set sail from the port, on Friday, the third of August, half an hour before sunrise, and steered for the Canary Islands of your Highnesses which are in the said ocean, thence to take my departure and proceed till I arrived at the Indies, and perform the embassy of your Highnesses to the Princes there, and discharge the orders given me. For this purpose I determined to keep an account of the voyage, and to write down punctually everything we performed or saw from day to day, as will hereafter appear. Moreover, Sovereign Princes, besides describing every night the occurrences of the day, and every day those of the preceding night, I intend to draw up a nautical chart, which shall contain the several parts of the ocean and land in their proper situations; and also to compose a book to represent the whole by picture with latitudes and longitudes, on all which accounts it behooves me to abstain from my sleep, and make many trials in navigation, which things will demand much labor.

Friday, 3 August 1492. Set sail from the bar of Saltes at 8 o'clock, and proceeded with a strong breeze till sunset, sixty miles or fifteen leagues south, afterwards southwest and south by west, which is the direction of the Canaries.

* * * * *

Wednesday, 10 October. Steered west-southwest and sailed at times ten miles an hour, at others twelve, and at others, seven; day and night made fifty-nine leagues' progress; reckoned to the crew but forty-four. Here the men lost all patience, and complained of the length of the voyage, but the Admiral encouraged them in the best manner he could, representing the profits they were about to acquire, and adding that it was to no purpose to complain, having come so far, they had nothing to do but continue on to the Indies, till with the help of our Lord, they should arrive there.

Thursday, 11 October. Steered west-southwest; and encountered a heavier sea than they had met with before in the whole voyage. Saw pardelas and a green rush near the vessel. The crew of the Pinta saw a cane and a log; they also picked up a stick which appeared to have been carved with an iron tool, a piece of cane, a plant which grows on land, and a board. The crew of the Nina saw other signs of land, and a stalk loaded with rose berries. These signs encouraged them, and they all grew cheerful. Sailed this day till sunset, twenty-seven leagues.
After sunset steered their original course west and sailed twelve miles an hour till two hours after midnight, going ninety miles, which are twenty-two leagues and a half; and as the Pinta was the swiftest sailer, and kept ahead of the Admiral, she discovered land and made the signals which had been ordered. The land was first seen by a sailor called Rodrigo de Triana, although the Admiral at ten o'clock that evening standing on the quarter-deck saw a light, but so small a body that he could not affirm it to be land; calling to Pero Gutierrez, groom of the King's wardrobe, he told him he saw a light, and bid him look that way, which he did and saw it; he did the same to Rodrigo Sanchez of Segovia, whom the King and Queen had sent with the squadron as comptroller, but he was unable to see it from his situation. The Admiral again perceived it once or twice, appearing like the light of a wax candle moving up and down, which some thought an indication of land. But the Admiral held it for certain that land was near; for which reason, after they had said the Salve which the seamen are accustomed to repeat and chant after their fashion, the Admiral directed them to keep a strict watch upon the forecastle and look out diligently for land, and to him who should first discover it he promised a silken jacket, besides the reward which the King and Queen had offered, which was an annuity of ten thousand maravedis. At two o'clock in the morning the land was discovered, at two leagues' distance; they took in sail and remained under the square-sail lying to till day, which was Friday, when they found themselves near a small island, one of the Lucayos, called in the Indian language Guanahani. Presently they descried people, naked, and the Admiral landed in the boat, which was armed, along with Martin Alonzo Pinzon, and Vincent Yanez his brother, captain of the Nina. The Admiral bore the royal standard, and the two captains each a banner of the Green Cross, which all the ships had carried; this contained the initials of the names of the King and Queen each side of the cross, and a crown over each letter. Arrived on shore, they saw trees very green many streams of water, and diverse sorts of fruits. The Admiral called upon the two Captains, and the rest of the crew who landed, as also to Rodrigo de Escovedo notary of the fleet, and Rodrigo Sanchez, of Segovia, to bear witness that he before all others took possession (as in fact he did) of that island for the King and Queen his sovereigns, making the requisite declarations, which are more at large set down here in writing. Numbers of the people of the island straightway collected together. Here follow the precise words of the Admiral: "As I saw that they were very friendly to us, and perceived that they could be much more easily converted to our holy faith by gentle means than by force, I presented them with some red caps, and strings of beads to wear upon the neck, and many other trifles of small value, wherewith they were much delighted, and became wonderfully attached to us. Afterwards they came swimming to the boats, bringing parrots, balls of cotton thread, javelins, and many other things which they exchanged for articles we gave them, such as glass beads, and hawk's bells; which trade was carried on with the utmost good will. But they seemed on the whole to me, to be a very poor people. They all go completely naked, even the women, though I saw but one girl. All whom I saw were
young, not above thirty years of age, well made, with fine shapes and faces; their hair short, and coarse like that of a horse's tail, combed toward the forehead, except a small portion which they suffer to hang down behind, and never cut. Some paint themselves with black, which makes them appear like those of the Canaries, neither black nor white; others with white, others with red, and others with such colors as they can find. Some paint the face, and some the whole body; others only the eyes, and others the nose. Weapons they have none, nor are acquainted with them, for I showed them swords which they grasped by the blades, and cut themselves through ignorance. They have no iron, their javelins being without it, and nothing more than sticks, though some have fish-bones or other things at the ends. They are all of a good size and stature, and handsomely formed. I saw some with scars of wounds upon their bodies, and demanded by signs the of them; they answered me in the same way, that there came people from the other islands in the neighborhood who endeavored to make prisoners of them, and they defended themselves. I thought then, and still believe, that these were from the continent. It appears to me, that the people are ingenious, and would be good servants and I am of opinion that they would very readily become Christians, as they appear to have no religion. They very quickly learn such words as are spoken to them. If it please our Lord, I intend at my return to carry home six of them to your Highnesses, that they may learn our language. I saw no beasts in the island, nor any sort of animals except parrots."

These are the words of the Admiral.

Saturday, 13 October. "At daybreak great multitudes of men came to the shore, all young and of fine shapes, very handsome; their hair not curled but straight and coarse like horse-hair, and all with foreheads and heads much broader than any people I had hitherto seen; their eyes were large and very beautiful; they were not black, but the color of the inhabitants of the Canaries, which is a very natural circumstance, they being in the same latitude with the island of Ferro in the Canaries. They were straight-limbed without exception, and not with prominent bellies but handsomely shaped. They came to the ship in canoes, made of a single trunk of a tree, wrought in a wonderful manner considering the country; some of them large enough to contain forty or forty-five men, others of different sizes down to those fitted to hold but a single person. They rowed with an oar like a baker's peel, and wonderfully swift. If they happen to upset, they all jump into the sea, and swim till they have righted their canoe and emptied it with the calabashes they carry with them. They came loaded with balls of cotton, parrots, javelins, and other things too numerous to mention; these they exchanged for whatever we chose to give them. I was very attentive to them, and strove to learn if they had any gold. Seeing some of them with little bits of this metal hanging at their noses, I gathered from them by signs that by going southward or steering round the island in that direction, there would be found a king who possessed large vessels of gold, and in great quantities. I endeavored to procure them to lead the way thither, but found they were unacquainted with the route. I determined to stay here till the evening of the next day, and then sail for the southwest;
for according to what I could learn from them, there was land at the south as well as at the southwest and northwest and those from the northwest came many times and fought with them and proceeded on to the southwest in search of gold and precious stones. This is a large and level island, with trees extremely flourishing, and streams of water; there is a large lake in the middle of the island, but no mountains: the whole is completely covered with verdure and delightful to behold. The natives are an inoffensive people, and so desirous to possess any thing they saw with us, that they kept swimming off to the ships with whatever they could find, and readily bartered for any article we saw fit to give them in return, even such as broken platters and fragments of glass. I saw in this manner sixteen balls of cotton thread which weighed above twenty-five pounds, given for three Portuguese ceutis. This traffic I forbade, and suffered no one to take their cotton from them, unless I should order it to be procured for your Highnesses, if proper quantities could be met with. It grows in this island, but from my short stay here I could not satisfy myself fully concerning it; the gold, also, which they wear in their noses, is found here, but not to lose time, I am determined to proceed onward and ascertain whether I can reach Cipango. At night they all went on shore with their canoes.

Sunday, 14 October. In the morning, I ordered the boats to be got ready, and coasted along the island toward the north-northeast to examine that part of it, we having landed first at the eastern part. Presently we discovered two or three villages, and the people all came down to the shore, calling out to us, and giving thanks to God. Some brought us water, and others victuals: others seeing that I was not disposed to land, plunged into the sea and swam out to us, and we perceived that they interrogated us if we had come from heaven. An old man came on board my boat; the others, both men and women cried with loud voices--"Come and see the men who have come from heavens. Bring them victuals and drink." There came many of both sexes, every one bringing something, giving thanks to God, prostrating themselves on the earth, and lifting up their hands to heaven. They called out to us loudly to come to land, but I was apprehensive on account of a reef of rocks, which surrounds the whole island, although within there is depth of water and room sufficient for all the ships of Christendom, with a very narrow entrance. There are some shoals withinside, but the water is as smooth as a pond. It was to view these parts that I set out in the morning, for I wished to give a complete relation to your Highnesses, as also to find where a fort might be built. I discovered a tongue of land which appeared like an island though it was not, but might be cut through and made so in two days; it contained six houses. I do not, however, see the necessity of fortifying the place, as the people here are simple in war-like matters, as your Highnesses will see by those seven which I have ordered to be taken and carried to Spain in order to learn our language and return, unless your Highnesses should choose to have them all transported to Castile, or held captive in the island. I could conquer the whole of them with fifty men, and govern them as I pleased. Near the islet I have mentioned were groves of trees, the most beautiful I have ever seen, with their foliage as verdant as we see in Castile in April and
May. There were also many streams. After having taken a survey of these parts, I returned to the ship, and setting sail, discovered such a number of islands that I knew not which first to visit; the natives whom I had taken on board informed me by signs that there were so many of them that they could not be numbered; they repeated the names of more than a hundred. I determined to steer for the largest, which is about five leagues from San Salvador; the others were some at a greater, and some at a less distance from that island. They are all very level, without mountains, exceedingly fertile and populous, the inhabitants living at war with one another, although a simple race, and with delicate bodies.

15 October. Stood off and on during the night, determining not to come to anchor till morning, fearing to meet with shoals; continued our course in the morning; and as the island was found to be six or seven leagues distant, and the tide was against us, it was noon when we arrived there. I found that part of it towards San Salvador extending from north to south five leagues, and the other side which we coasted along, ran from east to west more than ten leagues. From this island espying a still larger one to the west, I set sail in that direction and kept on till night without reaching the western extremity of the island, where I gave it the name of Santa Maria de la Concepcion. About sunset we anchored near the cape which terminates the island towards the west to enquire for gold, for the natives we had taken from San Salvador told me that the people here wore golden bracelets upon their arms and legs. I believed pretty confidently that they had invented this story in order to find means to escape from us, still I determined to pass none of these islands without taking possession, because being once taken, it would answer for all times. We anchored and remained till Tuesday, when at daybreak I went ashore with the boats armed. The people we found naked like those of San Salvador, and of the same disposition. They suffered us to traverse the island, and gave us what we asked of them. As the wind blew southeast upon the shore where the vessels lay, I determined not to remain, and set out for the ship. A large canoe being near the caravel Nina, one of the San Salvador natives leaped overboard and swam to her; (another had made his escape the night before,) the canoe being reached by the fugitive, the natives rowed for the land too swiftly to be overtaken; having landed, some of my men went ashore in pursuit of them, when they abandoned the canoe and fled with precipitation; the canoe which they had left was brought on board the Nina, where from another quarter had arrived a small canoe with a single man, who came to barter some cotton; some of the sailors finding him unwilling to go on board the vessel, jumped into the sea and took him. I was upon the quarter deck of my ship, and seeing the whole, sent for him, and gave him a red cap, put some glass beads upon his arms, and two hawk's bells upon his ears. I then ordered his canoe to be returned to him, and dispatched him back to land.

I now set sail for the other large island to the west and gave orders for the canoe which the Nina had in tow to be set adrift. I had refused to receive the cotton from the native whom I sent on shore, although he pressed it upon me. I looked out after him and saw
upon his landing that the others all ran to meet him with much wonder. It appeared to
them that we were honest people, and    that the man who had escaped from us had done
us some injury, for which we kept him in custody. It was in order to favor this notion that
I ordered the canoe to be set adrift, and gave the   man the presents above mentioned, that
when your Highnesses send another expedition to these parts it may meet with a
friendly reception. All I gave the man was not worth four maravedis. We set sail about
ten o'clock, with the wind southeast and stood southerly for the island I mentioned
above, which is a very large one, and where according to the account of the natives on
board, there is much gold, the inhabitants wearing it in bracelets upon their arms, legs,
and necks, as well as in their ears and at their noses. This island is nine leagues distant
from Santa Maria in a westerly direction. This part of it extends from northwest, to
southeast and appears to be twenty-eight leagues long, very level, without any
mountains, like San Salvador and Santa Maria, having a good shore and not rocky,
except a few ledges under water, which renders it necessary to anchor at some distance,
although the water is very clear, and the bottom may be seen. Two shots of a lombarda
from the land, the water is so deep that it cannot be sounded; this is the case in all these
islands. They are all extremely verdant and fertile, with the air agreeable, and probably
contain many things of which I am ignorant, not inclining to stay here, but visit other
islands in search of gold. And considering the indications of it among the natives who
wear it upon their arms and legs, and having ascertained that it is the true metal by
showing them some pieces of it which I have with me, I cannot fail, with the help of our
Lord, to find the place which produces it.

Being at sea, about midway between Santa Maria and the large island, which I name
Fernandina, we met a man in a canoe going from Santa Maria to Fernandina; he had
with him a piece of the   bread which the natives make, as big as one's fist, a calabash of
water, a quantity of reddish earth, pulverized and afterwards kneaded up, and some dried
leaves which are in high value among them, for a quantity of it was brought to me at San
Salvador; he had besides a little basket made after their fashion, containing some glas
beads, and two blancas by all which I knew he had come from San Salvador, and had
passed from thence to Santa Maria. He came to the ship and I caused him to be taken on
board, as he requested it; we took his canoe also on board and took care of his things. I
ordered him to be presented with bread and honey, and drink, and shall carry him to
Fernandina and give him his property, that he may carry a good report of us, so that if it
please our Lord when your Highnesses shall send again to these regions, those who
arrive here may receive honor, and procure what the natives may be found to possess.

Tuesday, 16 October. Set sail from Santa Maria about noon, for Fernandina which
appeared very large in the west; sailed all the day with calms, and could not arrive soon
enough to view the   shore and select a good anchorage, for great care must be taken in
this particular, lest the anchors be lost. Beat up and down all night, and in the morning
arrived at a village and anchored. This was the place to which the man whom we had
picked up at sea had gone, when we set him on shore. He had given such a favorable account of us, that all night there were great numbers of canoes coming off to us, who brought us water and other things. I ordered each man to be presented with something, as strings of ten or a dozen glass beads apiece, and thongs of leather, all which they estimated highly; those which came on board I directed should be fed with molasses. At three o'clock, I sent the boat on shore for water; the natives with great good will directed the men where to find it, assisted them in carrying the casks full of it to the boat, and seemed to take great pleasure in serving us. This is a very large island, and I have resolved to coast it about, for as I understand, in, or near the island, there is a mine of gold. It is eight leagues west of Santa Maria, and the cape where we have arrived, and all this coast extends from north-northwest to south-southeast. I have seen twenty leagues of it, but not the end. Now, writing this, I set sail with a southerly wind to circumnavigate the island, and search till we can find Samoet, which is the island or city where the gold is, according to the account of those who come on board the ship, to which the relation of those of San Salvador and Santa Maria corresponds. These people are similar to those of the islands just mentioned, and have the same language and customs; with the exception that they appear somewhat more civilized, showing themselves more subtle in their dealings with us, bartering their cotton and other articles with more profit than the others had experienced. Here we saw cotton cloth, and perceived the people more decent, the women wearing a slight covering of cotton over the nudities. The island is verdant, level and fertile to a high degree; and I doubt not that grain is sowed and reaped the whole year round, as well as all other productions of the place. I saw many trees, very dissimilar to those of our country, and many of them had branches of different sorts upon the same trunk; and such a diversity was among them that it was the greatest wonder in the world to behold. Thus, for instance, one branch of a tree bore leaves like those of a cane, another branch of the same tree, leaves similar to those of the lentisk. In this manner a single tree bears five or six different kinds. Nor is this done by grafting, for that is a work of art, whereas these trees grow wild, and the natives take no care about them. They have no religion, and I believe that they would very readily become Christians, as they have a good understanding. Here the fish are so dissimilar to ours that it is wonderful. Some are shaped like dories, of the finest hues in the world, blue, yellow, red, and every other color, some variegated with a thousand different tints, so beautiful that no one on beholding them could fail to express the highest wonder and admiration. Here are also whales. Beasts, we saw none, nor any creatures on land save parrots and lizards, but a boy told me he saw a large snake. No sheep nor goats were seen, and although our stay here has been short, it being now noon, yet were there any, I could hardly have failed of seeing them. The circumnavigation of the island I shall describe afterward.

Wednesday, 17 October. At noon set sail from the village where we had anchored and watered. Kept on our course to sail round the island; the wind southwest and south. My intention was to follow the coast of the island to the southeast as it runs in
direction, being informed by the Indians I have on board, besides another whom I met with here, that in such a course I should meet with the island which they call Samoet, where gold is found. I was further informed by Martin Alonzo Pinzon, captain of the Pinta, on board of which I had sent three of the Indians, that he had been assured by one of them I might sail round the island much sooner by the northwest. Seeing that the wind would not enable me to proceed in the direction I first contemplated, and finding it favorable for the one thus recommended me, I steered to the northwest and arriving at the extremity of the island at two leagues' distance, I discovered a remarkable haven with two entrances, formed by an island at its mouth, both very narrow, the inside capacious enough for a hundred ships, were there sufficient depth of water. I thought it advisable to examine it, and therefore anchored outside, and went with the boats to sound it, but found the water shallow. As I had first imagined it to be the mouth of a river, I had directed the casks to be carried ashore for water, which being done we discovered eight or ten men who straightway came up to us, and directed us to a village in the neighborhood; I accordingly dispatched the crews thither in quest of water, part of them armed, and the rest with the casks, and the place being at some distance it detained me here a couple of hours. In the meantime I strayed about among the groves, which present the most enchanting sight ever witnessed, a degree of verdure prevailing like that of May in Andalusia, the trees as different from those of our country as day is from night, and the same may be said of the fruit, the eeds, the stones and everything else. A few of the trees, however, seemed to be of a species similar to some that are to be found in Castile, though still with a great dissimilarity, but the others so unlike, that it is impossible to find any resemblance in them to those of our land. The natives we found like those already described, as to personal appearance and manners, and naked like the rest. Whatever they possessed, they bartered for what we chose to give them. I saw a boy of the crew purchasing javelins of them with bits of platters and broken glass. Those who went for water informed me that they had entered their houses and found them very clean and neat, with beds and coverings of cotton nets. Their houses are all built in the shape of tents, with very high chimneys. None of the villages which I saw contained more than twelve or fifteen of them. Here it was remarked that the married women wore cotton breeches, but the younger females were without them, except a few who were as old as eighteen years. Dogs were seen of a large and small size, and one of the men had hanging at his nose a piece of gold half as big as a castellailo, with letters upon it. I endeavored to purchase it of them in order to ascertain what sort of money it was but they refused to part with it. Having taken our water on board, I set sail and proceeded northwest till I had surveyed the coast to the point where it begins to run from east to west. ere the Indians gave me to understand that this island was smaller than that of Samoet, and that I had better return in order to reach it the sooner. The wind died away, and then sprang up from the west-northwest which was contrary to the course we were pursuing, we therefore hove about and steeredarious courses through the night from east to south standing off
from the land, the weather being cloudy and thick. It rained violently from midnight till near day, and the sky still remains clouded; we remain off the southeast part of the island, where I expect to anchor and stay till the weather grows clear, when I shall steer for the other islands I am in quest of. Every day that I have been in these Indies it has rained more or less. I assure your Highnesses that these lands are the most fertile, temperate, level and beautiful countries in the world.

Thursday, 18 October. As soon as the sky grew clear, we set sail and went as far round the island as we could, anchoring when we found it inconvenient to proceed. I did not, however, land. In the morning set sail again.

Friday, 19 October. In the morning we got under weigh, and I ordered the Pinta to steer east and southeast and the Nina south-southeast; proceeding myself to the southeast the other vessels I directed to keep on the courses prescribed till noon, and then to rejoin me. Within three hours we descried an island to the east toward which we directed our course, and arrived all three, before noon, at the northern extremity, where a rocky islet and reef extend toward the North, with another between them and the main island. The Indians on board the ships called this island Saomete. I named it Isabela. It lies westerly from the island of Fernandina, and the coast extends from the islet twelve leagues, west, to a cape which I called Cabo Hermoso, it being a beautiful, round headland with a bold shore free from shoals. Part of the shore is rocky, but the rest of it, like most of the coast here, a sandy beach. Here we anchored till morning. This island is the most beautiful that I have yet seen, the trees in great number, flourishing and lofty; the land is higher than the other islands, and exhibits an eminence, which though it cannot be called a mountain, yet adds a beauty to its appearance, and gives an indication of streams of water in the interior. From this part toward the northeast is an extensive bay with many large and thick groves. I wished to anchor there, and land, that I might examine those delightful regions, but found the coast shoal, without a possibility of casting anchor except at a distance from the shore. The wind being favorable, I came to the Cape, which I named Hermoso, where I anchored today. This is so beautiful a place, as well as the neighboring regions, that I know not in which course to proceed first; my eyes are never tired with viewing such delightful verdure, and of a species so new and dissimilar to that of our country, and I have no doubt there are trees and herbs here which would be of great value in Spain, as dyeing materials, medicine, spicery, etc., but I am mortified that I have no acquaintance with them. Upon our arrival here we experienced the most sweet and delightful odor from the flowers or trees of the island. Tomorrow morning before we depart, I intend to land and see what can be found in the neighborhood. Here is no village, but farther within the island is one, where our Indians inform us we shall find the king, and that he has much gold. I shall penetrate so far as to reach the village and see or speak with the king, who, as they tell us, governs all these islands, and goes dressed, with a great deal of gold about him. I do not, however, give much credit to these accounts, as I understand the natives but imperfectly, and perceive them to be so poor that a trifling quantity of gold
appears to them a great amount. This island appears to me to be a separate one from that of Saomete, and I even think there may be others between them. I am not solicitous to examine particularly everything here, which indeed could not be done in fifty years, because my desire is to make all possible discoveries, and return to your Highnesses, if it please our Lord, in April. But in truth, should I meet with gold or spices in great quantity, I shall remain till I collect as much as possible, and for this purpose I am proceeding solely in quest of them.

Saturday, 20 October. At sunrise we weighed anchor, and stood to the northeast and east along the south side of this island, which I named Isabela, and the cape where we anchored, Cabo de la Laguna; in this direction I expected from the account of our Indians to find the capital and king of the island. I found the coast very shallow, and offering every obstacle to our navigation, and perceiving that our course this way must be very circuitous, I determined to return to the westward. The wind failed us, and we were unable to get near the shore before night; and as it is very dangerous anchoring here in the dark, when it is impossible to discern among so many shoals and reefs whether the ground be suitable, I stood off and on all night. The other vessels came to anchor, having reached the shore in season. As was customary among us, they made signals to me to stand in and anchor, but I determined to remain at sea.

Sunday, 21 October. At 10 o'clock, we arrived at a cape of the island, and anchored, the other vessels in company. After having dispatched a meal, I went ashore, and found no habitation save a single house, and that without an occupant; we had no doubt that the people had fled in terror at our approach, as the house was completely furnished. I suffered nothing to be touched, and went with my captains and some of the crew to view the country. This island even exceeds the others in beauty and fertility. Groves of lofty and flourishing trees are abundant, as also large lakes, surrounded and overhung by the foliage, in a most enchanting manner. Everything looked as green as in April in Andalusia. The melody of the birds was so exquisite that one was never willing to part from the spot, and the flocks of parrots obscured the heavens. The diversity in the appearance of the feathered tribe from those of our country is extremely curious. A thousand different sorts of trees, with their fruit were to be met with, and of a wonderfully delicious odor. It was a great affliction to me to be ignorant of their natures, for I am very certain they are all valuable; specimens of them and of the plants I have preserved. Going round one of these lakes, I saw a snake, which we killed, and I have kept the skin for your Highnesses; upon being discovered he took to the water, whither we followed him, as it was not deep, and dispatched him with our lances; he was seven spans in length; I think there are many more such about here. I discovered also the aloe tree, and am determined to take on board the ship tomorrow, ten quintals of it, as I am told it is valuable. While we were in search of some good water, we came upon a village of the natives about half a league from the place where the ships lay; the inhabitants on discovering us abandoned their houses, and took to flight, carrying of their
goods to the mountain. I ordered that nothing which they had left should be taken, not even the value of a pin. Presently we saw several of the natives advancing towards our party, and one of them came up to us, to whom we gave some hawk’s bells and glass beads, with which he was delighted. We asked him in return, for water, and after I had gone on board the ship, the natives came down to the shore with their calabashes full, and showed great pleasure in presenting us with it. I ordered more glass beads to be given them, and they promised to return the next day. It is my wish to fill all the water casks of the ships at this place, which being executed, I shall depart immediately, if the weather serve, and sail round the island, till I succeed in meeting with the king, in order to see if I can acquire any of the gold, which I hear he possesses. Afterwards I shall set sail for another very large island which I believe to be Cipango, according to the indications I receive from the Indians on board. They call the Island Colba, and say there are many large ships, and sailors there. This other island they name Bosio, and inform me that it is very large; the others which lie in our course, I shall examine on the passage, and according as I find gold or spices in abundance, I shall determine what to do; at all events I am determined to proceed on to the continent, and visit the city of Guisay, where I shall deliver the letters of your Highnesses to the Great Can, and demand an answer, with which I shall return.
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