

## **ROBERT FERNEA**

Professor Emeritus, Dept. of Anthropology and Middle Eastern Studies, University of Texas at Austin

### **ABSTRACT**

#### **Demonizing the Other**

A terrorist becomes a demonized human being. What are the implications of such a definition? Demonization of an "other," whether an individual or a group, rules out the common understandings which we share with those with whom we identify. Demonized humans are beyond normal human comprehension because they are outside the boundaries of the human community. The rules governing military combat, therefore, no longer apply. Many examples of this can be found, but I will use, as a case in point, the narrativization of the Native Americans (American Indians) by the European settlers who colonized the North American continent. From the early seventeenth until the mid nineteenth centuries narratives of captivity were of great popularity among Americans of European descent. These published tales featured episodes of torture and torment inflicted on settlers, frontier people and pioneers, usually women and children, which reinforced the notion of the Indians as a savage population that must be brought under control at any cost. I shall discuss captive narratives as a cultural construction which helped European settlers ignore the rights and lives of Native Americans. What does this tell us about the relationship between dominant powers and those who resist domination? What does it lend to our understanding of terrorism in the contemporary world? This will be the subject of our discussion.

Lecture for ISODARCO conference on Terror and Terrorism, February 9-16, 2003, Andalo, Italy.

#### **ROOTS OF TERRORISM: DEMONIZATION OF "OTHERS" IN FRONTIER AMERICA**

By Robert Fernea, Professor Emeritus of Anthropology, University of Texas at Austin

Creating an Evil Other and a Virtuous Self is an essential part of the development of violence and terrorism. No matter who may be involved, the more absolute the belief in "our" right and "their" wrong, the more meritorious otherwise forbidden behavior becomes. Here I would like to use the colonial conflict between European settlers and Native Americans to demonstrate the process whereby the Other may be Demonized.

The process of vilifying the American Indian began some 300 years ago - before the United States of America became a nation - and only recently, in a few films and books, has the persecution of the Native American been regarded with newsympathy for the Indians. Even when the American Indians were all but eliminated, the image of the Indian remained that of the Savage transgressor, while the White man stayed blameless. This attitude was reflected in American popular culture long after the number of Indians had dropped well beyond any possibility of successful armed resistance to White domination. Only in the last decade or so, has a serious second look at the conquest of America begun to reveal how relentlessly the Native Americans were victimized. By this time American Indians were only 1% of our population. How did this happen? How could we be so hypocritical, so self-deceived, and rationalize our violence for so long? Only by virtue of a symbolic transformation of identity was this possible, a transformation whereby the American Indians were reduced to Savages and Barbarians.

It is important to recognize that in North America the first conflicts between the English Puritans and the Indians were localized and erratic. America was not a country; the Indians were not a state; no war took place between organized nations. Indians had helped the English in the early years of settlement and there was much social interaction between the groups, both peaceful and conflicted. Finally, however, a decisive clash between Indians and settlers did occur in the King Phillip's War, 1675-1677, which has been called the most deadly battle between colonists and Indians in the early years of English settlement in North

America. It was after this war that all American Indians for over three hundred years came to be seen as evil Savages, sub-human, worthy of destruction in the eyes of most European settlers. This decisive, stigmatizing classification justified the genocide which followed. In accepting the invitation to participate in this ISODARCO conference, I decided to examine King Philip's War and its consequences in America history in the hope that it might offer a fruitful basis for general discussion of the origins and basis of terrorism and violence.

Situations, attitudes, beliefs, even language similar to those in modern America today were present in our Colonial past, thus important lessons may be inferred about our contemporary relations with the Arab world. In fact, I am looking at this historic situation with the mind-set of a person who has been a student of the Arab world most of my professional life. My construction of our colonial history is through the prism of the present day situation in the Middle East. I am biased by the present, which inevitably helps organize my construction of our past. And it is to the present I will finally turn.

Most European and Asian countries have experienced a period of national expansion and domination of others, whether neighbors or colonies at a distance from the homeland. American experience as a British colony lasted for around two centuries and ended in rebellion. This parallels the experience of many once-colonized nations around the world. However, the struggle for independence was coupled with a determination to dominate what is now the North American homeland of the United States. For most of our history the struggle at the Frontier, the "unsettled West," was part of our national life despite (or because of) the fact that Native Americans, Indians, for several thousand years had occupied that "unsettled West." Our domination of Native Americans and our occupation of the continent finally meant the near extermination of these peoples. How did this proceed? How did the greatest democracy in the world develop at the same time that Native Americans were being driven from their lands and their ways of life forced to end? The answer clearly is that this was possible in large part by denying human equality to these Others, by demonizing them and, at the same time, making heroes of the White American.

At the beginning of the 21st century the United States has completed its territorial expansion and has become an imperial force in other parts of the world, some times directly (we have some form of military presence in around 30 countries) or indirectly, through globalizing American business and through world-wide cultural expansion. For most Americans, cheaper labor costs have meant lower prices for commodities. We thus have enjoyed a commodity-oriented, prosperity-by-default economy along with enormous gains in income and wealth for a small minority. In the 1990's the majority of Americans were economically optimistic.

But suddenly, in the course of this political and economic expansion, a traumatic event has occurred affecting all classes of American society. For the first time we have been attacked from the outside world. The two most gigantic office towers in the country have been demolished; part of a well-known skyline is gone. The center of our military establishment was damaged. Our civil airplanes were pirated and destroyed. Thus was a national trauma, a blow of great emotional and material consequence to New Yorkers.

For nearly all Americans, the 11 September, 2001 assault on the Twin Towers and the Pentagon was a totally unexpected, outrageous experience. We may have known that not everyone in the world liked us, but we were amazed to discover that some other people in the world hate us, would - and could - kill us in our own land, in fact. In fact, we have quickly learned to fear and hate them, whoever "Them" may be and whoever "Who" may include. "They" have been publicly damned by our President using Old Testament language; "They" are condemned, hunted everywhere, at home and abroad. The America public has been part of all this through constant coverage in our newspapers and on TV. Security precautions make the existential presence of unseen dangers felt at the airports and on our borders. Millions of Muslims living in America are being forced to register. Arabs and Muslims around the world have become objects of our

suspicious. Americans, still the majority, are ready for war against Iraq, part of the Other, waiting for our military to strike out and eliminate enemies, as we did in Afghanistan. We are afraid of what may happen in our homeland. But contrary to some current news commentators, this is not a new experience in America.

In the early 1670's, Puritans living in the New England colonies, the northern group of early settlements on the East coast of America, suffered from a traumatic experience equal to 9/11 - it was called King Philip's War. Apparently friendly relations between the colonies and their Indian neighbors abruptly deteriorated and Puritan lives were lost in attacks which the English were ill-prepared to resist. Many European colonists' lives were lost. Native American Indians suddenly were seen as Savages and Barbarians, terrorists, who would kill any European, anywhere, night or day, no matter what their sex, age, class or even religion. What is the background to that traumatic war? How did it develop?

In early 17th century New England, many Indians had been converted to Christianity and this was a process the Puritans thought would continue. Many of these Indians, like the Wampanoag, part of the Algonquin language speakers group, were horticulturalists who supplemented their corn cultivation with fishing along the Atlantic coast. Conversion to Christianity did not seem to be the cause of general Indian resistance. Along the Western borders of the Puritan colonies, Indian "Prayer Towns" had emerged, where Christian Indians farmed and prayed in churches, like the Puritans. For educators like John Eliot, this conversion and education of the Indians was a primary Puritan responsibility, for the Indians were believed to be a lost Hebrew tribe and to convert them was to carry on Christ's work. The Bible was translated into an Indian language and over 1000 copies published. Money was raised for a college at Harvard University, which would be set aside for Native Americans. Many Indians attended church, wore European clothes, and went to schools to learn English like Puritan children. For many people living at the time, a new society seemed to be in construction, shared by both Europeans and Native Americans.

However, with this so-called Great Migration of 1630, more Puritans arrived from England. They feared civil warfare there and persecution with the return of the Catholic Stuarts to the monarchy. The increased number of immigrants placed greater pressure on the land resources within the Colony and this encouraged more farmer families and fur trappers to move West, to live among their Indian neighbors. Many new settlers had more Indian than European neighbors. Interactions between the Whites and the Indians were commonplace and widely accepted.

This peaceful co-habitation of the same land apparently suited many settlers and Indians very well. However, the Colonies' religious leaders, like Increase Mather, first President of Harvard University and later on a leader of the Salem Witch trials, became greatly concerned. He preached that the movement of Puritans out into the hinterlands was resulting in a decline in church attendance, and this, he stated, was a disaster. Hellfire and damnation was a certainty if religious education and guidance was not a constant factor for all members of the community.

The Puritan Church was the major social institution of the New England colonial settlements. As the new migrants and some established settlers moved away from the Colonies, that move not only threatened the religious premises of civil life but also undermined the authority of the religious leaders. In addition, Native Americans, innocent or evil, Christian or pagan, were considered to be potentially ill-omened company since they were a distance from full humanity, a view set forth by Christopher Columbus in 1492. A mixture of Europeans with Indians was viewed by some to be a sure way to dilute or lose English civilization in the New World.

Therefore, we can say that the growing concern in the English Colonies was strongly linked to an increased need for land, but also to what the ruling hierarchy saw as a weakening of Church leadership and control as Puritans and Indians settled together, away from central authority. Further, large numbers of Indians were dying from alien diseases brought over by the Europeans, and were thus less and less able to defend their

own interests through territorial occupation and regular use of their land. A real contest for control of natural resources, in this case land and all its uses, was developing.

At the same time, some Puritans began to argue about priorities. Was it not morally more important to save Indian souls rather than seize Indian land? However, until King Philip's war, 1675-1677, open hostility between the English and the Wampanoag, the Indians closest to the Puritan Colonies, was largely avoided. This war proved to be the most devastating conflict between Indian and settler in Colonial history. Jill Lepore, who has recently published a history of that war, writes:

In every measurable way King Philip's war was a harsher conflict than any Indian-English conflict that preceded it. It took place on a grander scale; it lasted longer; the methods both sides employed were more severe; and the language the English adopted to justify and document it was more dismissive of Indian culture - Indian religious beliefs; Indian warfare; Indians' use of the land; and, ultimately, Indian sovereignty - than it had ever been before. In some important ways King Philip's War was a defining moment, when any lingering, though slight, possibility for Algonquian political and cultural autonomy was lost and when the English moved one giant step closer to the worldview that would create, a century and half later, the Indian removal policy adopted by Andrew Jackson.

What happened to destroy the peaceful English-Wampanoag relationship? What precipitated the two-year conflict, King Philip's war of 1675-1676? There are conflicting opinions which emerge even at the time it happened, though the views of the Indians involved are sadly missing. Despite the level of literacy among them, no record of the war written by an Indian is known to exist. However, modern historical commentaries have revised the accepted older views, which entirely blamed the Indians and, in particular, made one Indian the English called "Philip" the evil nemesis, the Evil One on whom much of the blame was placed.

Philip was a sachem, or chief, among the Wampanoag Indians, who lived near the Puritan colonies in what is now Massachusetts and Rhode Island. In some earlier encounters with hostile Indian groups, the Wampanoag had been allies of the English settlers. The Wampanoag probably numbered about 12,000 until contact with the English brought small pox and venereal and other diseases for which the Indians had no natural resistance. This resulted in a number of epidemics, which devastated the Wampanoag population. By 1675, less than half of the Wampanoag were left alive. At the same time, the English population had risen to between 40,000 and 50,000, and was about three times as large as their Indian neighbors. The combination of epidemics and conflict with other Indian tribes left vast tracts of Wampanoag land uninhabited and thus open for easy settlement by the English. Nevertheless, the Wampanoag did not agree their territory was empty, for in their view it was common property, owned by their group as a whole. For the English, property was fenced, defined and privately owned. This was a major source of misunderstanding between the two groups.

By the time of the war, the Wampanoag were self-supporting horticulturalists, peaceable and in many ways well on the way to adapting to English styles of life. They enjoyed the goods supplied to them by the English; in fact, they were becoming dependent on the white man for such items as iron kettles and cookware, iron traps, and firearms. However, as the number of English settlers increased, the English were becoming more and more concerned about acquiring more land. Sometimes, they fairly bought land from the Wampanoags, but sometimes they cheated the Indians, which created bad feelings. To deal with this issue a 1670 Peace Treaty between the English and Massasoit, also a Sachem (or chief) of the Wampanoag Indians, was signed in 1670. The treaty declared that the Wampanoag would not "give, sell, or convey any of their Lands, Territories, or Possessions whatsoever, to any person or persons, whomsoever, without the privity and consent of the Government of Plymouth".

On September 29, 1671, the Wampanoag chief Philip, signed another agreement with the Plymouth Colony, stating that he and his people were now subjects of the royal British government and bound by the

laws of the colony. He also agreed to follow the colonies guidance in affairs of war and in the disposal of Indian land. This agreement, in effect, stripped the Wampanoag of all power and made them dependent subjects of the Plymouth Colony. Judging from subsequent events, Philip may well have signed this agreement under pressure, to gain time, for Wampanoag land was rapidly being occupied and any ability to deal equitably with the Europeans was disappearing. All that was left to them was open resistance.

With support from the Nipmuc, Pocumtuc, and Narragansett tribes, Philip and the Wampanoag began to plan an uprising for the spring of 1676. But, before the Indian tribes were fully united and prepared, an incident occurred which threw off their timetables and started the war a year early.

In January of 1675, the body of John Sassamon, a 'praying Indian' who had studied at Harvard, who was Philip's English-speaking secretary and a friend to preacher-educator John Eliot, was discovered under the ice covering the Assowampset Pond. For several days before, Sassamon had warned the Plymouth authorities of a possible uprising by Philip and the Wampanoags. So the Wampanoag were blamed, justly or otherwise, for killing a fellow tribesman who was a traitor to their interests.

Three Wampanoagmen were tried before a jury of both Englishmen and Indians. The only problem with this arrangement was that the Indian on the jury were not allowed to vote on the verdict. The defendants were found guilty and sentenced to be hung. The execution for the two eldest went smoothly, but when the youngest was hung the rope broke. Unnerved, the young Indian claimed that the two who had been hung were guilty but that he was innocent. Undeterred by this, the English hung the Indian boy again, this time successfully.

When word of the triple hanging reached the Wampanoags they became incensed. They felt that the trial had been unfair. Apparently the court had refused to hear a witness for the defense. King Philip, also disturbed by rumors that the English were planning to arrest him, held a war council at Mount Hope. The Wampanoag were behind their chief as were the Nipmuc and Pocumtuc. The Pennacook and the Abenaki were divided in loyalties, as were several other Indian groups.

Then, in late June of 1675, a settler from Swansea village killed a Wampanoag in a dispute over cattle. The Wampanoag quickly struck back and on June 24, some of them attacked Swansea town, killing and scalping eight settlers. Other clashes soon occurred. King Philip's War had begun.

At this time, the English military forces in New England consisted only of small militia in each town, whose training was based on formal English military practices. There were no security provisions; the settlements had no stockades, colony homes easily could be accessed, burned, and the inhabitants killed. This initial inability to counterattack, to know where the next strike would be, to see loved ones of all ages killed and scalped, was terrifying and certainly led to thinking that tied the Indians to Satanic supernatural forces. Conflicts with Indians had occurred before, as thousands of Pequot Indians had been killed in their own settlements some years before, but fighting was carried to the Indians, not the other way around. Bringing danger home to the colonies was a qualitative shift in circumstances: the advent of unforeseen terror. So it seems reasonable to argue that at this point in American history Indians, all Indians, began to be regarded as the incarnations of Evil, savages, barbarians who in the eyes of increasing numbers of Whites deserved to be routed and killed by any means possible.

The next step was to construct the identity of the Evil Savage, and this was done by appropriating conceptual artifacts which had already been employed by earlier settlers in the New World - the Spanish. For years Puritan settlers had reminded each other over and over again that they did not want to be like the Catholic Spanish who had preceded them to America. The Spanish were inhuman, unchristian Papists whose example should not be followed by Puritan Protestants. A work translated from the Spanish which appeared in colony publications of the time states:

"The Spanish have a perfect right to rule these barbarians of the New World and the adjacent islands, who in prudence, skill, virtues, and humanity are as inferior to the Spanish as children to adults, or women to men, for there exists between the two as great a difference as between savage and cruel races and the most merciful, between the most intemperate and the moderate and temperate and, I might even say, between apes and men....

(Juan Gines de Sepulveda, *The Second Democrates*, 1547)

The English Protestants, unlike the wicked Spanish, felt it was their duty to make the Indians Christians like themselves, and this meant they should be educated, like Europeans, not treated like apes! As stated earlier, a special college exclusively for Indians already had been added to the new Harvard University. (They never attended it and the building became the home of the Harvard University Press.) Many Indians had already become Christians. The so-called "praying Indians" had established settlements with churches, which lay around the Western boundaries of the Colonies' territory. Many Christian Indians lived among the settlers in the Colonies. On the surface, things seemed peaceful; America was apparently to become a home of Christian peoples of common faith from many different origins. After all, the Puritans had the Quakers, whom they distrusted and disliked, living among them. If they could live with Quakers, why not Christian Indians?

King Philip's war seems to have brought these utopian ideas to an end. After the war, in 1685, a representative of James II of England was sent over to investigate the war and report back to His Majesty. I quote part of his report:

"The government of the Massachusetts (to give it in their own words) do declare these are the great evils for which God hath given the heathen commission to rise against them: The wofull breach of the 5th commandment, in contempt of their authority, which is a sin highly provoking to the Lord: For men wearing long hair and perewigs made of women's hair; for women wearing borders of hair and for cutting, curling and laying out the hair, and disguising themselves by following strange fashions in their apparell: For profaneness in the people not frequenting their (church) meetings, and others going away before the blessing be pronounced: For suffering the Quakers to live amongst them and to set up their thresholds by Gods thresholds, contrary to their old lawes and resolutions."

One magistrate at the time said this conflict was the result of trying to make uncivilized people into Christians too soon, before they were civilized. But the Puritan leaders argued that it was because of their own sins that this catastrophe has happened. "We have sinned, now we are being punished." So the paradigm which began to structure White and Indian relations took form: the Indians were Savage servants of the Devil, the manifestation of Evil, but they were also present to punish the settlers if they allowed themselves to slide away from the governance of the church and the direction of its leadership.

This view of White- Indian relations became the basis for the first literary genre to emerge in colonial America, the "Captivity Narrative." Twenty or so of these literary accounts were published between 1682 and 1776, but many went into several editions and printings. The first, most popular and influential of these

captivity narratives went into eight editions. This memoir, called *The Sovereignty & Goodness of God, Together, with the Faithfulness of His Promises Displayed; Being a Narrative of the Captivity and Restauration of Mrs. Mary Rowlandson*, was last republished in 1773. In her memoir, Mrs. Rowlandson tells us how sorely she was tried and how complete her penitence had become during her captivity.

According to Mrs. Rowlandson, to be taken by the Indians was a new opportunity for much needed repentance. She makes clear that the reason she was spared the tomahawk and the bloody deaths she witnessed the rest of her family receive, was so she could experience the fate of the damned in the hands of barbarians. That she had not been raped, that she was in fact fed and kindly treated most of time by her captors had nothing to do with their natures, "black creatures in the night, which made the place a lively resemblance of hell," "...wild beast of the forest" "...ravenous wolves," she wrote. God alone had stopped their bloody hands from acting, hands from which she was safely ransomed after two years of (apparent) fear and trembling.

Thus, Mrs. Rowlandson continued, by scourging God's people, the Indians served Him. No matter how strong their Evil desires might have been, the hand of God reached down and kept these terrible creatures from raping and killing her. In this way Puritan hermeneutics provided a totalizing poetics for Mary Rowlandson and her readers. The unfamiliar OTHER was reduced to an instrumentality of Satan himself, in which They, the Indians, totally lacked rationality, morality, or agency. Rowlandson wrote of her fears and terrors along with colorful descriptions observations of Indian daily life and ceremonies. Both her morality tale of redemption and her ethnography fascinated America readers for more than a hundred years. They had the virtue of a religious meditation combined with the excitement of a European woman's brave encounter with the Evil Ones - and her eventual salvation, for she was ransomed and safely returned home after two years captivity.

Books were a major form of information and opinion at this time, equivalent to modern media in their impact. The popular stories of captivity by Indians were an establishment-approved way of dealing with fears common among the settlers, fears of Indians on the one hand and of damnation on the other. It was essential that the need to kill Indians and drive them away from the settlements be seen as a God-given necessity. Thus attitudes and beliefs which together made the genocide of Native Americans a fact of life became hegemonic in America well before we became a nation in 1776. The Other was given an identity, one of evil and unlimited perversity. "Getting rid of the Indian" whether by arms or incarceration became taken for granted by the American public, a matter of common assumption.

King Philip's War was a defining moment, shaping settlers attitudes toward the Native Americans for years to come. It was also an early devastating experience for the Indians, one of the first of many. The Wampanoags were totally defeated, many of them scalped, burned at the stake, their heads put on poles by the Puritans, their land lost, their villages scattered. Philip, the primary Evil One on whom the conflict was principally blamed was killed, his wife sold into slavery and his ten year old son sentenced to death by the settlers, though this sentence was apparently never carried out. Christian Indians were put in chains, sent to camps and isolated from the English, their number deliberately confused with surrendering and captured pagan Indians. Selling the captured Indians to slave traders became a profitable Puritan option and thousands of Indians were shipped to Caribbean plantations. Removing Indians from the Puritan towns became paramount and even if Indians were Christians it did not prevent them from being interned and sold. Racial segregation had begun.

The settlers needed more land and Puritan religious beliefs provided the ideology according to which the Indians could be overcome and dominated. To kill pagans, to kill the Indian, was to kill something not yet

fully human. Recognizing them now for what they "really" always had been, i.e., Savages, relieved the Puritans from any blame for taking their land and killing or displacing Indians. It also made heroes out of the People of the Frontier: those "intrepid souls" who would push the power of the eastern seaboard Colonies further and further West into Indian territory. While there were at this time, and later on, occasional colonial voices heard which questioned, if not the concept of Savage, then perhaps the way the American whites were treating them, the view of the Indian as the enemy of civilized society continued and was elaborated on in the centuries ahead.

In 1889, more than 200 years after the King Philip's war, Theodore Roosevelt, the 26th president of the United States, in his monumental narrative, *The Winning of the West*, eulogized the "spread of the English-speaking peoples over the world's waste spaces." "No 'period of race expansion' he said, had ever been 'either so broad or so rapid' as in America. And none, it would seem, had ever been so just. The European settlers 'moved into an uninhabited waste... the land is really owned by no one.... The settler ousts no one from the land. The truth is, the Indians never had any real title to the soil... The world would probably not have gone forward at all, had it not been for the displacement or submersion of savage and barbaric peoples as a consequence of the armed settlement in strange lands of the races who hold in their hands the fate of the years.'"

In addition, Roosevelt argued that "the most ultimately righteous of all wars is a war with savages, though it is apt to be also the most terrible and inhuman. The rude, fierce settler who drives the savage from the land lays all civilized man under a debt to him." To criticize the march of progress, in Roosevelt's view, was "idle sentimentality." In a more succinct formulation, Roosevelt warned that "if we fail to act on the 'superior people' theory..., barbarism and savagery and squalid obstruction will prevail over most of the globe."

One must reflect that a half century later Winston Churchill, in his defense of the Zionist conquest of Palestine echoed Roosevelt's sentiments. Comparing the indigenous population of Palestine to a dog in a manger, Churchill said:

"I do not agree that the dog in a manger has the final right to the manger, even though he may have lain there for a very long time... I do not admit that a wrong has been done to these people by the fact that a stronger race, a higher grade race, or at any rate, a more worldly-wise race, to put it that way, has come in and taken their place."

But I stray from my subject. The concept of the Native American as savage, Evil, treacherous, never ceased to prevail in the American public mind. Here are a few more quotations from some national figures over the last centuries: Let us hear from Mark Twain in 1870:

"His heart (the Red man's) is a cesspool of falsehood, of treachery, and of low and devilish instincts. With him, gratitude is an unknown emotion; and when one does him a kindness, it is safest to keep the face toward him, lest the reward be an arrow in the back. ... The scum of the earth!"

All history and honest observation will show that the Red Man is a skulking coward and a windy braggart, who strikes without warning—usually from an ambush or under cover of night, and nearly always bringing a force of about five or six to one against his enemy; kills helpless women and little children, and massacres the men in their beds; and then brags about it as long as he lives, and his son and his grandson and great-grandson after him glorify it among the 'heroic deeds of their ancestors'."

The journalist Horace Greeley wrote in 1860:

"I have learned to appreciate better than hitherto, and to make more allowance for, the dislike, aversion, contempt wherewith Indians are usually regarded by their neighbors, and have been since the days of the Puritans. It needs but little familiarity with the actual, palpable aborigines to convince anyone that the poetic Indian—the Indian of Cooper and Longfellow—is only visible to the poet's eye. To the prosaic observer, the average Indian of the woods and prairies is a being that does little credit to human nature—a slave of appetite and sloth, never emancipated from the tyranny of one animal passion save by the more ravenous demands of another.

Even famed Harvard physician and social commentator Oliver Wendell Holmes observed in 1855 that Indians were nothing more than a half-filled outline of humanity whose "extermination" was the necessary "solution of the problem of his relation to the white race." Describing native peoples as "a sketch in red crayons of a rudimentary manhood," he added that it was only natural for the white man to "hate" the Indian and to "hunt him down like the wild beasts of the forest, and so the red-crayon sketch is rubbed out, and the canvas is ready for a picture of manhood a little more like God's own image."

Many, many others similar statements could be provided from Americans whose other contributions to the more noble parts of our national history cannot be doubted. But I do not believe this is necessary since the historic treatment of American Indians is all too well known. Anyone who has attended U.S. Western movies, especially older ones, has seen the, taken-for-granted negative nature of America's attitudes toward Indians. Only recently has the Indian ceased to be a perennial villain, partly because of recent laws against publicly discriminating against so-called ethnic or racial groups in the United States. Let us investigate for a moment the "mythology of violence" as Richard Slotkin has called it, which has had such an enduring persistence in American culture.

Richard Slotkin, in his idea of a "mythology of violence" that persists in American culture, makes many similar points about the demonization of the Indian. The transformation of American Indians from Christians and potential Christians into savages and sub-humans was accomplished in a variety of ways. First of all, a major villain, a prime Evil One was established as King Philip. Hatred for him was a unifying force among the Puritans and was long remembered. Second, and of great importance was the power of the religious leadership. This leadership was threatened by the dispersal of settlers into friendly Indian territory, peaceful relationships, beyond the control of the colony establishment with the churches and the Sunday sermons. Finally, once the Indians became identified with the ways of Satan and the works of the devil, as was portrayed in the "captivity narrative" books, they had to be anathema for any good Christian. There was no hope for a final reconciliation, only for separation and division between the Good and the Bad.

However, the material issue of competition for scarce resources was also of growing importance. For settlers, especially the new arrivals, who may not have shared all the religious enthusiasm of the older English residents, had not left behind fears and poverty in Britain to find themselves without land in America, free land preferably. So cheating the Indians and killing the Indians both became means to both material and ideological ends. The great differences between Indian groups were scarcely recognized. Different languages, different forms of livelihood, costumes, customs, ceremonies—such things were only interesting to a few; for the majority considering Indians, the fact that they were, savage Red Men, was all one needed to know. Military folklore from King Philip's war to Custer's Last Stand held that in battle against the Savage enemy, one side or the other must perish, whether by limitless murder or by the degrading experience of capture and torture. Therefore, always save the last bullet for your own head, was the common wisdom for those Whites who might be in conflict with Indians.

American Indians also became scapegoats for the morally troubling side of American expansion: the myth of Savage war became a basic ideological convention of a culture that was itself increasingly devoted to the extermination or expropriation of the Indians and the kidnapping and enslavement of black Americans. And in addition, any class struggle, real or incipient, in White America could be projected onto the American savage so long as a frontier existed. "Go West Young Man, Go West," was a call to keep the landless poor from wanting what the rich already had. If you want more, go West and get it. If killing Indians was part of this movement, then you even had a chance to become a hero.

Neither the slave trade nor the subjugation/extermination of Others has been exclusively Anglo-American, of course. The mass genocides of the Twentieth Century belong to the histories of Europe, Asia, and Africa. What is perhaps distinctively American is not necessarily the amount or kinds of violence we have actually experienced, but rather the mythic significance we have attached to our history, the forms of symbolic violence we have imagined or invented, and the political uses to which we put that symbolism. That is, once the Savagery and Evil nature of the Indian is commonly taken for granted, becomes hegemonic, then the door is wide open for heroes and for glorious undertakings, for Alamos and Custer's Last Stands and all manner of other ways in which the White man could reveal his God-fearing, self-righteous nature, always, of course, in contrast to the depravity of the Indian, his sneak attacks and his tomahawk.

Of course, we must note the anti-hegemonic voices in America. One Indian, pure and natural, close to innocent, appeared in popular literature - for people at home east of the Frontier. From Hiawatha in Longfellow's epic poem to Tonto on the radio as the Lone Ranger's sidekick, a romantic incarnation of the Indian always existed which seemed to contradict their evil reputations. Even King Philip had a reincarnation in the play called "Metamora," which debuted in 1829. In this play, the masculinity of Metamora (his Indian name) was glorified and compared with the "effete" quality of Europeans; Metamora was a "true" American in both body and soul. For there was, after all the American/English opposition. America was an ex-English colony. Even our Indians were better than the damn English! The view was condescending, however: even "good" Indians were naturally unequal to the American Whites who dominated them.

The frontier romances of James Fenimore Cooper published between 1823 and 1850 codified and systematized the representations of the Frontier and the Indian/White conflict that had developed haphazardly after Philip's war in the late 1600's. From such diverse genres as the personal "captivity narrative," the history, the sermon, the newspaper item, the street ballad, the cheap paperbacks, Cooper created the ur-myth of the "noble savage" to account for the fundamental ideological and social oppositions dividing the society of 19th century America. This paradigm of good and evil had enormous survival value. When I was a little boy we were still playing cowboys and Indians in my neighborhood; the cowboys always won in the end, there was no question as to who were the bad guys. This is what we learned from our comic books, movies, and children's tales.

American Indians did strike when they could and unsuccessfully defended their lands as long as they were able. But they received little honor and no glory for this. As early as 1779 Chiksika, elder brother of Tecumseh, is reported to have said:

"When an Indian kills a white man in a fair fight it is called murder. When a white army battles Indians and wins it is called a great victory, but if they lose it is called a massacre and bigger armies are raised. If the Indian flees before the advance of such armies, when he tries to return he finds that white men are living

where he lived. If he tries to fight off such armies, he is killed and the land is taken anyway. When an Indian is killed it is a great loss which leaves a gap in our people and a sorrow in our heart; when a white is killed, three or four others step up to take his place and there is no end to it."

Romanticizing the Indian did not stop our government from driving Indians off their land, penning them into reservations, separating children from their parents in government schools and white foster homes and generally impoverishing the finally captive Red man. This seeming contradiction between Romanticism and Demonization might be compared in some ways to the treatment of gypsies in Europe at different times and places. Gypsies were people who could be admired for their songs and skills - at a distance, in operas or plays perhaps - but they were hardly to be tolerated as neighbors or cultivated as friends. American Indians could be imaginarily reconstructed to suit the fancies of American whites, but not admitted as equals in the course of daily life. Today, in bourgeois American society, it has become quite chic to admit to having an Indian as a part of one's ancestry - but not too close, of course, and certainly not in the here and now, as kinspeople in a middle class white household.

What does this process of Demonization tell us about American foreign policy, about American attitudes and outlooks? If we compare America's foreign policy today with our domestic policy in the days of the Frontier, there is much which can cause concern, not the least of which is the way in which the potential conflict in the Middle East has been incarnated as a kind of holy war by George W. Bush. Evil and terrorism have become so frequently used by Bush and his spokesmen that they have become commonalities. In public discourse, the Evil One is almost a synonym for Saddam Hussein.

But perhaps the most depressing is the way in which Saddam Hussein has taken on all the negative qualities associated with the 9/11 attacks, since as far as anyone has determined, neither he nor other Iraqis had anything to do with AlQaida. It doesn't seem to matter. All evil is collected together, Saddam (who is present) is blamed, Bin Laden (who is not present) has slipped from media view and is rarely mentioned in our newspapers and TV program. This guilt by association and generalization seems an amazing piece of stereotyping, but not, perhaps, when viewed in the context of the Demonization of the American Indians.

Worse than this, Arabs in general, and Muslims from around the world have found themselves the target of negative acts and statements from the United States. Not only have there been occasional attacks against Muslim residents in the States, Muslim who are not citizens are also the object of new government regulations designed to reveal and track their existence and, when possible, to expel them from the country. A whole segment of our population now feels under suspicion and subject to government investigation.

In an interview on February 28, 2000, former president Bill Clinton remarked "The biggest problem in human society is fear and distrust and dehumanization and violence against the Other." The following year, in an address at Georgetown University, School of Foreign Service, he made Others of the Indians:

"Bill Clinton, the former president, said yesterday that terror has existed in America for hundreds of years and the nation is "paying a price today" for its past of slavery and for looking "the other way" when a significant number of native Americans were dispossessed and killed to get their land or their mineral rights or because they were thought of as less than fully human... And we are still paying a price today.

It is hopeful to have a president who speaks like that after Theodore Roosevelt, but the statement does not resolve the issues which I intended this paper to address. Are we in America not in the process of Demonization again? Is there not a religious cast to the President's vocabulary in talking about Iraq? Are we not seeing the Arabs and the Muslims as one large entity, one continuous Other, all of which we (can) blame, fear, distrust, hate or despise? Are the Arabs not becoming the new Indian, the new Savage?

Last year a book was published called *Reel Bad Arabs; How Hollywood Vilifies a People*, by Jack Shaheen, a professor of Mass Communications at Southern Illinois University. Shaheen reviews 900 films, dating back to the silent film days, to see how Arabs are portrayed. The record is appalling. While portraying Native Americans, (or Blacks or Jews or other racial or ethnic minorities) in a consistently negative light has ended, the Arab has remained and developed as a favorite villain. In more than fifty films, Arab women are humiliated, demonized and sometimes eroticized. Arab sheikhs are shown as stooges-in-sheets, slovenly, hook-nosed potentates who are generally lecherous. As Edward Said wrote, "The perverted sheikh can often be seen snarling at the captured Western hero and blonde girl... 'My men are going to kill you but they like to amuse themselves before.'"

The Savage Indian has disappeared from most film dramas; the villainous Arab has taken his place. Who did people first believe they saw leaving the bombing in Oklahoma City? Arabs. That it was a blond White American was a great surprise to many. The Arab has become the new American Indian, our villain of choice.

We in America have a righteousness that is part of our Frontier attitude, a predisposition to find Evil ones to blame for terror, and a penchant for seeing to see ourselves as innocents who must go to war against Satan's minions. Terror comes from Others, Others who are unlike ourselves. We have taken our country from Others, subhuman, unlike ourselves. We depended for decades on the enslavement of Others, African Americans, unlike ourselves, who could be forced to do our work. Now we can wage the War against Terrorism on a world-wide basis. Not a war against other human beings, like ourselves. Rather against Evil ones, like Saddam Hussain - and Others, like him.