

You Call It Corn, We Call It Maize: The Ethnocentric Legacy Of Columbus.



e:\history\one\maizer\maize.30dp

What Europeans called the Native Americans.	What Native Americans called themselves.
1. General. Indian. Christopher Columbus, 1492, called the natives Indians because he believed that he had landed in the Asian country of India	Native Americans: A person indigenous to the Americas.
The name Eskimos means "eaters of raw meat" in the Algonquian language. When the Algonquians called their northern neighbors by this name, they meant it as an insult. Carl Waldman, 81.	<i>Inuit</i> , meaning The People. <i>Inuit</i> meaning men. <i>Yuit</i> meaning men in Siberian Eskimo.
The origin of the name <i>Kansa</i> is not clear. Others speculate that <i>Kansa</i> derived from the Spanish <i>escanseques</i> , meaning "the troublesome." 208.	They called themselves <i>Hutanga</i> , "by the edge of the shore," relating to a tradition that they once lived on the Atlantic Ocean. They are also known as the <i>Kaw</i> and the Wind People. Barbara Leitch, MA University of Michigan, <i>A Concise Dictionary of Indian Tribes</i> (Algonac, Michigan: Reference Publications, 1979), 208.
2. Enemy. Sioux is an Ojibwa word implying enemy. Barry M. Pritzker, American History teacher, Taos Pueblo Day School, <i>Native Americans: An Encyclopedia of History, Culture, and Peoples</i> , Volume I (Santa Barbara, California: ABC-Clio, 1998), 452.	In the Siouan language, the name <i>Dakota</i> or <i>Lakota</i> or <i>Nakota</i> means "allies." Carl Waldman, <i>Encyclopedia of Native American Tribes</i> (New York: Facts on File Publications), 1988, 223.
Dakota, which is interpreted to mean "friends" or "allies" or "an alliance of friends," is the name these people call themselves. The more commonly known name, Sioux, is from Nadewisou, meaning "treacherous snake," the name given them by their enemy, the Ojibwa. Virginia Driving Hawk Sneve, <i>The Time of the Horse and The Tribe of the Burnt Thigh</i> (Boston, Massachusetts: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1981), 13.	
<i>Commanche</i> , via Mexican-Spanish meaning from the Shoshones. From Ute/Spanish	<i>Comanche</i> , a name derived from either the Ute <i>Komantcia</i> , People who Fight Us All the

meaning enemy. <i>Komantcia</i> meaning anyone who wants to fight me.	Time, or the Spanish <i>camino ancho</i> , broad trail. The self-designation was <i>Numinu</i> , People. Barry M. Pritzker, 441.
A graver threat to Texas's security than the Mexican Army were the Comanche Indians. "Comanche" was a rough Spanish translation of the Ute expression for "anyone who to fight me all the time." Superb horsemen, horse thieves, and warriors, the Comanches were so powerful during the eighteenth century that Spain agreed to pay them tribute and to respect their southern border along El Camino Real. Joseph Wheelan <i>Associated Press</i> reporter, <i>Invading Mexico: America's Continental Dream And The Mexican War, 1846-1848</i> (New York: Carroll & Graf Publishers, 2007), 51.	
Apache, a Spanish word derived from a Zuni word meaning enemy people. Enemies who have cultivated fields. Apache, comes from the Zunis, who feared them, gave them the name Apachu, meaning "enemy." Carl Waldman, 13.	The Apache and Navajo both referred to themselves as <i>Dine</i> , meaning, the people. Barbara Leitch, 38.
3. Character. <i>Navajo</i> , a Spanish word meaning thief. Enemies who have cultivated fields.	<i>Dine</i> (Dineah) means "the People," in their own language.
Mohawk, a name applied to them by their enemies, means "man eater." Barbara Leitch, 282.	The Mohawks think of themselves rather as the People of the Place of Flint. Carl Waldman, 130.
<i>Otoe</i> from Wahtohata means lovers or lechers, referring to an alleged incident between the children of an Otoe and a Missouri chief. 501.	An earlier self-designation may have been <i>Che-wae-rae</i> . Barry M. Pritzker, 501.
4. Characteristics. <i>Winnebago</i> is Algonquin for People of the Filthy Water. This name was translated by the French back into English as stinkards. Barry M. Pritzker, 678.	The Indian's own proud name for themselves was <i>Hotcangara</i> for "people of the big speech." Carl Waldman, 250.
The Winnebagoes belonged to the Dakota family, but, so far as can be known, were naturally a peace-loving people, and had no sympathy with the more warlike tribes of their race. The Algonquins gave them the name of Winnebagoes, or "people of the salt-water;"	The original name of the Delawares was Lenni Lenape, or "original people." They were also called by the Western Woes Wapenachki, "people at the rising of the sun." When the name "Delawares" was given to them by the whites, they a first resented it; but

and as the Algonquin word for salt-water and stinking-water was the same, the French called them "Les Puants," or "Stinkards." The Sioux gave them a more melodious and pleasing name, "O-ton-kah," which signified "The large, strong people." Helen Hunt Jackson, <i>A Century Of Dishonor: The Early Crusade For Indian Reform</i> (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1881, 1965), 218.	being told that they, and also one of their rivers, were thus named after a great English brave—Lord De le Warre—they were much pleased, and willingly took the name. Their lands stretched from the Hudson River to the Potomac. They were a noble spirited but gentle people; much under the control of the arrogant and all-powerful Iroquois, who had put upon them the degradation of being called women," and being forced to make war or give up land at it pleasure of their masters. Helen Hunt Jackson, 33.
<i>Nskapi</i> is a Montagnais word that may mean rude or uncivilized people. 727.	Their self-designation was <i>Nenenot</i> , the People. Barry M. Pritzker, 727.
<i>Huron</i> was a French word meaning "boar like" or "unkempt." Barbara Leitch, 186.	Their name for themselves was <i>Wendat</i> , <i>Guyandot</i> , or <i>Wyandot</i> , probably meaning "islanders" or "peninsula dwellers." Carl Waldman, 99.

5. Other Characteristics. <i>Arapaho</i> probably from the Pawnee word for trader and Spanish word for "tattered and dirty clothing." 421.	The <i>Arapahos</i> originally called themselves <i>Inuna-ina</i> , Our People. Barry M. Pritzker, 421.
The name Cherokee was probably given to them by the neighboring Creeks - <i>tciloki</i> in its original form, meaning "people of the different speech." Carl Waldman, 43.	The Cherokee name for themselves in Iroquoian was <i>Ani-yun-wiya</i> , meaning "real people." Carl Waldman, 43.
Cheyenne, a French/Sioux word meaning people speaking a language not understood. Speakers of an unintelligible language.	The Cheyenne called themselves <i>Tsistsistas</i> , meaning "beautiful people." Carl Waldman, 48.
<i>Gros Ventres</i> is French for big belly. 459.	Their self-designation is <i>Haaninin</i> , Lime People or White Clay People. Barry M. Pritzker, 459.

Sources: Alvin Joseph, *The American Heritage Book of Indians, 1915*. George Bird Grinnell, *The Fighting Cheyenne* (Norman, Oklahoma, University of Oklahoma Press, 1956).

6. Scorecard. Bartolome de Las Casas, a priest who accompanied the Conquistadors wrote: The Spaniards cut off the arm of one, the leg or hip of another, and from some their heads at one stroke, like butchers cutting up beef and mutton for market. Six hundred natives were slain like brute beasts. Vasco ordered forty of them to be torn to pieces by dogs. Some Indians they burned alive. They threw others to the dogs. They cut off the breasts of women. John C. Mohawk, Seneca Nation, American Studies professor, SUNY, <i>Exiles in the Land of the Free:</i>	Main Ideas: Analysis: Evaluation:
---	---

<p><i>Democracy, Indian Nations and the US Constitution</i> (Santa Fe, New Mexico: Clear Light Publishers, 1992), 48.</p>	
<p>What was wrought upon the American natives by European invaders over a period of four centuries was genocide, pure and simple. When the English colonists first arrived in North America, there were about 800,000 Indians in approximately four hundred tribes scattered across the continent from east to west. By the end of the century, there were about 200,000 left, penned up in concentration camps euphemistically called reservations. The heart of the conflict between the white man and the Indian was, of course, land and the wealth to be got from it. The history of how the white man acquired the land is an uninterrupted tale of war, massacres, violated treaties, unkept promises, murder, theft, and treachery of all kinds. John G. Neihardt, amateur historian and Professor of Poetry at University of Nebraska, <i>Black Elk Speaks</i>, Wayne Moquin, ed., <i>Great Documents in American Indian History</i> (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1973), 20.</p>	
<p>In Middle America the confrontation between Hispanic and native cultures spelled disaster for the Amerindians in every conceivable way: a drastic decline in population, rapid deforestation, pressure on vegetation from grazing animals, substitution of Spanish wheat for maize (Indian corn) on crop land, and construction of new Spanish towns. The quick defeat of the Aztec state was followed by a catastrophic decline in population. Of the 15 or 25 million native inhabitants of Middle America when the Spanish arrived (estimates vary) only a century later just 2.5 million survived. H.J. DeBlij, <i>Geography: Realms, Regions and Concepts</i>, (New York: John Wiley & Sons: 1994), 274.</p>	
<p>7. Nathaniel Bacon conducted a crusade against Indians—all Indians . . . The friendly Occaneechees captured a number of Susquehannahs for him. After the prisoners had been killed, Bacon’s men turned their guns on the Occaneechees and dispatched most of them too, thus demonstrating their evenhanded determination to exterminate Indians without regard to tribe . . . Bacon neglected to add that friendly Indians were somewhat easier to catch than hostile ones, and made a satisfactory substitute as far as he and his men were concerned. Edmund S. Morgan, Professor of History at Yale, <i>American Slavery, American Freedom, the Ordeal of</i></p>	<p>Main Ideas: Analysis: Evaluation:</p>

<i>Colonial Virginia</i> , (New York: 1975), 259.	
In 1675 a group of Doegs [Indians] took some hogs belonging to Thomas Matthew, alleging that he failed to pay for goods he had bought of them. Matthew pursued, recovered hogs and killed several Indians. The Doegs retaliated and killed one of Matthew's servants . . . George Mason, by accident or indifference, killed fourteen Susquehannahs before discovering that he had the wrong Indians. Edmund S. Morgan, 251.	
In 1675, instead of going after the guilty Susquehannock, the militia, in typical frontier fashion, attacked the friendly, fur-trading Occaneechee, accusing them of harboring enemy fugitives, and killed their chief Persicles. Samuel Eliot Morison, Progressive Professor of History at Harvard, <i>The Oxford History of the American People</i> (New York: Oxford University Press, 1965), 113.	
8. Friendly Indians. In December, Pennsylvania civilians went on the offensive. Some fifty vigilantes known as the Paxton Boys decided to make war on any Indians they could find. They descended on a peaceful village of friendly Conestoga Indians and murdered and scalped twenty of them. The vigilantes, numbers swelling to 500, next marched on Philadelphia to try to capture and murder some Christian Indians held in protective custody. British troops prevented that, but the unruly Paxton Boys escaped all punishment for their murderous attack on the Conestoga. James L. Roark, 141.	Main Ideas: Analysis: Evaluation:
During the French and Indian War, the Susquehannas, living peaceably in white towns, were hatcheted by their neighbors, who then collected bounties from authorities who weren't careful whose scalp they were paying for, so long as it was Indian. James W. Loewen, 122.	
"The English treated the Indians, with no distinction between friend and foe: 'What madness and rage hath there bee against all Indians whatsoever.' ⁷⁶ . . . Mather was shocked that even church members were guilty of indiscriminate racism. ⁷⁷ Michael G. Hall, Professor of History at the University of Texas at Austin, <i>The Last American Puritan: The Life of Increase Mather</i> (Hanover, New Hampshire: Wesleyan University Press University Press, 1988), 123.	
76. Increase Mather, <i>An Earnest Exhortation</i> (Boston Massachusetts: 1676), 186.	
77. Ibid, 187. See also <i>Diary</i> , Belknap transcript, May 9, August 7, 1676, Massachusetts Historical Society, <i>Proceedings</i> , 2 ser., 13 (1899,	

1900), 403.	
<p>9. Wrong Tribe. There were some Apache raids south of the Gila, with six Anglos killed and some livestock driven off. The citizens of Tucson decided to take revenge on Indians they could catch. They enlisted some Papagos (five years before they had raised money one hundred dollars for each Apache scalp) and set out-7 Anglos, 48 Spanish Americans, and 92 Papagos. At dawn on April 30, 1869, they surprised the sleeping Aravaipas when most of the men were away and started killing them, the Papagos clubbing them to death, the white men shooting those who tried to escape. They murdered about 125 people-all but perhaps 8 being women and children-and captured 27 children, who were turned over to the Papagos to be sold as slaves in Sonora. Not one of the assailants was even wounded. Angie Debo, Ph.D. in history from the University of Oklahoma, <i>A History of The Indians of The United States</i> (Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press, 1970) 269.</p>	<p>Main Ideas: Analysis: Evaluation:</p>
<p>In 1860, California ranchers killed 185 of the 800 Wiyots, a tribe allied with the whites, because they were angered by another tribes' cattle raids. James W. Loewen, New Left Professor of Sociology at the University of Vermont, <i>Lies My Teacher Told Me: Everything Your American History Textbook Got Wrong</i> (New York: New Press, 1995) 122-3.</p>	
<p>In mid 1778, the Delaware chief White Eyes negotiated a treaty at Fort Pitt, pledging Indian support in the war in exchange for supplies and trade goods. But escalating violence undermined the agreement. That fall, when American soldiers killed two friendly Shawnee chiefs, Cornstalk and Red Hawk, the Continental Congress hastened to apologize, as did the governors of Pennsylvania and Virginia, but the soldiers who stood trial for the murders were acquitted. Two months later, White Eyes, still nominally an ally and informant for the Americans, died under mysterious circumstances, almost certainly murdered by militiamen, who repeatedly had trouble honoring distinctions between allied and enemy Indians. James L. Roark, 175.</p>	
<p>10. Policy. The only good Indians I ever saw were dead. US Army General Philip H. Sheridan, veteran of the Civil War and the Indian Wars, 1869.</p>	<p>Main Ideas: Analysis: Evaluation:</p>
<p>If the savage resists civilization, with the <i>Ten Commandments</i> in one hand and the sword in the other,</p>	

demand his immediate extermination. President Andrew Johnson, <i>Message to Congress</i> , 1867.	
Without knowing the force of words, it will be impossible to know men. Confucius, <i>The Confucian Analects</i> , 470 B.C.	
There were some 200 pitched battles between soldiers and Indians in the years 1869-76. The contest was not unequal, for the Indians had become excellent shots. They could attack or flee from the heavy United States cavalry at will, and they were not troubled by logistic problems . . . The army could always recruit Indian scouts, and the redskins were defeated piecemeal. Samuel Eliot Morison, 750-1.	
"Often women and children became the targets of choice, as in the Mystic River campaign of 1637 during the Pequot War in New England, when Puritans soldiers ignored a fort manned by warriors to incinerate another few miles away which was packed of Pequot noncombatants . . . The real purpose was terror. Outnumbered in a hostile land, Europeans used deliberate terror against one Indian people to send a grim warning to any others nearby." John M. Murrin, Professor of history at Princeton University, "Beneficiaries of Catastrophe," Eric Foner, editor, <i>The New American History</i> (Philadelphia Pennsylvania: Temple University Press, 1997), 12.	
Nelson A. Miles arrived at Fort Bowie on April 12, 1880. He had five thousand men under his command. Scornful of Crook's reliance on Apache scouts . . . he tried pursuing with cavalry, then he dismounted his troopers . . . Their hardships reached the limit of human endurance against an enemy that melted away unharmed. Angie Debo, 279.	

11. Connection? (Wars) are fought usually by people not driven by an innate aggression, against an enemy they often do not see. In war men are more like sheep than wolves. They may be led to manufacture munitions at home, to release bombs, or to fire long-range guns and rockets - all as part of one great cooperative effort. It is not insignificant that the soldiers who engage in fierce and bloody hand-to-hand fighting are subjected to an intense process of desensitization before they can do it. Richard E. Leakey and Roger Lewin, <i>Origins</i> (New York: E.P. Dutton, 1977), 223.	Main Ideas: Analysis: Evaluation:
A psychological change has to happen for you to (exploit someone). You have to make them worse or less than you. Otherwise, you can't treat them badly because they are	

<p>your equal. If you make them spics or japs or niggers, then you can attack because those people aren't human. Dr. Will Miles, University of Colorado sports psychologist <i>Rocky Mountain News</i>, 12/31/94, 5B.</p>	
<p>A good example of this psychological change came out of the Vietnam War and still affects thousands of Americans today. Many of the Vietnam vets who suffer from (post traumatic stress disorders) had trouble dehumanizing the enemy to the point where they could kill them without repercussions. They never made a good transition into the proper dehumanizing psychology, and that is trouble for someone in combat. This is why when they practiced using their bayonets, the military leaders would have the soldiers yell "gooks" as they struck the bayonet into the enemy dummy. It was to reinforce to the soldier that what he was killing wasn't human-just these dirty, awful, hateful, killer gooks. Dr. Will Miles, 5B.</p>	
<p>12. Objectification. The explanation of prejudice can be explained, in part, as the result of ethnocentric attitudes about one's own group. To achieve group solidarity and morale, the in-group has to insist that its cultural ways and even its appearance are better than others. The attitude is usually acceptable to the individual member of the group because the ego is inflated through group identification. Group belonging also gives a sense of security. Out-groups are thought to be a threat to the security of the in-group, especially when its members have a superior status that they would hate to lose. Elbert W, Stewart, Professor of Sociology and Anthropology, Bakersfield College, James A. Glynn, Professor of Sociology Bakersfield College, <i>Introduction to Sociology</i> (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1979) 162-3.</p>	<p>Main Ideas: Analysis: Evaluation:</p>
<p>The in-group will choose a positive label when describing a trait possessed by the group and the contrasting trait of the out-group will be described by a negative label. For instance, when Americans describe themselves they say they are friendly and outgoing. The English, describing these same traits, say that Americans are intrusive and forward. The English describe themselves as being reserved and respectful of the rights of others. Americans, however, think of the English as cold and snobbish. This biased labeling process contributes to the formation of positive stereotypes for in-groups and negative stereotypes for out-groups. Daniel Perlman, University of Manitoba, P. Chris Cozby, California State University, Fullerton,</p>	

<p><i>Social Psychology</i> (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1983), 424.</p>	
<p>The [North Korean] enemy commonly remarked that "the Americans do not recognize Koreans as human beings." "GIs never spoke of the enemy as though they were people, but as one might speak of apes. Even among correspondents, every man's dearest wish was to kill a Korean. "Today . . . I'll get me a gook." Americans called the Koreans "gook," he thought, because "otherwise the essentially kind and generous Americans would not have been able to kill them indiscriminately or smash up their homes and poor belongings" . . . According to a KPA detachment that got to Yongdong on July 20 and spoke with ten eyewitnesses, American troops herded some two thousand civilians from two villages in Yongdong county into the mountains in this guerrilla-infested country and then when Taejon fell, slaughtered them, apparently mostly from the air, although the account also said women were raped before being shot." Bruce Cumings, Professor of History at the University of Chicago, <i>The Origins of the Korean War, Volume II, the Roaring of the Cataract, 1947 - 1950</i> (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1981), 697, 705, 706.</p>	
<p>13. Prejudice. Sumner considered it virtually a law of human interaction that in-group solidarity and hostility toward out-groups are directly related. Several researchers have found that hostility toward an out-group tends to increase loyalty toward an in-group. Kenneth Dion has found, similarly, that membership in highly cohesive in-groups tends to increase prejudice against out-groups. Elbert W, Stewart, 45.</p>	<p>Main Ideas: Analysis: Evaluation:</p>
<p>There have been various theories using the concept of prejudice as a main explanation of inequality. The argument usually is as follows: when a dominant group holds these negative views about subordinate groups, the dominant group will discriminate against these other groups. Moreover, this discrimination will produce various inequalities for the subordinate groups, which in turn will reinforce the stereotyped prejudices. Howard J. Sherman, University of California, Riverside, James L. Wood, San Diego State University, <i>Sociology: Traditional And Radical Perspectives</i>, (New York: Harper & Row, 1979), 108.</p>	
<p>Prejudice and discrimination support each other: Discrimination breeds prejudice, and prejudice legitimizes</p>	

<p>discrimination. David G. Myers, Hope College. Holland, Michigan, <i>Social Psychology</i> (New York: McGraw-Hill Companies, 1996), 402.</p>	
<p>The name "Gypsie" comes from a myth we spread that we were fortune tellers from Egypt, bohemians, nomads, outcasts. Outsiders can call us what they want. The word we use, "Roma" it is our word for human. Seiji Mizushima, <i>Full Metal Alchemist: The Movie Conqueror of Shamballa</i> (Andiplex, 2005),</p>	
<p>14. Group Competition. Anti-Chinese feeling in California followed a similar pattern: Prior to the mid-1860's, there was little anti-Chinese sentiment in the United States. After the Civil War and the completion of the transcontinental railroad, however, there was a large, and sudden, increase in hostility toward Chinese-Americans. Before the 1860's, the Chinese were generally regarded as sober, inoffensive, and law-abiding; but as economic competition increased, they became objects of hatred, and were stereotyped as criminal, conniving, intellectually inferior, etc. Barry E. Collins, University of California, Los Angeles, Richard D. Ashmore, Livingston College, Rutgers University, <i>Social Psychology, Social Influence, Attitude Change, Group Processes, and Prejudice</i> (Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1970), 259.</p>	<p>Main Ideas: Analysis: Evaluation:</p>
<p>Much the same thing happened with regard to attitudes toward Japanese-Americans. Until about 1890, the Japanese in California "were received with great favor" and "were accepted and even absorbed." As the Japanese became significant competitors for jobs, sentiment against them mounted, especially in the stronghold of California labor, San Francisco. The rise of anti-Japanese attitudes bears out the theory of multiple determinants of prejudice . . . Prejudice was propagated by the upper classes, but it was also furthered by economic competition felt in the lower classes. Barry E. Collins, 259.</p>	
<p>Adolph Hitler and his Nazis carried racist beliefs to their ultimate conclusion in the 1930s, when he proclaimed that "Aryans'-white, male, non-Jewish Germans were a master race, superior to all other groups. He created a stereotype, or ideal picture, of all Aryans as big, strong, blond, and super-intelligent-even though Hitler himself was none of these. Jews were portrayed as small, greedy, and cowardly. All other non-Aryans were physically weak and mentally inferior. On the basis of these stereotypes, Hitler</p>	

killed millions of Jews, non-German Europeans and Russians and enslaved hundreds of millions of people. Howard J. Sherman, 110.	
---	--

<p>15. Selective Demonization. "Allied critics tended to describe these as "Nazi" crimes rather than behavior rooted in German culture or personality structure. [In the Pacific, the enemy was] presented as being simply "Japanese." John W. Dower, Professor of History at MIT, <i>War Without Mercy: Race and Power in the Pacific War</i> (New York: Pantheon Books, 1986), 34.</p>	<p>Main Ideas: Analysis: Evaluation:</p>
"It is virtually inconceivable, however, that teeth, ears, and skulls could have been collected from German or Italian war dead and publicized in the Anglo-American countries without provoking an uproar, and in this we have yet another inkling of the racial dimensions of the war." John W. Dower, 66.	
"Racism, dehumanization, technological change, and exterminationist policies became interlocked in unprecedented ways." John W. Dower, 93.	
"Race hate fed atrocities, and atrocities in turn fanned the fires of race hate. The dehumanization of the Other contributed immeasurably to the psychological distancing that facilitates killing and . . . the decision to make civilian populations the targets of concentrated attack . . . and a truly Manichaeian struggle between completely incompatible antagonists. The natural response to such a vision was an obsession with extermination on both sides—a war without mercy." John W. Dower, 11.	
"The implications of perceiving the enemy as "Nazis" on the one hand and "Japs" on the other were enormous, for this left space for the recognition of the "good German," but scant comparable place for "good Japanese." John W. Dower, 78-9.	
"Admiral William F. Halsey emphasized at a news conference early in 1944. "The only good Jap is a Jap who's been dead six months" Jap." John W. Dower, 79.	

<p>16. Government's Moral Authority. Open rebellion against law is ever considered by the majority as rebellion against morality. Speaking of the moral influence of law, Sheldon Amos says:</p> <p>As soon as a law is made and lifted out of the region of controversy, it begins to exercise a moral influence, which is no less intense and wide-spreading for being almost</p>	<p>Main Ideas: Analysis: Evaluation:</p>
--	--

<p>imperceptible. Though law can never attempt to forbid all that is morally wrong, yet that gets to be held as morally wrong, which the law forbids.</p> <p>No less does unwritten law come to be regarded as morally right. The customs of society built up through teachings of the church, and laws of the state, have destroyed that sense of personal security among women, which is the chief value of social life and of law. The very foundation of religion tends to this end even with man, but the division of rights and duties promulgated by the church as between man and woman, the changing form of laws—class legislation—has rendered the position of woman notably insecure. Matilda Joslyn Gage, Women's Rights Advocate and Abolitionist, (1893), <i>Woman, Church And State</i> (New York: Humanity Books, 1893, 2002), 433-4.</p>	
<p>In an article entitled "The Perils of Obedience" (1974) Stanley Milgram wrote:</p> <p>"Before the experiments, I sought predictions about the outcome from various kinds of people -- psychiatrists, college sophomores, middle-class adults, graduate students and faculty in the behavioral sciences. With remarkable similarity, they predicted that virtually all the subjects would refuse to obey the experimenter. The psychiatrist, specifically, predicted that most subjects would not go beyond 150 volts, when the victim makes his first explicit demand to be freed. They expected that only 4 percent would reach 300 volts, and that only a pathological fringe of about one in a thousand would administer the highest shock on the board."</p> <p>The Obedience to Authority experiment was continued by Milgram over a number of other scenarios such as where the "learner" could indicate discomfort by way of voice feedback - at "150 volts", the "actor-learner" requested that the experiment end, and was consistently told by the experimenter that - "The experiment requires that you continue. Please go on." or similar words. In this scenario the percentage of subjects who were prepared to administer the maximum 450 volts dropped slightly to 62.5%</p> <p>Where the experiment was conducted in a nondescript office building rather than within the walls of a</p>	

<p>prestigiously ornate hall on Yale's old campus the percentage of subjects who were prepared to administer the maximum voltage dropped to 47.5%.</p> <p>Where the "teacher" had to physically place the "learner's" hand on a "shock plate" in order to give him shocks above 150 volts the percentage of subjects who were prepared to administer the maximum voltage dropped to 30.0% and where the "experimenter" was at end of a phone line rather than being in the same room the percentage of subjects who were prepared to administer 450 volts dropped to 20.5% and where the "teacher" could himself nominate the shock level the percentage of subjects who were prepared to continue to the end of the scale dropped to 2.5%. Age of the Sage.org, "Obedience to Authority: The experiment by Stanley Milgram," (2002), http://www.age-of-the-sage.org/psychology/milgram_obedience_experiment.html</p>	
<p>At least one essential feature of the situation in Germany was not studied here--namely the intense devaluation of the victim prior to action against him . . . Systematic devaluation of the victim provides a measure of psychological justification for brutal treatment of the victim and has been the constant accompaniment of massacres, pogroms, and wars. Stanley Milgram, Professor of Psychology at Yale and Harvard, <i>Obedience To Authority: An Experimental View</i> (New York: Harper & Row, 1974), 9.</p>	
<p>The learner cannot break off and at the same time protect the authority's definitions of his own competence. Thus, the subject fears that if he breaks of, he will appear arrogant untoward, and rude . . . In an effort to avoid this awkward event, many subjects find obedience a less painful alternative. Stanley Milgram, 150-1.</p>	
<p>Inner doubt, externalization of doubt, dissent, threat, disobedience, it is a difficult path, which only a minority of subjects are able to pursue to its conclusion. Stanley Milgram, 163.</p>	
<p>The importation and enslavement of millions of black people, the destruction of the American Indian population, the internment of Japanese Americans, the use of napalm against civilians in Vietnam, all are harsh policies that originated in the authority of a democratic nation and were responded to with the expected obedience. In each case, voices of morality were raised against the action in question, but the typical response of the common man was</p>	

to obey orders. Stanley Milgram, 179-80.		
The kind of character produced in American democratic society, cannot be counted on to insulate its citizens from brutality and inhumane treatment at the direction of malevolent authority. A substantial proportion of people do what they are told to do, irrespective of conscience, so long as they perceive that the command comes from a legitimate authority. Stanley Milgram, 189.		
After watching the learner being strapped into place, he is taken into the main experimental room and seated before an impressive shock generation. Its main feature is a horizontal line of thirty switches, ranging from 15 volts to 450 volts, in 15-volt increments. There are also verbal designations, which range from "slight shock" to "Danger-severe shock." Stanley Milgram, 3.		
Each subject was given a sample shock from the shock generator, prior to beginning his run as teacher. This shock was always 45 volts and was applied by pressing the third switch of the generator. The shock applied to the wrist of the subject and the jolt strengthened the subject's belief in the authenticity of the generator. Stanley Milgram, 20.		
Very Strong Shock 195, 210, 225, 240 [Volts]	Intense Shock 255, 270, 285, 300	
Extreme Intensity Shock 315, 330, 345, 360	Danger, Severe Shock 375, 390, 405, 420	
XXX 435. 450.		
Stanley Milgram, 29.		
Karen Dontz, Nurse, in Experiment 8. Forty-year old housewife. Before administering the 345-volt shock, she points to the label, "Danger" on the shock generator . . . She begins to mumble to herself inaudibly. When the experimenter instructs her to continue using the 450-volt switch, she says in tones that are both concerned but exceedingly humble, "What if there's something wrong with the man, sir?" But she proceeds. Stanley Milgram, 78.		
Afterwards, . . . she states she was nervous because she knows that 210 volts is household current and "most people can be electrocuted with that." Stanley Milgram, 78.		
Gretchen Brandt, 33-year-old medical technician . . . at 220 volts . . . Well, I'm sorry, I think when shocks continue like this, they are dangerous. You ask him if he wants to get out. It's his free will . . . I don't want to be responsible		

<p>for anything happening to him. I wouldn't like it for me either . . . I think we here are on our own free will. I don't want to be responsible if he has a heart condition if anything happens to him. Please understand this. She refuses to go further and the experiment is terminated. Stanley Milgram, 85.</p>	
--	--

I. Ethnocentrism.



Probably Hendricks or Corn Planter


1. In your opinion, who has the right to name another group of people?








2. If you want to show respect for a Native American Tribe, would you use their own name, for their people, or would you use the Anglo-Saxon term? Explain your reasoning.

3. Most of the Anglo-Saxon chosen terms for individual tribes, Are they flattering or not?

4. Most of the Native American terms for their individual tribes, Are they flattering or not?

5. What does this say about the attitudes of each group about themselves and their relationships with each other?

<h2>II. Prejudice Chart</h2>							
<p>Prejudice</p>	<p>A judgment or opinion formed before the facts are known; preconceived idea, favorable or, more usually, unfavorable.</p>						
<p>a) Prejudice =</p>	<p>Pre-judge Judging a Book by Its Cover</p>						
<p>b) Example: Native Americans</p>	<p>All Indians are savage warriors No American-Indians are peaceful, civilized, or friendly</p>						
<p>c) Eleanor's black college Roommate</p>	<p>They hate me, but they do not even know me.</p>						
<p>d) Elizabeth Cady-Stanton</p>	<p>The prejudice against color, of which we hear so much, is no stronger than that against sex. It is produced by the same cause, and manifested very much in the same way. The Negro's skin and the woman's sex are both prima facie evidence that they were intended to be in subjection to the white Saxon man. Elizabeth Cady-Stanton, <i>Speech before the New York Legislature</i>, February 18, 1860.</p>						
<p>e. Prejudice Chart.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="191 1575 617 1795"> <tr> <td>Attitude</td> <td>Prejudice</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Thinking</td> <td>Stereotype</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Action</td> <td>Discrimination</td> </tr> </table>	Attitude	Prejudice	Thinking	Stereotype	Action	Discrimination	
Attitude	Prejudice						
Thinking	Stereotype						
Action	Discrimination						

<h3>III. John Dower's Chart on Selective Demonization of the Enemy</h3>							
<p>John W. Dower</p>							
<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Germany, World War II</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	Germany, World War II		<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Japan (Yamamoto)</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	Japan (Yamamoto)			
Germany, World War II							
Japan (Yamamoto)							
Nazi leaders		Japs, Nips, Yellow Peril					
Only fanatical leaders are bad		All Japanese are bad (including Japanese-Americans)					
Leaves Room for Good or Friendly Germans The German people are still good They are still human beings		All Japanese are the enemy They are all sub-humans, We dehumanize them and annihilate them					