

## SIGNS OF RACE

General Editors: Philip D. Beidler and Gary Taylor

### Volumes Already Published

*Writing Race across the Atlantic World: Medieval to Modern*, edited by Philip D. Beidler and Gary Taylor

*Buying Whiteness: Race, Culture, and Identity from Columbus to Hip-hop*, by Gary Taylor

### Future Volumes

*English and Ethnicity*, edited by Janina Brutt-Giffler, Catherine Davies, and Lucy Pickering

*Women and Others: Racial and Gender Difference in Anglo-American Literature and Culture*, edited by Celia R. Daileader, Rhode Johnson, and Anilar Shabazz

*Race, Nationality, and National Literatures: The Institutionalization of English*, edited by Peter Logan

*Postcolonial Otherness and Transnational Capitalism: Contexts, Contests and Contradictions*, edited by Robert Young

## WRITING RACE ACROSS THE ATLANTIC WORLD MEDIEVAL TO MODERN

Edited by

*Philip D. Beidler and Gary Taylor*

palgrave  
macmillan

- English Renaissance* (Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1986). On the georgic tradition see Shuger, "Irishmen, Aristocrats, and Other White Barbarians," *Renaissance Quarterly*, 50 (1997): 507-522; Anthony Low, *The Georgic Revolution* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985) and Alastair Fowler, "Georgic and Pastoral: Laws of Genre in the Seventeenth Century," in *Culture and Civilization in Early Modern England: Writing and the Land*, ed. Michael Leslie and Timothy Raylor (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1992), 81-88. On contemporary concerns about the danger of empire to England see Armitage, *Ideological Origins of the British Empire* and "John Milton: Poet against Empire," *Milton and Republicanism*, ed. David Armitage, Armany Himy, and Quentin Skinner (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 206-225.
56. Beverly, *History and Present State of Virginia*, ed. Wright, 233.

## 3

## PREHISTORIC DIASPORAS: COLONIAL THEORIES OF THE ORIGINS OF NATIVE AMERICAN PEOPLES

*Gordon M. Sayre*

### PROLOGUE: KENNEWICK MAN AND THE LEGACY OF COLONIAL THEORIES<sup>1</sup>

The cultural and political importance of the issue of Native American origins has been emphasized by the recent controversy over Kennewick Man. Kennewick Man is a skeleton that was first found by spectators at a powerboat race along the banks of the Columbia River near Kennewick, Washington in July 1996. Radiocarbon dating established that the bones are roughly 9,000 years old, making it a major archaeological discovery, since only thirty-two human remains that old have been found in North America, and this skeleton is among the most complete. A local anthropologist named James Chatters collected the bones and touched off a media sensation when he was quoted saying that features of the skull resembled "caucasoid" peoples more than modern Native Americans. Chatters later asked an artist friend to make a reconstruction of the flesh on Kennewick Man's head. When photos of the bald clay model appeared in newspapers and magazines across the country, many news stories repeated Chatters's suggestion, that Kennewick Man resembled the actor Patrick Stewart. Many also confused the paleontological term "caucasoid" with "caucasian," and concluded that Kennewick Man was white. However, under the terms of the Native American Grave Protection and Repatriation Act, a 1990 federal law known as NAGPRA for short, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, owner of the land where the bones were found, determined that they were the

property of local Indian tribes. There ensued of course a lawsuit, filed by a group of eight physical anthropologists eager to study Kennewick Man in hope of building support for their theories about human migrations into North America at the end of the Ice Ages, ten to fifteen thousand years ago. In 2001, Judge Jelders of Federal District Court in Portland, Oregon finally issued a ruling in favor of the plaintiffs, who apparently succeeded in portraying the Indian tribes as obscurantist foes of science, and as fearful that their claims might be nullified if examination of the bones was allowed to proceed.<sup>2</sup>

Kennewick Man reveals the huge stakes behind the question of the origins of Native American peoples. The basic question of "Who was here first?" carries enormous cultural, political, and legal weight, because it implies symbolic claims to sovereignty over the continent. And if answers can come from Kennewick Man, they will be built upon arguments that are as much racial as archeological. The measurement of his skull, and its classification according to a resemblance to Asian, European, or paleo-Indian skulls, may carry the authority of science, but the ways in which such classifications are perceived is deeply racialized, and bound up with colonial claims to North America established during the sixteenth to eighteenth centuries.<sup>3</sup> The public response to the controversy has followed a pattern established over the last five hundred years, as Euro-Americans have sought to assert sovereignty and "nativity" over the Americas. Twentieth-century science has done surprisingly little to change the terms of the debate about American Indian origins, the leading theories proposed, or even the types of evidence considered. An awareness of the history behind the question is necessary to a critical understanding of the colonialist patterns of this debate.

In the lawsuit over Kennewick Man, the plaintiffs asserted that NAGPRA did not apply because there was no evidence to meet the statutory requirement of a "cultural affiliation" linking the bones to any local Indian tribe. Paleontologists thus attempted to force the Corps of Engineers to prove that this man, 9,000 years ago, called himself Umatilla or Yakima, as his descendants do today. But can any culture, anywhere in the world, prove that its language, its material culture, and its name for itself have not changed in 9,000 years? The influence of dominant groups over prehistory lies in asserting affiliations with ancient cultures, in spite of changes that have occurred over thousands of years. One may claim to be descended from the Gauls, the Celts, the Romans, or the Anglo-Saxons, but will also identify oneself as Irish, English, French, or Italian. There are winners

and losers, majorities and minorities among these European ethnicities, but a history of invasions and migrations is always involved, a history often elided or manipulated by European nationalist and essentialist ideologies such as the Nazi "Aryan race." Euro-Americans who call themselves "Caucasian," even if they can't place the Caucasus on a map, are eager to assert kinship to Kennewick Man, I believe, because such an affiliation supports myths of European sovereignty in North America, and marginalizes the sovereignty of American Indians. Among the plaintiffs was the Asstru fellowship, a New Age pagan group eager to support their theory of ancient Norse migrations to America. The news media gave as much attention to the Asstru as to the Native tribes' beliefs about their own ancient presence in the region.<sup>4</sup> What's more, the attempt to classify Kennewick Man according to a modern racial identity is simply ludicrous. Racial labels used in the U.S. today have little relevance in settings hundreds of years ago, much less thousands. And because the diversity within populations labelled as races is actually much greater than the differences between them, and there is only one Kennewick Man to measure, there is little rigor behind claims that he belonged to a population of ancient Asians, Europeans, or Caucasoids. Kennewick Man may have looked similar to his lost compatriots, or he might have appeared unusual beside them.

#### INTRODUCTION: COLONIAL THEORIES OF MIGRATION AND DIASPORA

Like other contributors to *Writing Race Across the Atlantic World*, I aim to compare our contemporary racial ideologies with those of early modern Europe, and to examine the intersection of scientific and literary discourses. The diasporas of interest here, however, cross not only the Atlantic but the Pacific, and extend back to the earliest of early modernities, the beginning of the Holocene era some ten thousand years ago. For just as beliefs about racial identity frequently depend upon notions of primitive or unconscious urges and essential or ordinary roots, popular and scientific beliefs about early man are shot through with racial thinking, and have been for hundreds of years. As news of the discovery of America spread in the fifteenth century, Europeans faced the challenge of accounting for American Indian peoples in the context of biblical and classical Mediterranean history. The biblical Genesis was axiomatic for most Europeans, and nearly all agreed that American peoples were part of that creation, but many also built a more specific cultural bias into

their stories of Native American origins, so as to assert an affinity with or authority over indigenous Americans whose lives and land were being seized by colonists. The recent claim that Kennewick Man demonstrates an ancient migration of Europeans to North America repeats arguments advanced by Renaissance Europeans who constructed "anthropological" support for colonial claims over this continent.

There was an enormous and complex body of European and Euro-American writing from the sixteenth and the nineteenth centuries on the origins of the Native Americans; dozens of pamphlets and treatises on the question were published in England, Holland, Germany, France, and Spain, in all those national languages plus of course Latin. In addition, hundreds of colonial histories and exploration texts included brief chapters or longer dissertations devoted to the issue. Most of this literature is little known today. Some anthropologists have acknowledged its significance, for example David Hurst Thomas's *Skull Wars: Kennewick Man, Archaeology, and the Battle for Native American Identity* (New York, 2000) includes a brief discussion of these issues. But aside from Lee Huddleston's *Origins of the American Indians: European Concepts, 1492-1729* (Austin, 1967), which emphasizes Spanish colonial material, I have found no monographs about the early modern literature on the topic. Such a study would be difficult to write. As the eminent historian of colonial Mexico Jacques Lafaye wrote in addressing the theme, "To summarize here, one by one, the different positions, would be to compose a boring catalog."<sup>5</sup> Reading these texts is frustrating for several reasons: First, few of the writers who weighed in on the question had any new, first-hand ethnological evidence to present. Many of those known for the most provocative theories, such as Isaac la Peyrère, Johannes de Laet, Hugo Grocius, and Menasseh Ben Israel, four who shaped a fierce debate during the latter half of the seventeenth century, never went to America and wrote toward larger scholarly arguments for which the origin of the American Indians was merely incidental.<sup>6</sup> Second, as the author of another brief survey points out, many of those who wrote on the controversy did so as "a pretext for showing their great erudition, knowledge of classical texts, and pedantry."<sup>7</sup> With a few exceptions, such as Jose de Acosta and Joseph-François Lafitau, those who had been to America and gathered information directly from Native Americans were usually not learned enough to do battle with the pedants in Europe, and others who did have knowledge worth sharing often obscured it by repeating the theories propounded by others.<sup>8</sup> Thirdly, many theorists, like Gregorio Garcia,

author of the 1607 *Origen de los indios de el nuevo mundo* or "Origins of the Indians of the New World," declined to come out in favor of any single origin theory or migration route, instead reviewing and endorsing several. The nineteenth-century Cherokee writer John Rollin Ridge concluded sardonically that American Indians were "descended from all the branches of the Old World stock at one and the same time."<sup>9</sup> Fourthly, the line between serious scientific conclusions and marginal speculations about Native American origins has never been easy to draw. As Stephen Williams has documented in *Fanastic Archaeology: The Wild Side of North American Prehistory* (Philadelphia, 1991), hoaxes and crackpot theories concerning prehistoric Americans have proliferated since the time of P. T. Barnum and include hundreds, even thousands of books. This essay cannot hope to touch upon this literature. I shall instead concentrate on sources prior to 1850, and rather than attempting the summary that Lafaye insisted would be boring, I will emphasize that many Early Modern theories are quite similar to those embraced today by anthropologists. The idea of migration across an Asia-America land bridge, for example, was widely circulated in the late 1500s, when Acosta argued for it. A critical judgment about how colonialist motives affect the scientific and popular debate about Native American origins will be possible only in light of the history of research and speculation on the issue. What follows is an introductory attempt at such a history, organized around five types of evidence that were and are used in debates about Native American origins, and then five major types of theories built upon that evidence.

### Cranionometry

Measurements of the skull of Kennewick Man provided initial support for the argument that he was "caucasoid" even though subsequent analysis supposedly documented closer similarities to the Ainu people indigenous to northern Japan. Although most try to avoid anachronistic or racial labels, archaeologists today still classify ancient skulls as eighteenth-century theorists did in building racist theories of a progression from ape to a Grecian sculptural ideal. Such speculation found its most successful American practitioner in Samuel G. Morton, author of *Crania Americana* (1839) and proud owner of a collection of over a thousand skulls.<sup>10</sup> Earlier researchers had studied variations in skull shape for support of a theory of polygenesis, of races as separate species of mankind. Morton also endorsed polygenesis, but he was ambivalent about phrenology, the study of the shape of the skull, and

sought to bring scientific rigor to craniometry by measuring the volume of the brain cavity. In his laboratory Morton would seal off the openings in a skull and fill it with lead shot, then empty and weigh the contents to determine its volume. Stephen Jay Gould in *The Mismeasure of Man* has exposed the unconscious bias in Morton's methodology, and other recent critics have used Morton as a leading example of nineteenth-century American scientific racism. Morton did assert that human races were products of separate creations, and that the white European species was superior, but he also admitted that his craniometric data did not fully support his racist ideas.<sup>11</sup> Like many earlier theorists, he believed in separate origins for two separate groups of Native Americans. He distinguished the "demi-civilized" Toltecs of central and South America, including both the Aztecs and Incas, from the totally uncivilized natives of North America. However, his measurements showed that the Inca skulls had the smallest volume of any in his collection. This did not support his hypothesis that the more advanced "races" had larger skulls, and he was honest enough to admit it.

The most alarming thing about *Crania Americana* is not its conclusions, but its method, which depended upon acquiring skulls by grave-robbing. Most of the "Caucasian" skulls in Morton's collection were those of lunatics, idiots, and notorious criminals, collected in the hope of discerning some cause of their antisocial behavior. During the nineteenth century, when so-called resurrectionists supplied medical schools with cadavers, it was a mark of class status to be able to preserve one's body undamaged in its grave. Native Americans held the lowest status of all, for their bones were sought by entrepreneurs, amateur collectors, and scientists. As anthropologist Franz Boas wrote in his diary: "It is most unpleasant work to steal bones from a grave, but what is the use, someone has to do it."<sup>12</sup> The conflict over Kennewick man suggests that the bones of Native Americans are still the objects of a fetishistic value, and that science indirectly contributes to this fetish, while denying Native Americans a contribution to the conclusions derived from their bones. Only in the past twenty years or so have Native American archaeologists begun to contribute to the discourses that have defined their racial and cultural status.<sup>13</sup>

### Pyramids of Egypt and the Yucatan

A second type of evidence used in the origins debate is what we now call "material culture" found in association with bones; the tools, structures, and art of human societies. For Early Modern Europeans,

who had not yet developed archeology as a discipline, but who were deeply impressed by classical Greece and Rome, stone buildings were the *sine qua non* of civilization. This is the primary reason why the Aztecs and Incas (and, after the publications of John Lloyd Stephens, the Maya as well) were considered to be distinct from other Native Americans.<sup>14</sup> Their stone temples, plazas, and pyramids were the only stone structures found in America that matched the grandeur of the ancient Mediterranean world. Augustus le Plongeon and other nineteenth-century archeologists came up with a theory that the Mayan pyramids and the iconography of carvings on them demonstrated a common origin with the ancient Egyptians.<sup>15</sup> The seventeenth-century Mexican intellectual Carlos Sigüenza y Góngora had made a similar assertion of Egyptian origin for the Aztecs, adding that both cultures also wrote in hieroglyphs.<sup>16</sup> These men had no proof that the Egyptian pyramids and writing actually predated the American developments, yet they did not entertain the notion that the Olmecs of ancient America might have colonized Egypt. Modern dating techniques have of course established that human presence in Eurasia and Africa predated that in the Americas, and that the Egyptian pyramids are older than the Mayan, but these findings have been used to reinforce a notion that cultural progress diffused in one direction only, from the Old World to the New, even though any migration could have taken people out of America as well as into it. For another example, some specialists in the styles of stone projectile points assert that the spearheads of the Clovis culture of ancient America resemble those of the paleolithic Solutreans of Western Europe, and use this evidence to support theories of a pre-Columbian transatlantic migration.<sup>17</sup> Such diffusionist arguments generally rest upon a conviction that the independent invention of similar cultural materials is much less likely than a single invention followed by their diffusion, even diffusion to great distances.<sup>18</sup> Critics of diffusion insist that similarities in the style of projectile points or the architecture of temples could easily be the result of independent solutions to similar problems.

### Atlantis and Mediterranean Myth

For European Renaissance humanists, even after Francis Bacon, the authority of classical texts often outweighed empirical data. It was very difficult for these scholars to accept that the Americas were a truly "New World" of which no mention could be found in Plato, Aristotle, or the Bible. Plato's *Timaeus* and *Critias* both mention a great lost land out in the western sea, the source of the myth of

Atlantis, which of course gave its name to the Atlantic Ocean, and has frequently been identified as America. Francisco Lopez de Gomara, the Spanish historian and biographer of Cortés, offered as confirmation the fact that the Nahuatl (Aztec) word for water was "atl."<sup>19</sup> But a more specific and influential myth arose out of Aristotle and Diodorus Siculus; both told a tale of Phoenician Carthaginians who sailed through the pillars of Hercules and settled an uninhabited land. The authorities in Carthage feared either that too much of their population would emigrate, or that an enemy power would seize the colony, so they put to death the discoverers, and forbade any further voyages. Gonzalo Fernandez de Oviedo y Valdez, author of the *Historia General y Natural de las Indias* of 1535, proposed this as a possible origin of the American Indians, and many others have revived the idea. While the seafaring prowess of the Phoenicians and Carthaginians was certainly adequate for crossing the Atlantic, the fact that no strong archeological evidence of their landfall has ever been found leaves the literary sources as the only support for the theory. It is quite possible, of course, that the Atlantis of Plato, Aristotle, or Diodorus derives from a voyage to the Canaries or Cape Verde islands, or even to a small island later destroyed by a volcanic explosion. But the relevance to the origin question is that the identity of Atlantis with America is only possible because "America" was a signifier with no referent. It has been the prerogative of Europeans to construct "America" and its peoples within historical discourse. Hence the myth of Atlantis has been taken seriously as evidence for a pre-Columbian migration, whereas American Indian myths, even if no more fantastic, are not considered historically valid.<sup>20</sup>

### Word Games

Thomas Jefferson declared, in pondering the "great question . . . from whence came those aboriginal inhabitants of America?" that "a knowledge of their several languages would be the most certain evidence of their derivation which could be produced."<sup>21</sup> But in his manuscript for *Notes on the State of Virginia* he here added an additional sentence: "so long as a passion for forcing a resemblance between two languages doesn't lead us to those irrational distortions of both which have involved this species of testimony in some degree of ridicule."<sup>22</sup> Indeed, the propensity for European writers about Native America to present homophonic words as evidence of cultural origins deserves plenty of ridicule. Gomara's "atl" and "atlantis" is a typical absurdity, and one could add many others. The few colonial

and missionary writers who learned an American language fluently were less likely to make such claims. By Jefferson's time, however, linguistic methods had become more rigorous with the work of his contemporary Sir William Jones, who mastered twenty-eight languages and laid the groundwork for the idea of a common origin for all the Indo-European tongues. If German, French, and English had evolved from an Indo-European root in common with Sanskrit, might not the languages of Native America also be traced to a common root, and might this root also be in Asia? Jefferson was excited at the prospect, but recognized the challenge posed by the phenomenal diversity of languages in Native North America—at least three hundred separate tongues. For Jefferson this multitude of languages in America "proves them of greater antiquity than those of Asia," and this fit his general goal in *Notes on the State of Virginia* of refuting European prejudices against America as an immature, infertile, or unhealthy place.<sup>23</sup> Modern linguists, on the other hand, have not all accepted the idea that the great diversity of languages in the Americas is proof of humans' antiquity here. Joseph H. Greenberg of Stanford University has devoted his career to developing a unified theory of a single root for all human languages. To do so, he has reduced the hundreds of distinct languages of Native America into two basic types, defying colleagues who insist that there are as many as 100 independent root languages. His method is really not so different from his eighteenth-century precursors—examining words in different languages and the phonemic similarities among them. Since Greenberg cannot of course learn all of these languages himself, or even interview their native speakers, he is dependent upon the transcriptions of hundreds of collectors, whose ears for oral language and methods of transcription cannot all have been equally accurate. Greenberg also assumes a fairly constant rate of change in the evolution of human languages, a method of "glottochronology" that is highly uncertain. Compounding the difficulty is the fact that many of these languages are now lost. Jefferson was at once cognizant of this problem, and explicit in it. He wrote: "it is to be lamented . . . that we have suffered so many of the Indian tribes already to extinguish, without our having previously collected and deposited in the records of literature, the general rudiments at least of the languages they spoke."<sup>24</sup> Jefferson and Greenberg reduce the oral cultures of native America to dead letters, transcriptions that "preserve" native cultures only by imprisoning them in an archive. And inquiries into the origins of American Indians have consistently rejected evidence from the oral traditions of these peoples today, relying instead on vague resemblances of words, of stones, or of bones.

### Genetic and Continental Drift

The development of human genomics and of supercomputers has recently made available one entirely new form of evidence concerning the origins of Native Americans, the study of genetic markers. Research began with blood types, when it was observed that nearly all American Indians had type O blood, a few Canadian tribes had a high incidence of type A, and virtually none had type B. Luigi Luca Cavalli-Sforza pioneered this work in the 1950s and then moved on to the study of DNA, measuring the relative frequency of dozens of genes in samples taken from peoples residing in Europe and around the world. Cavalli-Sforza and his colleagues attempt to measure the diasporas of human history on the largest scale, such as the spread of agricultural peoples out of Africa and the Middle East, and their gradual displacement of and mixture with local hunter gatherers. His results for the Neolithic period in Western Europe have been quite compelling, but he admits that "the selection of markers used in research to date has mostly involved variables identified among populations of European origin. . . . New markers that take account of the variations in non-European populations need to be found."<sup>25</sup> Moreover, given the history of colonial genocide in the Americas, the speedy diffusion of European immigrants across the continents, and the variable degree of their intermarriage with indigenous peoples, this genetic evidence may prove to be of limited value in establishing a reliable history of prehistoric migration and diaspora in the Americas.

### Acosta and the Land Bridge Migration

Anthropologists today generally believe that the Americas had no human inhabitants until the end of the Pleistocene about twelve to fifteen thousand years ago, when migrants crossed from Asia to Alaska on land exposed by the lower sea levels of the ice ages. Renaissance geographers had no conception of an ice age, but because the North Pacific was among the last coastal areas of the world to be explored by Europeans, such a land bridge was envisioned. In his 1590 *Natural and Moral History of the Indies*, Acosta rejected the myths of Atlantis and of a Carthaginian discovery, insisting that without the compass early mariners would not have succeeded in crossing the oceans. Observing also that the New World abounded in animal species which humans would not have chosen to transport on their ships, Acosta concluded "that the one and the other world are joynd and continued one with another in some part, or at the least are very

neere," and that humans and animals gradually migrated to the new world from Asia. "Some peopling the lands they found, and others seeking for newe, in time they came to inhabit and people the Indies, with so many nations, people, and tongues as we see."<sup>26</sup> Acosta did ask some Natives of Peru how they came to inhabit that land, but he did not accept their answer: "I have found them so farre unable to give any reason thereof, as they believe confidently, that they were created at their first beginning at this new world, where they now dwell. But we have freed them of this error by our faith, which teacheth us that all men came from the first man."<sup>27</sup> Acosta's account of Native American origins is in outline the consensus view of today's anthropologists, and some have credited him with the first modern or scientific study of the origin question.<sup>28</sup> Yet because the geography of the North Pacific was still unknown, Acosta's thesis was still speculative. His theory was prescient not only for the land bridge migration theory, but also for its outright rejection of Native Americans' own account of their origins. Acosta may have guessed right, but the coincidence demonstrates how slowly the consensus has changed. Acosta of course stayed within the Biblical chronology, and modern anthropologists were also very slow to question it. Until the excavation of the Folsom and Clovis sites in New Mexico in the 1920s and 1930s, the dogmatic authority of Ales Hrdlicka of the Smithsonian Institution insisted that no humans had been in America for more than 4000 years, a date that preserved the Biblical creation even in the post-Darwin era.<sup>29</sup> Since then the date of migration has been pushed back to 12,000 years, and new findings may extend it even earlier.<sup>30</sup>

### The Lost Tribes of Israel

From the most "modern" theory let us shift to what appears as the most obsolete, the notorious "Lost Tribes." The key primary source for this is the Fourth Book of Esdras in the Apocrypha, which, as Acosta quoted in rejecting the theory, tells how ten of the twelve tribes, after their captivity in Babylon, "ooke this counsell to themselves to leave the multitude of the heathen, and go forth into a farther countrie, where newer mankind dwelt." They went eastward to a region called Azareth, where they will live until "the latter time."<sup>31</sup> Since the Esdras text has the tribes departing eastward across Asia, this story is easily reconciled with the land bridge theory, although the style and motives behind each are very different. Because the ten lost tribes theory derives from the Bible, some have assumed that it was widely held in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, but it was not.

Mexican historians Juan Tovar and Diego Duran endorsed it in the 1580s, but their texts were not published until the nineteenth century.<sup>32</sup> And although the lost tribes thesis fit with the millenarian beliefs of Franciscans in the sixteenth century, Protestants have championed the theory since then, including seventeenth-century New England missionaries John Eliot and Roger Williams, and their English contemporary Thomas Thorowgood. The theory's most colorful exposition in this era was in *The Hope of Israel* (1650) by Menasseh Ben Israel, a Spanish Jew exiled to Holland.<sup>33</sup> As Benjamin Braude has shown in his work on Menasseh, his translations of the account of a discovery of Jewish people living in the jungles of South America were tailored on the one hand to Hebrew readers pondering a Second Coming foretold by the spread of Jews to the ends of the earth, and on the other to Englishmen who might be inspired to lift the ban on Jewish immigration to England.<sup>34</sup> Thus the theory was closely tied to political and religious issues in seventeenth-century Europe.

It was in the nineteenth century that the Lost Tribes theory reached its widest influence. James Adair's *History of the American Indians* (1775), based on his residence among the Cherokee and building upon earlier ethnographers, documented for hundreds of pages apparent parallels between Indian languages and Hebrew, and customs such as taboos against menstruating women. Missionary official Elias Boudinot's *A Star in the West* (1816) was another popular book that updated the millenarian program. *The Book of Mormon*, supposedly based on ancient plates unearthed in New York state in 1827, laid out a comprehensive history of multiple pre-Columbian migrations by Israelite tribes, accounting for all the major civilizations of Meso-America. In response to this, Ojibway historian Peter Jones wrote that the Book of Mormon was actually written by the Marchi Manitou, the evil spirit of Algonquian mythology.<sup>35</sup> James Fenimore Cooper even parodied the theory through his character Parson Amos in *The Oak Openings* (1848).

#### Madoc, St. Thomas, and Prester John

The route and the conveyance for pre-columbian migrations to America is really a separate issue from the ethnic identity of the migrants. And Israelites of whatever tribe offered only one possible ethnic origin. I won't even try to list all the other peoples of the Renaissance and ancient world who were proposed as probable migrants and ancestors of the Native Americans. Virtually all were

candidates. Instead, as the third type of theory I want to point out a pattern whereby colonizers attempted to justify their dispossession of Native American peoples by claiming that these peoples originated from, or had already acknowledged the authority of, earlier European migrants.

English colonists in the seventeenth century were eager to catch up with the Spanish and to legitimate their imperial efforts by contrast with the Catholic conquistadors, and they developed several myths for this purpose. When Protestant publisher Theodore deBry printed the narrative of Thomas Hariot and engraved the paintings of John White from the Roanoke colony, he included an appendix showing the Picts, whose bodies were adorned with elaborate designs in "pictage" or tattoos. The Picts had been natives of Northern Britain, and foes of colonizing Romans. Hence by analogy the English colony at Roanoke could be seen as repeating the imperial project that had brought civilization to the British Isles. Because Britain had seen violent colonial conflicts in Roman times and more recently in Ireland, Wales, and Scotland, colonial theories could identify Native Americans either with the colonized, as White implied, or with the colonizers.<sup>36</sup> Thomas Morton in *New English Canaan* (1637) rejected the theory that the Natives had come from Tartary over a frozen sea, for he claimed that they spoke vestiges of Latin. "[I]t may perhaps be granted that the Natives of this Country might originally come of the scattered Trojans," descendants of Brutus, great-grandson of Aeneas, who left Latium and was cast away at sea.<sup>37</sup> Other versions of this legend, which Morton must have known, had Brutus himself landing in England.<sup>38</sup> Morton's theory, built upon the *Aeneid* and its classical and pagan associations, rebutted the evangelical beliefs of New England Puritans, and of Roger Williams, who saw the Indians as actual or potential Israelites.

The most enduring English colonial myth came out of medieval history. Richard Hakluyt's *Principall Navigations* of 1589, the chief propaganda organ for Elizabethan imperialism, promoted the legend of the Welsh king Madoc, who supposedly had discovered a land across the western sea in the twelfth century, then returned and collected ten ships to start a colony there. Hakluyt supported this story with claims of Welsh words in Indian languages, derived from a text by David Ingram that I believe is fictional. He then embellished it with allusions to the Aztec legends published by Gomara, and with Queen Elizabeth's claims of a Welsh ancestry, to come up with a justification for English rule in North America parallel to the recent annexation of Wales. The legend endured well enough that later



explorers on the western plains, including George Catlin, claimed to have found tribes that spoke the Welsh language.<sup>39</sup>

These English efforts recapitulated those of the Spaniards earlier in the sixteenth century, when the historian of the conquest Gonzalo Fernández de Oviedo y Valdés had proposed that the Americas were the Isles of the Hesperides discovered by the legendary Spanish king Hesper, and hence that the conquest was really a reconquest of former Spanish subjects.<sup>40</sup> This far-fetched notion did not win many converts. The myth of Quetzalcoatl was much more successful. Instead of imagining adventurous Europeans settling a vacant Eden like Atlantis, the Quetzalcoatl story grounds the pre-Columbian connection in native Aztec mythology. This Aztec god or culture-hero was in human form a king among the Toltecs, the highly cultured people whom the Aztecs conquered and appropriated (much as the Romans did the Greeks). His image was bearded and fair-skinned, and he had departed across the sea to the east in ancient times, leaving a promise to return and claim sovereignty over his people. Cortez had the happy coincidence to land in Veracruz on One Reed of the Aztec calendar, the very year prophesized, and in confronting Montezuma he cultivated the impression that he was the returning Quetzalcoatl. The myth still commands popular assent and is part of the foundation of Mexican nationalism. However, a few scholars, such as Gesa Mackenthun, Susan Gillespie, and Jacques Lafaye, have questioned its authenticity, pointing out that all Spanish accounts of it can be traced back to a single source, Sahagun's *General History of the Things of New Spain*, the work of Aztec informants in the 1580s, who would have been aware of the myth's importance among their Spanish masters, and may have concocted it through a kind of mimicry.<sup>41</sup>

There were also legends of apostolic visits to the New World, a missionary variation upon the myths of the third type. The first such story arose from Columbus's conviction that he had sailed to India, which in medieval writings and maps was often identified as the site of Eden or Paradise, and as a land with Christian churches begun during an ancient visit by the apostle St. Thomas.<sup>42</sup> The presence of Christians in the Far East had evolved in medieval times out of the story of Prester John in Mandeville's *Travels*. Long after Columbus's confusion had been cleared up, the myth persisted as part of a millennial worldview, not just among the zealous Franciscans in Mexico, who saw themselves as typological embodiments of the twelve apostles, but also among Jesuits like Antonio Ruiz de Montoya in Paraguay, who imagined that St. Thomas had visited much of South

America, and planted among the natives a dormant potential for conversion.<sup>43</sup> Others saw Quetzalcoatl himself as the manifestation of St. Thomas, or even, say some Mormons, of Christ.<sup>44</sup> Northern Europeans writing in the seventeenth century did not share in this myth arising out of the travels of St. Thomas to India, and drew instead upon a tenth-century story that the Irish St. Brendan had crossed the Atlantic, accompanied, according to Breton patriots, by St. Malo, whose city was home to several early explorers including Jacques Cartier.<sup>45</sup> These myths of the third type do not necessarily explain the origins of the Native Americans, but they do try to legitimate European colonial rule over their societies. Whether the land King Madoc discovered was already inhabited or not, whether St. Thomas had actually converted all the Indians or just preached to them, these myths offered historical types or analogues supporting the European colonial conquest.

### Prehistoric Diasporas

Most Renaissance treatises on the origin problem did not endorse one migration route to the exclusion of all others. Many articulated a fourth type—"multiple migration" theories that sought to explain why a few Native American cultures, such as the Aztecs, Incas, Natchez, or even the ancient Moundbuilders, appeared to be more sophisticated than the mass of others. Benjamin Smith Barton, one of the leading American scientists of the Early Republic, linked the Moundbuilders of the Ohio Valley to Danish or Welsh migrations across the Atlantic, and distinguished these people from the less civilized Indians who had come to that region from the West.<sup>46</sup> In this Barton echoed Hugo Grotius and his *De Origine Gentium Americannum* (1642), which claimed that the North American Natives were descended from Scandinavians who had arrived via Greenland, the Maya of the Yucatan from the Ethiopians, and the Incas from the Chinese.<sup>47</sup> Such theories influenced those who had first-hand ethnographic information. Antoine-Simon Le Page du Pratz, based on eight years living alongside the Natchez Indians in colonial Louisiana, wrote that although the majority of American "natures" (as he called them) migrated from Northeast Asia, the Mexicans were from China and the Natchez descended from trans-Atlantic migrants, either Carthaginians or Phoenicians. Although presented in the words of a Natchez informant, this origin story follows in part the theories of Grotius and more specifically of an unpublished 1718 manuscript by a missionary to Louisiana, Le Maire.<sup>48</sup> Thus the Carthaginian migration legend

persisted, and was used to grant a Mediterranean origin to Natives for whom Le Page du Pratz had particular respect.

These theories inspired my title, "Prehistoric Diasporas"; for to imagine multiple migrations from other nations, (or even several passages across the land bridge, as many archeologists propose) is to imagine confrontations and intermarriage among these distinct populations. Much as Cavalli-Sforza's measurements of genetic drift document the ancient confrontations between hunter-gatherers and agriculturalists in Europe, similar encounters may have occurred in America. Multiple migrations across a Bering Straits land bridge may have created distinct groups. Or, if Phoenician sailors did arrive two to three thousand years ago, they might have become a diasporic population, preserving their identity amidst a primitive "gentile" majority. Today "diffusionist" theories attract scorn from many anthropologists, but "diaspora" carries great prestige. The theories of American Indian origins should invite us to contrast and reexamine the dynamics of diffusion and diaspora. The real motive of Barton, Le Page du Pratz, and others, I believe, was to grant a European or classical Mediterranean origin to a select group of Indians, the Moundbuilders or the Natchez, as part of an elegaic narrative about their demise. The Natchez were attacked and dispersed by French attacks, while the Moundbuilder cultures, Adena, Hopewell, and Mississippian as they are called by anthropologists, declined for unknown reasons a thousand years ago or more. A popular nineteenth-century story, told in William Cullen Bryant's poem "The Prairies," held that they were killed off by invasions of the Indians who lived in the West at that time.<sup>49</sup> Early modern Northern Europeans admired the grandeur of classical Rome, mused upon the causes for its fall, and wavered between identifying themselves with Rome or with the barbarous tribes who sacked it. In the Americas, a similar process has occurred with the Moundbuilders, or, more recently, with the Anasazi who built the impressive cliff dwellings in the Southwest before their culture declined around the twelfth century. In a pattern similar to the Kennewick Man controversy, Euro-Americans have appropriated the mantle of a vanished people, denied the continuity between that culture and modern Native Americans, and sometimes even blamed the latter for destroying the former. These speculative visions of prehistoric diaspora establish the elite status of the vanished culture, Aztec, Natchez, or Moundbuilder, by giving them Eurasian origins.<sup>50</sup>

The debate over American Indian origins is shaped not only by race, but by region. Argentine anthropologist Augusto Cardich, who

has excavated several sites in South America that show evidence of human habitation 9,000 years ago or longer, advocates a theory of a pre-Columbian migration from Australia to South America.<sup>51</sup> Because the Bering Straits land bridge theory makes South American civilizations even "younger" than North American, the appeal of such a migration route to South America is obvious.<sup>52</sup> Uruguayan cultural critic Enrique Dussel has drawn upon this theory for his provocative attempt to "unmask Hegel's vision of history" and propose an eastward rather than westward course for human civilization, beginning in Mesopotamia and moving through India, China, and across the Pacific to Meso-America and the Andes. Dussel critiques the "myth of modernity" as an unfortunate anomaly in world history, and probably would also rebuke the paradigm of "the Atlantic world," which has emerged in history and cultural studies since the 1990s, and inspired this symposium. Yet Dussel still endorses the myth of Quezalcóatl, Montezuma's abdication to Cortes, and a quasi-Aztec millenarianism.<sup>53</sup> Latin American culture has appropriated the mantle of its Native civilizations to a much greater degree than in Anglo-America, and hence the regional pride associated with Inca or Aztec histories offers a perspective on the more obscure patterns of such appropriation in North America.

### The Autochthony of Native Americans

Finally, let us turn to the most radical, that is, most rooted and most controversial type of theory, which grants an autochthony and autonomy to Native American peoples. For most seventeenth-century Europeans the idea of an autochthonous American population was a novel heresy, but a few in America began to recognize the power of the idea for asserting the importance of the American colonies. Antonio Leon Pinelo, an official bibliographer and historiographer of the Indies who had lived eighteen years of his youth in Peru, wrote *El Paraíso en el Nuevo Mundo* or "Paradise in the New World" in 1650. For creoles, or *criollos* (those born in the New World of European parents), locating the biblical Eden in America was a strong political statement, one that could bolster the chronic discrimination these colonials felt they received from Spanish *peninsulares*.<sup>54</sup> Yet such a "creole compromise" on the origin question did little to challenge the hegemony of Judeo-Christian colonialism over Native Americans. If, as nineteenth-century anthropologist Josiah Priest claimed, "America was peopled before the flood... it was the country of Noah, and the place where the ark was erected" then the colonization of America

by Judeo-Christians to Americas could be legitimated as a sort of homecoming.<sup>55</sup> The scale of time was greater, but the effect was similar to the Hesperides and Madoc legends, or Morton and the polygenecists. The genesis, mono- or poly-, remained a biblical one. Monogenesis seems today like the humanistic, scientific, and antiracist position, but in practice it has served to support the privileged position of western science and Judeo-Christian cosmogony. To unsettle it, we should read Native American origin stories and consider the idea that nearly every culture is ethnocentric, and sees itself as the product of a special creation.

My students, whiggish historians as they generally are, have sometimes assumed that the notion of polygenesis, of human races as separate species, was pervasive in the Age of Discovery because the conquistadors treated the Indians as beasts. In fact, polygenesis rose to prominence as an article of nineteenth-century "scientific racism" and was rare before then. Its most prominent Early Modern advocate was Isaac La Peyrère, author of *Præ-Adamianæ*, subtitled in its English translation *A Theological Systeme upon that Proposition that Men were before Adam* (1656). This treatise understandably turned La Peyrère into a celebrated heretic, and many pious writers set out to rebut him. The issue of American Indian origins was one of La Peyrère's primary pieces of evidence, but it was not what attracted most attention to the text. La Peyrère had already published a *Relation of Greenland*, and pointed out that since the Norse voyagers had encountered native Eskimos when they reached North America, the Native Americans could hardly be their descendants, as Hugo Grotius had claimed. Today a challenge to the Adamic Genesis is no longer a heresy, but the idea that human beings arose in the New World rather than migrating from the Old does place one beyond the pale of scientific respectability.

How can Euro-Americans disabuse ourselves of the Eurocentrism that for five hundred years has prevented recognition of American Indian autochthony and sovereignty? An Iroquois acquaintance of mine told an anecdote about his brother, who was employed as a tour guide. Some Japanese tourists commented on the resemblance of his facial features to their own, and he replied that this was because the Japanese were descendants of his people. The tourists were nonplussed, too polite to argue. But let us think critically about this anecdote. If Kennewick Man is most closely related to the Ainu people indigenous to Japan's northern isle of Hokkaido, as some anthropologists have claimed, and also the ancestor of the Umatilla and Yakima Indians of the Columbia River valley, then are not the

Ainu the offspring of a Yakima just as much as the Yakima of an Ainu?<sup>56</sup> We are misled, I think, by our habits of confusing racial terms with geographic ones. By using geographical terms as ethnic labels, and then using these ethnic labels as surrogates for race, as with "African-American" or "Causasian," we allow the characteristics of Kennewick Man, or of Native Americans generally, to support imperialistic claims that Native American sovereignty is invalid, and Native American identity somehow inauthentic.

### CONCLUSION

The critical study of the question of Native American origins demands that we reflect upon how "race" has been constructed not only historically, but also prehistorically. Ethnocentric contradictions and biases have infected the popular discussions of human prehistory because we extend our names and notions for human races and cultures of the past few hundred years to the archeological vestiges of peoples as old as ten thousand years. In effect, our historiography has still not responded to the consequences of the shift from a shallow biblical time frame to a deeper geological and paleontological scale. Such an extreme application of anthropological "upstreaming" as deciding whether Kennewick Man is Umatilla or not may be compelled by the legal demands of NAGPRA, but when critically considered it only reveals the absurdity of popular notions of race and ethnicity. A thousand years is long enough to utterly transform cultures, languages, and races. Yet we too easily collapse temporal gaps and pretend to determine the "race" of a Kennewick Man, pretend that the landing of Phonicians in America two thousand years ago would make a difference in the racial identity of Native Americans today.

A critical recognition of how the deeply ingrained assumptions of Judeo-Christian cosmology and European colonialism have influenced the construction of Paleoindian cultures in the Americas should help Anglo-Americans appreciate the perspective of Native American cosmologies, even if such oral histories are not given the same weight as archaeological evidence.<sup>57</sup> In teaching about race and ethnicity in our courses, the perspectives offered by American pre-history and Native American myth and literature can be extremely valuable, precisely because most students' ignorance of this material leaves them open to enlightening perspectives, if the material is presented properly. When I teach the Mayan creation story *Popol Vuh* I try to deflect the inevitable comparisons to the creation story in Genesis by asking

students to articulate the Judeo-Christian myth in the context and vocabulary of the Mayan, rather than the other way around. Ask not how "they are like us" but how "we are like them." Rather than impose an Old World origin upon New World peoples, try to imagine a New World influence upon Europe and Asia.

## NOTES

1. My thanks to Gary Taylor and Phil Beidler, organizers of the conference in Tuscaloosa, and especially to Madonna Moss of the Department of Anthropology, University of Oregon, for her help in revising this essay. Assistance such as hers makes this sort of inter-disciplinary work possible.
2. For a fine study of Kennenwick Man and the controversy, see Roger Downey, *Riddle of the Bones: Politics, Science, Race, and the Story of Kennenwick Man* (New York: Copernicus, 2000). Although the case has aroused extensive press coverage for more than five years, it is important to recognize that conflicts between Native peoples and archeologists need not be so contentious. The excavation of remains of similar age in Idaho and Southeast Alaska proceeded much more smoothly, with the cooperation of local Native peoples. See Terence E. Fifield, "Human Remains Found in Alaska Reported to be 9,730 Years Old," Society for American Archaeology *Bulletin*, 14:5 at www.saa.org, and Susanne J. Miller et al., "The Buhl Burial: A Paleoindian Woman from Southern Idaho," *American Antiquity*, 63:3 (1998): 437-456. The latter paper is my source for the figure of thirty-two similar finds.
3. While my critique aims to expose the racial character of research in this field, at least one anthropologist has attacked the gender bias in this insular field dominated by men: "Paleoindian studies stands out as particularly circumscribed within a closely interactive group of scholars contained by boundaries of specialized journals dedicated solely to Paleoindian research (for example, the *Mammoth Trumpet*)." Joan Gero, "The Social World of Prehistoric Facts: Gender and Power in Paleoindian Research," *Women in Archaeology: A Feminist Critique*, ed. Hilary du Cros and Laurajane Smith (Canberra, Australia: Prehistory Press, 1993), 33.
4. See for example "Expert Panel Recasts Origin of Fossil Man in Northwest" by Timothy Egan, *The New York Times* October 16, 1999, which has photos of the skull and the reconstruction; "Find this man's origins: Congress should approve scientific study" editorial, *The Register-Guard*, Eugene, Oregon, November 23, 1997.
5. Lafaye, *Quetzalcoatl and Guadalupe: The Formation of Mexican National Consciousness, 1531-1813* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1976), 39.
6. On this debate see Francois-Xavier de Charlevoix, *Journal d'un voyage fait par ordre du roi dans l'Amérique septentrionale*, ed. Pierre Berthiaume (Montreal: Les Presses Universitaires de Montreal, 1994),

- 116-135, and Richard Popkin, *Isaac La Peyrère: His Life, Work and Influence* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1987).
7. "[U]n pretexte a montrer beaucoup d'érudition, une connaissance des oeuvres classiques et du pédantisme." John R. Carpenter, *Histoire de la Littérature Française sur la Louisiane de 1673 à 1766* (Paris: Nizet, 1966), 261.
8. Joseph-François Lafrau, *News des Sauvages américains comparés aux nouveaux des premiers temps* (Paris, 1724); English edition: *Customs of the American Indians Compared with the Customs of Primitive Times*, trans. and ed. William Fenton and Elizabeth Moore (Toronto: Champlain Society, 1974); on Acosta, see below.
9. Ridge, "The North American Indians, part 1," *The Hesperian*, 8:1 (March 1862) qtd. in Scott Michaelsen, *The Limits of Multiculturalism: Interrogating the Origins of American Anthropology* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999), 142.
10. Morton, *Crania Americana: or, A Comparative View of the Skulls of Various Aboriginal Nations of North and South America: To Which is Prefixed an Essay on the Varieties of the Human Species* (Philadelphia: J. Dobson, 1839); see also Paul Semolin, "'Nature's Nation': Natural History as Nationalism in the New Republic," *Northwest Review*, 30:2 (1992): 6-41.
11. Gould, *The Mismeasure of Man* (New York: Norton, 1981), 50-68. See also Michaelsen, *The Limits of Multiculturalism*, 143-146, who treats Morton much more kindly.
12. Qtd. in Robert Bieder, *Science Encounters the Indian, 1820-1880* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1986), 67.
13. See Dorothy Lippert, "In Front of the Mirror: Native Americans and Academic Archaeology" and other essays in *Native Americans and Archaeologists: Stepping Stones to Common Ground*, ed. Nina Swidler et al. (Walnut Creek, CA: Altamira Press, 1997).
14. John Lloyd Stephens, *Incidents of Travel in Yucatan* (Norman: University of OK Press, 1962).
15. Le Plongeon, *Queen Moo and the Egyptian Sphinx* (Paris, 1878). See Robert Wauchoppe, *Last Tribes and Sunken Continents: Myth and Method in the Study of American Indians* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962), 7-21; and Lawrence G. Desmond, "Augustus Le Plongeon: A Fall from Archaeological Grace," in *Assembling the Past: Studies in the Professionalization of Archeology* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1999), 81-90.
16. See David A. Brading, *The First America: The Spanish Monarchy, Creole Patriots, and the Liberal State, 1492-1867* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 365.
17. James M. Chandler, "Immigrants from the Other Side," *Mammoth Trumpet*, 17:1 (December 2001): 11-16; Thomas D. Dillehay, *The Settlement of the Americas: A New Prehistory* (New York: Basic Books,

- 2000), 68. For a rebuttal to this theory, promoted by Dennis Stanford of the Smithsonian Institution, see Lawrence G. Straus, "Solutrean Settlement of North America? A review of reality," *American Antiquity*, 65:2(2000): 219-226.
18. Stephen C. Jett, "Diffusion versus Independent Development: The Bases of Controversy," *Man Across the Sea: Problems of Pre-Columbian Contacts*, ed. Riley et al. (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1971), 5-53.
19. Francisco Lopez de Gomara, *Historia general de las Indias* (Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1941), II: 248-249; qtd. in Lee Huddleston, *Origins of the American Indians: European Concepts, 1492-1729* (Austin: University of Texas Press, Institute for Latin American Studies, 1967), 25.
20. On the Atlantis myth see Williams, *Fammaric Archaeology*, 130-155, and Wauchope, *Last Tribes and Sunken Continents*, both discuss some of the dozens of popular books on the subject. On Phoenician-Carthaginian migration, see Michael Frank Doran, "A Time Perspective for Study of the Trans-Atlantic Phoenician Problem," M.A. Thesis, University of Oregon, 1971.
21. Thomas Jefferson, *Notes on the State of Virginia*, ed. Frank Shuffleton, (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1998), 107.
22. *Ibid.*, 316.
23. *Ibid.*, 108.
24. *Ibid.*, 107.
25. Luigi Luca and Francesco Cavalli-Sforza, *The Great Human Diasporas: The History of Diversity and Evolution* (Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1995), 120-121. Related research using mitochondrial DNA has resulted in the theory of an "African Eve" origin of paleo-humans in Africa, some 150,000-200,000 years ago. See R. M. Cann, Stoneking and A. Wilson "Mitochondrial DNA and human evolution," *Nature*, 325 (1987): 31-36.
26. Jose de Acosta, *Historia natural y moral de las Indias* (1590). English edn. *Natural and Moral History of the Indies*, trans. Edward Grimston (1604, rpt. Hakluyt Society, 1880), I: 60, 61.
27. *Ibid.*, I: 72.
28. Williams, *Fammaric Archaeology*, 32.
29. *Ibid.*, 126, 284.
30. Dillehay, *The Settlement of the Americas*, 168-180. Dillehay is the principal investigator of the Monte Verde site in Chile, dated at more than 12,000 years ago. This finding on the west coast of South America would imply a much earlier presence of humans in North America, or possibly a trans-Pacific migration.
31. Acosta, *History of the Indies*, I: 67.
32. Diego Duran, *The History of the Indies of New Spain*, trans. Doris Heyden (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1994), 4-5.
33. Williams, *A Key into the Language of America* (London, 1645); Menasseh Ben Israel, *The hope of Israel/Menasseh ben Israel; the English translation by Moses Wall, 1652*, ed. Henry Méchoulan and Gérard Nahon (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987).

34. Braude, Benjamin, "Les contes persans de Menasseh Ben Israël: Polémique, apogée et dissimulation à Amsterdam au xviii<sup>e</sup> siècle," *Annales Historie, Sciences Sociales*, 49 (1994): 1107-1138.
35. Jones, *History of the Ojibway Indians* (1861), rpt. Toronto: Canadiana House, 1973; qtd. in Michaelsen, *The Limits of Multiculturalism*, 132.
36. The ideological links between English colonialism in North America and in Ireland are numerous, and several scholars have studied similarities in the representations of the two peoples as "savages." See for example Francis Jennings, *The Invasion of America: Indians, Colonialism, and the Cant of Conqueror* (New York: Norton, 1976); and, for a much later period, Astrid Wind, "Irish Legislative Independence and the Politics of Staging American Indians in the 1790s," *Symbiosis: A Journal of Anglo-American Literary Relations*, 5:1 (April 2001), 1-16.
37. Morton, *New English Cannan or New Cannan* (New York: Arno Press, 1972), 20.
38. See Djeidal Kadri, *Columbus and the Ends of the Earth: Europe's Prophectic Rhetoric as Conquering Ideology* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992), 184-188. Karen Kupperman's paper in this volume is also relevant to the issue.
39. For a discussion of the Madoc myth, see Mackenthun, *Metaphors of Dispossession*, 29-30; and Gwyn Williams, *Madoc: The Making of a Myth* (London: Methuen, 1979). For later claims, see Robert Silverberg, *Monard Builders of Ancient America: The Archaeology of a Myth* (Greenwich, CT: New York Graphic Society, 1968), 85.
40. Oviedo, *Historia general y natural de las Indias* (1535-1550, rpt. Madrid, 1959), I: 17-18; see also Brading, *The First America*, 36.
41. Gillespie, *The Aztec Kings: The Construction of Rulership in Mexican History* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1989), xli; Lafaye, *Quetzalcoatl and Guadalupe*, chap. 9; Bernardino de Sahagun, *Historia general de las cosas de Nueva España*, English edition *Florentine Codex: The General History of the Things of New Spain* (Santa Fe: School for American Research, 1951-55); Mackenthun, *Metaphors of Dispossession*, 89-140.
42. See John Moffitt and Santiago Sebastian, *O Brave New People: The European Invention of the American Indian* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1996), 31-43.
43. Brading, *The First America*, 173.
44. Wauchope, *Last Tribes and Sunken Continents*, 61.
45. Moffitt and Sebastian, *O Brave New People*, 243.
46. Barton, *Observations on some parts of Natural History, to which is prefixed an account of several remarkable vestiges of an ancient date, which have been discovered in different parts of North America* (London: for the author, 1787).
47. On Groitius see Huddleston, *Origins of the American Indians*, 118-121; Charlevoix, *Journal d'un Voyage*, 121-130.
48. Le Page du Pratz, Antoine-Simon, *Histoire de la Louisiane* (Paris: De Bure, Veuve Delaguerre, et Lambert, 1758), III, 61-86. For an English

- translation, see my website at <http://www.darkwing.uoregon.edu/~gsayre/LPDP>. For the Le Maire manuscript, see Jean Delanguez, "M. Le Maire on Louisiana," *Mid-America*, 19:2 (1937): 124-154.
49. See my "The Mound Builders and the Imagination of American Antiquity in Jefferson, Bartram, and Chateaubriand," *Early American Literature*, 33:3 (Fall 1998): 225-249.
50. The politics of this dynamic are complicated by the existence of Native oral histories that provide some support for these scenarios. The Aztec legend of Aztlan, the Lenapes' *Walam Olum*, and the migration of the Sauk from the St. Lawrence to the Mississippi all bear witness to the dynamic movements of Native American populations. And given two or three thousand years, Native American cultures and populations could have changed so dramatically as to absorb and transform many groups of trans-oceanic migrants without leaving a trace. While much current interest in Atlantic history and diaspora as paradigms for the study of race is driven by work on the Black Atlantic, a Native American diasporic history may offer quite different paradigms rotating around the Pacific, and involving thousands rather than hundreds of years.
51. Interview with Augusto Cardich, "The Southern Route: not Beringia, but Tierra del Fuego," *Mammoth Trampet*, 16:2 (March 2001), 4-6. Also, there has been research into the diffusion of the sweet potato and certain squash species from South America to Polynesia or vice versa. See *Man Across the Sea*, 328-375.
52. Because evidence of human presence on Pacific islands dates back only 2000 or 3000 years at most, the anthropological consensus is strongly against Cardich's theory. On the intellectual history of the immaturity and inferiority of the Americas, see Antonello Gerbi's classic *The Dispute of the New World*, trans. Jeremy Moyle (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1973).
53. Enrique Dussel, *The Invention of the Americas: Eclipse of the Other and the Myth of Modernity*, trans. Michael D. Barber (New York: Continuum, 1995), 74, 75-90.
54. Leon Pinelo, *El Paraiso en el Nuevo Mundo* (Lima, 1943); for a discussion of this work, see David A. Brading, *The First America*, 200-204.
55. Priest, *American Antiquities and Discoveries in the West: being an exhibition of the evidence that an ancient population of partially civilized nations differing entirely from those of the present Indians peopled America many centuries before its discovery by Columbus, and inquiries into their origins, with a copious description of many of their stupendous works, now in ruins, with conjectures concerning what may have become of them; compiled from travels, authentic sources, and the researches of antiquarian societies* (Albany, NY: Hoffman and White, 1835), preface, n.p.
56. The Ainu have been discriminated against by ethnic Japanese, who nurture a myth of their own primal sovereignty over the islands in defiance of evidence of their ancient migration from mainland Asia. But my

- point here is that the changed residence of Native Americans should not alter how we trace their ancestry to Northeast Asia, if this is the conclusion supported by genetic and archeological evidence.
57. For one example of the debate over the value of oral histories of events thousands of years old, see Thomas, *Skull Wars*, 239-253; and Vince Deloria, Jr., *Red Earth, White Lies: Native Americans and the Myth of Scientific Fact* (Golden, CO: Fulcrum, 1997), 161-209.