



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Exploration and Colonization of the 'other' The initial contact between the Spanish 'Conquistadores' and the Indigenous peoples of the Caribbean, Mexico and Peru

Fioole, Peter

Citation

Fioole, P. (2023). *Exploration and Colonization of the 'other': The initial contact between the Spanish 'Conquistadores' and the Indigenous peoples of the Caribbean, Mexico and Peru.*

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [License to inclusion and publication of a Bachelor or Master thesis in the Leiden University Student Repository](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3502209>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Exploration and Colonization of the 'other'

The initial contact between the Spanish 'Conquistadores' and the Indigenous peoples of the Caribbean, Mexico and Peru

Name: Peter Fioole

Student number: S1815849

Ba: World Archaeology

Supervisor: Prof. dr. Corinne L. Hofman

Leiden University, Faculty of Archaeology

Leiden, 15-06-2022

Table of contents

Chapter 1: Introduction.....	4
Research aims and questions.....	5
Methodology.....	6
Thesis outline	6
Chapter 2: Historical background.....	8
Chapter 3: Methodology	11
Chapter 4: Christopher Columbus and the Taíno.....	12
Chapter 5: Hernan Cortes and the Aztec Empire	14
Chapter 6: Fransisco Pizarro and the Inca Empire	16
Chapter 7: Discussion	18
Chapter 8: Conclusion	20
Abstract	22
Bibliography.....	23

Chapter 1: Introduction

After a very risky, long voyage the first Spanish men set foot on one of the Lucayan Islands, most likely to be San Salvador in 1492. Columbus' voyage to discover another passage to India failed but brought forth a brand-new world and an era with dramatic consequences for the Indigenous peoples of the Americas. With their arrival on the island they contacted the first peoples of the New World, who they called the "*Indios*" but are now more commonly known as the "*Taíno*" of the Greater Antilles (Rouse, 1992, 5). These encounters rapidly developed into oppression, slave labour and death for these Indigenous peoples. Within a period of almost thirty years the majority of the native population of the island had died and had to be replaced with other forced labour (Deagan, 2022, 283). Eventually the islands of the Caribbean were serving as a forward operating base for foraging into the mainland of the American continent.

Near the end of Columbus' last trip around the Caribbean, a minor Spanish nobleman named Hernán Cortes arrived in 1504. He came to the Americas to look for riches and opportunity and after helping put down a rebellion by Indigenous *Cacique* Anacaona he was awarded lands and native workers (Cortes, 2014, 11). After working these lands for a while and joining an expedition into Cuba he set his eyes for the American mainland and the Yucatan peninsula. After landing on the coast and setting up the town of Veracruz he proceeded onwards into the *Mexica* lands. His mission of seeking contact with the Indigenous population and commencing commerce with them soon changed into plans of conquest. The Aztec Empire was, as any Empire, made up of several peoples and states. This meant that Cortes could rely upon native allies that were not happy being assimilated into an Empire. By using these Indigenous allies in 1521 the city of Tenochtitlan was captured and one the Aztec Empire was no more (McKay, 2006, 443).

Not soon hereafter, a third Spanish *Conquistador* made his way to the Americas, having been given permission by the king and queen to set up an expedition towards the West Coast of South America. Here Francisco Pizarro contacted the Inca Empire, the oldest and largest of the American Empires. Within a period of 40 years the Spanish had conquered and enslaved this Empire, and with it the final foundation of *Nueva España* had been completed (McKay, 2006, 443).

This series of events which took place almost half a millennium ago and has through time been simplified for a broader public. This simplification has created a discord between what a general audience knows about these Indigenous peoples, and what is factual based on archaeological research. The historical sources which are written nowadays are based on the reports of witnesses or on sources which were written later and of which the authors were not present at that time. The two problems with this discord are that the original sources are unreliable, as many Spanish sources were written by men who did not fully understand what they saw and were most likely terrified in a new and unknown country. Many of their sources, for instance the writings of Columbus, were made with a political agenda and meant to portray Indigenous peoples as easy pickings or bloodthirsty cannibals (Jansen, 2019, 7). In the writings about the Aztecs we see descriptions of enormous amounts of human sacrifices and cannibalism a feature of said culture which has never been archaeologically proven.

The other problem with these historical sources is that they tell a story of politics, war and conquest. A culture of Indigenous peoples cannot be accurately described based on the experiences of Europeans, who are exploring and conquering entirely new land. Our view on these Indigenous peoples and cultures is therefore based on large political events and provide us with little insight into the lives of the Indigenous peoples and their culture.

A majority of historical research into this period has been done and many works written based on these Spanish reports (McKay, 2006, 461). These consisted of works which tried to present an image of mostly visuals and experiences in what they called the '*New World*'. At the same time also being full of bias and lies to project an image less harsh than that took place. Even though the Spanish brought with them the Catholic faith and all the knowledge and wisdom of a modernized Europe, steeped in Renaissance traditions and humanistic values, the opposite was acted out (Deagan, 2022, 289). However, several sources written much later present the Spanish conquistadores with a truer representation of events and the butcher's bill of their conquest of the Caribbean and Americas (Las Casas, 1957, 44). These sources, both friendly and benign, represent only a historical, and very simplified account of the events that transpired. Two factors that are overlooked are the Indigenous perspective on these events and the archaeological sources.

There has been an increased archaeological interest in the cultures of the Indigenous peoples of the Americas in a pre-Columbian era. This is due to a present-day visibility of cultural traits and habits that have been passed on for generations (Hofman, 2018, 202). The quincentennial celebration of the 'discovery' by Christopher Columbus of the Americas also drew more attention to the topic. Where the exploitations of the Spanish in meso-America and the Andes have been explored more by archaeologists and historians, the account of Indigenous peoples of the Caribbean remained largely out of the spotlight. With our current post-colonial mindset, it would not be sufficient to just focus on historical sources and condemnation of the Spanish but bring to light the perspective of the Indigenous people of the Caribbean, Meso-America, and the Andes themselves, whose culture and heritage is very persistent but overly oppressed today.

Research aims and questions

Therefore, to contribute to a more nuanced view of these initial contacts the aim of this thesis is to contrast the Spanish historical sources with Indigenous perspectives grounded in archaeological sources. To provide both a more two-sided image of what transpired at these events, as well as to give voice to Indigenous peoples themselves, who as in the case of the Caribbean did not leave any written histories behind. Eventually in our discussion we will compare the relations between the Spanish and the Indigenous peoples of Hispaniola with those of the Aztec and Inca Empires. These three initial moments of contact between the two worlds are often presented as separate instances, where Cortes and Pizarro are mentioned together as conquistadores versus Columbus as 'discoverer'. In order to get a better understanding, highlighting the Indigenous perspective, of these initial moments of contact and how connected these moments were with each other, this thesis aims to evaluate the Spanish historical sources and contrast those with information from the archaeological record. The evaluation of historical sources will consider both eye-accounts from the 15th-16th century and contemporary literary works.

The main question addressed in this thesis is: How can we contribute to a more nuanced picture of the initial contact between the Indigenous inhabitants of the Americas and the Spanish invaders? Sub questions are: Who are these Indigenous people of the Caribbean, Mexico and Peru and what characterizes their culture? What can the Indigenous sources that remain inform us about their side of this contact?

Methodology

At the base of this research stands the comparison between the historical sources concerning the colonization and Indigenous populations of the Americas and the Caribbean Islands and archaeological data from recent investigations in the three areas concerned. To achieve this, we will first present the image created by the Spanish during their colonization based on written records of the 15th and 16th century as well as modern historical sources. This will give us an historical image of the Indigenous peoples of the areas, but also emphasize the Eurocentric and flawed image. By using historical sources, we can also show how much our present day understanding of these cultures is still based on ideas that the Spanish projected on the Indigenous cultures during the initial contacts. By focusing on the three most famous contacts of the Spanish colonial period we hope to eventually show the difference in how the Spanish approached the Indigenous peoples in these areas.

By contrasting the historical sources with the archaeological sources, we hope to better show the differences and prejudices that still occur in historical writing. At the same time, we hope to contribute to a more nuanced view on these first encounters and provide an Indigenous perspective. The Indigenous side of these contacts has mostly been overshadowed by general historical chronologies and meta narratives without considering the contribution of said Indigenous populations. It is also not exaggerated to put forward that the Spanish colonization would have utterly failed without Indigenous support.

The methodology used in this thesis entails the comparison and contrasting of historical and archaeological sources to overcome the Eurocentric and western perspectives of events and provide more a nuance and decolonized picture of the exploration and conquest of the other. By using this de-colonizing view on the first contacts between the Spanish and these Indigenous peoples of the Americas, we hope to decrease the stereotypes and misinformation that still persists today also in school curricula. The historical stereotypes and prejudices, which are widespread in common historical writing and teachings, should be abandoned and replaced by a multi-vocal and inclusive narrative.

Thesis outline

After the introduction in this first chapter, chapter 2 will provide a background into the general historical writings about the initial contacts. The historical background about these three events, and which image is most connected with these. Based on historical sources and modern historical writings. Focus will be laid on Christopher Columbus's first contact with the so-labelled *Taino* people on Hispaniola, which were described as 'Indians' and who would not have evolved beyond simple hunter-gatherer societies. After this Hernan Cortes' initial contact with the Aztec Empire and its human sacrifices will be examined. Finally, Fransisco Pizarro's experiences with the Inca Empire, it's conquest and how the lack of representable eye-witness reports have altered our view of the Inca Empire.

Secondly, in Chapter 3 we will discuss the methodology employed for this thesis. This methodology consists of taking three major misconceptions about these initial contacts that are prominent in historical writing and corroborating these with the Indigenous archaeological sources. The next three chapters will include the results of the evaluation of recent archaeological research in the regions concerned. Chapter 4 provides the information that was gathered on recent work that had been done in sites on Hispaniola, in so-called '*Taino*' settlements. Chapter 5 will provide insight into the lifeways of the Aztec but will foremost delve into the archaeological evidence regarding their death cult and human sacrifices. Chapter 6 will focus on the archaeology of the Inca and the indigenous side of Inca archaeology. Chapter 7 will entail the discussion in which the main questions of this

thesis will be answered on the comparison of the previously given historical images and the recent archaeological findings. In Chapter 8 the main conclusions will be presented as well as ideas for future research.

Chapter 2: Historical background

Many historical writings concerning Columbus' arrival on Hispaniola describe the Indigenous peoples of said island as 'Taíno' Indians. Columbus called these Indigenous peoples 'Indians' because he had predicted to arrive on the East coast of India. The word 'Taíno' itself was first used by Constantine Samuel Rafinesque in 1836 (Oliver, 2009, 6). He based this on Columbus' description of meeting prisoners on an island in the eastern Caribbean. These prisoners assured Columbus that they were the 'good ones' or the 'honourable ones' and for this used their word *tayno* (Oliver, 2009, 6). This to signify to Columbus that they were different from the other Indigenous peoples spread along the western and eastern edges of the Caribbean. These other Indigenous peoples were the Caribes of the lesser Antilles and the Guanahatabey who occupied the edge of Cuba (Varcacel Rojas, 2021, 519, Oliver, 2009, 92). Both these peoples, and several others on the mainland of South America, dispersed across the Caribbean Islands and eventually evolved in their own cultures (Oliver, 2009, 5). It is because of this ancestry that many contemporary writers have described these distinct groups as 'Taíno', or a sub-division among the Taíno (Oliver, 2009, 92). Other descriptions, however, state that the Taíno peoples were not necessarily an ethnic group, but a part of a caste-system on the Islands. This system would include four different layers of society where the Taíno would occupy the second-highest tier being only second to the 'aristocratic' *Caciques* (Loven, 2010, 419). Already we see a large discord in historical writings concerning the name of these Indigenous peoples, as the heavy influence of Spanish historical sources has created a way of writing that relies for the majority on Eurocentric historical viewpoints (Curet, 2018, 547).

Eventually with the colonization and the second and third voyages of Columbus, more settlers and materials were brought from Spain to Hispaniola. After settling both the northern and southern coast of the island and a corridor between those, the Spanish started their search for gold. The Cibao valley became the first major area exploited for its natural resources, and with it the Indigenous population was divided into the slave labour intensive repartimiento-system (Valcarcel Rojas, 2021, 519). This system meant that the Indigenous population living on a plot of land would be subjugated by the owner of that land and had to work as slave labour in the goldmines. This system eventually evolved in the *encomienda* system where the local *Cacique* became overseers of production. It is here that the real tragedy of the colonization of the island takes place. The Indigenous population would be forced to work up to six or eight months in the mines, leaving no time or room to forage for other foodstuffs than the grown yucca and maize. This caused the number one cause of death under the Indigenous population of Hispaniola: starvation (Loven, 2010, 499). Within a few decades the Indigenous population of Hispaniola nearly became extinct to such a level that slaves from Africa had to be brought in. The image of these Indigenous peoples as scarcely clothed hunter-gatherers who were subjugated by the sword and by disease is a vivid image in historical writing and imagery. An example of these images can be found in the etchings of Theodor de Bry in the 16th century; a man who himself never set foot in the Americas, but whose etchings and drawings were used as staple imagery for the Indigenous peoples of the Americas (Mason, 1990, 216, Mignolo, 2011, 184).

During the time of the Spanish colonization of the Caribbean Islands, several small-scale expeditions were sent to the west to explore and map the American mainland. Even though the Spanish were aware of the existence of the continent, no great undertaking into the jungles of Meso-America took place until 1519. At this time, a young nobleman named Hernán Cortes was a well-established name in the Caribbean islands. He himself having come to the Caribbean years earlier, serving as an officer during a local revolt on Hispaniola and eventually pacifying the island of Cuba. On both of these

islands he was awarded land and Indigenous peoples to work the land, cultivating crops and raising sheep and horses. Cortes lived on these islands for 15 years before undertaking an expedition to the Yucatán peninsula.

The Aztec Empire was made up of a union of three *Mexica* city-states: Tenochtitlan, Tlacopan and Tetzucoco who joined forces to conquer and subdue the other, larger city-states around the lake (Berdan, 2014, 135). Being as extensive in their organisation of state, commerce, religion and subsistence as their ferociousness in battle. These peoples would eventually have referred to themselves as *Culhua-Mexica*, signifying that they came from the noblest of places where the *Mexica* resided (Berdan, 2014, 139, Weaver, 1993, 439).

The largest part which is written about Cortes' conquest of the Aztec Empire is dedicated to the religion of the Aztecs. More importantly the number of human sacrifices. Many of the eyewitnesses report being terrified as they saw first Indigenous, and later their own men being dragged up the Templo Mayor to be sacrificed for the gods (Cortes, 2014, 23).

During the conquest of Cortes, a second type of historical sources surface alongside the pictographic, Indigenous sources. Cortes himself wrote in several letters about his experiences as well as having scribes with him to document his conquest and encounters. Reports have also been made of his men and their experiences during their meetings with the Aztecs. During the conquest of Cortes, the city was estimated to be the same size as London or Paris. Many of the Spanish sources and eye testimonies describe a city of incredible scale, organization, and beauty (Soustelle, 1955, 34). The conquest of Cortes was for the Aztecs a world-shattering event taking place in just six years. The Empire that had known an enormous growth in little over a century came crashing down. The Spaniards that arrived at the city were both awed by its magnificence and revolted by the sacrificial religion the Aztecs practiced. Both from Spanish eye-reports as well as from Aztec pictographic writing the image of large temples on which thousands of humans are sacrificed is one that remains strong in the historical consensus (Cortes, 2014, 23. Jansen, 2019, 2).

During the time that Cortes was conquering the Aztec Empire in Mexico, the Spanish started exploring and colonizing the west coast of South America. Vasco Nuñez de Balboa had already ventured through the jungle of present-day Panama and discovered a way to the Pacific Ocean as early as 1513 (Hemming, 1970, 23). Among this group was Francisco Pizarro, the man who would later receive a royal decree to conquer the lands now known as Peru and be its viceroy.

With the Inca Empire we experience a comparable situation as with the *Taíno* Indians of the Caribbean. The Indigenous peoples of the West Coast of South America during that time were referred to as the *Inca*. This name, however, has its origin in both the term *Sapa Inca* as well as a kindred circle (Mosely, 2001, 9). The word *Sapa Inca* was used for their Emperor meaning 'Sun under the Sun' in the native language of *Quechua*. All other subjects of the Inca Empire who were not part of the familiar circle of the *Sapa Inca* were Inca subjects but not ethnic Incas. The Inca themselves viewed them as inhabitants of *Tahuantinsuyu* which meant 'realm of the four parts' due to the division of four territories in the Inca Empire.

At this time a civil war was taking place in the Inca Empire, as the three sons of the *Sapa Inca* were battling for control of the Empire. The one to emerge victorious was Atahualpa. It was this leader that met Pizarro and his men and brought them to Cajamarca where the fate of the Empire would be decided. Pizarro describes the route inland as traversing incredibly rough terrain and stating that without the aid of the Incas they would never have succeeded. (McKay, 2006, 443). Atahualpa was eventually betrayed by the Spanish who had gotten increasingly nervous. They ambushed Atahualpa, who admitted to Pizarro that he would have done the same to the Spaniards,

but they beat him to it and killed over seven thousand of the Incas and ransomed him before killing him (Hemming, 1970, 37, McKay, 2006, 444).

The destruction and colonization of their empire at the hands of the Spanish, however, was not a cut and dry subject compared to the definitive conquests of the Aztecs or the destruction of the Taíno. Several timelines can be made for this Empire. The majority of sources that place the beginning of the Inca Empire is at AD 1200, the moment in which Cuzco was founded. The end of the Inca Empire however, can be divided into two moments. The first of which being the slaying of the last Inca Emperor Atahualpa in 1533 (Barker, 2014, 9). The second moment that can be used to mark the end of the Inca Empire is the death of Tupac Amarú, nephew of Atahualpa in 1572 and with him the last Inca stronghold in the Empire (Barker, 2014, 9).

As was the case with the conquest of the Aztec Empire, the Inca Empire was its own Achilles' heel. Being a state made up of several conquered people bred resentment, and many of the Indigenous peoples were eager to work together with the Spanish and chose to live under their colonizing rule. Beside this internal division, and the aforementioned civil war which weakened the Empire, disease fell upon the Inca shortly before the Spanish arrived (Hemming, 1970, 28). Having spread from the rainforest of present-day Brazil, it is possible that the Spaniards were responsible for the epidemic, spreading from the east coast of South America through the Amazon to eventually the Inca. The two images that historical sources present about the Inca peoples is that there is little historical account available, and at the same time portrays ideas about a vastly wealthy Empire.

The images the Spanish presented of the Indigenous peoples of the Americas and Caribbean is one of contradictions. First the inhabitants of the Caribbean islands are generous but simple. A word often used in later historical works is that of the 'noble savage', these Indigenous peoples would have lived as simple hunter-gatherers in huts in the jungle. After contact with the Spanish the majority of them would have died of European diseases in what historians call the 'Columbian Exchange'. (McKay, 2006, 448.) The Aztec Empire was an ancient Empire based on a cult of death where human sacrifices were a daily occurrence. At the time of the Spanish conquest several thousands of sacrifices would be held on a daily basis and, as well as on the Caribbean islands, would cannibalize their victims. The Inca Empire was as vast as the Empire of the Aztecs but much more difficult to conquer by the Spanish. An enormous wealthy Empire rife with civil war where the Sapa Inca was eventually, though being it easily, captured and killed by the Spanish. This led to the end of the Inca Empire (McKay, 2006, 443).

All these images are based on historical writings done by eyewitnesses, chroniclers or historians. A common factor in these writings is that they hardly leave any room for the Indigenous point of view in these events. As both the *Taíno* and the Inca Empire did not have access to written sources, it would be easy to dismiss their oral sources or traditions as additions to historical writing. Where there exists a lack of written Indigenous sources from these initial contacts, the archaeological sources provide us with the Indigenous perspective on these contacts.

Chapter 3: Methodology

The historical sources vary depending on the location in question. There exists a substantial difference in where and when historical sources were written during the initial contacts of Columbus, Cortes and Pizarro. While Columbus and Cortes had chroniclers with them, most men in the expedition of Pizarro were illiterate. These sources give first-hand accounts of how they experienced the Indigenous peoples and cultures of those areas. We have to keep in mind that these reports might not always be fully dependable, as they were written by men who never experienced situations like those before. Many of these works based themselves on the reports and accounts of eyewitnesses, but these were only written down much later than the events took place. These inaccurate narratives have been used and continued into our present-day historical sources and provide us with an exaggerated image of events. These sources, both eye-witness reports and modern historical sources will be used to provide a more general historical image of the interaction between Indigenous peoples and the Spanish.

Delving into these we can see that they are written with a certain degree of bias towards the Indigenous peoples. As we will discover many of the terms we use to describe these cultures stem from misconceptions made during the first contact, or derive from later works written about these contacts. These sources not only understate the importance and the presence of Indigenous peoples, but also misrepresents them by using terms that are a projection of Western values. This will become clear when we start discussing the names these Indigenous peoples were given. To counter this Eurocentric way of investigating the contact between Indigenous peoples and the Spanish, we compare these historical sources with archaeological sources. This indigenous perspective provides us with a way to corroborate the historical sources.

We will check these sources based on three major events in the history of the colonization of America and the Caribbean: Columbus' interaction with the Taíno Indians, Cortes' conquest of the Aztec Empire and Pizarro's conquest of the Inca Empire. We will start with Columbus' contact on the island of Hispaniola with the Taíno's because it was the first contact between Spanish colonizers and Indigenous peoples in the so called 'New World'. In the greater process of the Spanish colonization this contact in the Caribbean often get outshined by the conquest of the Aztec and Inca Empires, despite all further information the Spaniards had was based on Columbus' findings.

We also use these three major events in the Spanish colonial history to compare them to each other. As these contacts came one after the other, we could assume that the Spanish learned from each interaction and brought this knowledge with them. In the Americas we see the opposite happening as all three cases become completely different from each other. Historical writing only joins with archaeology to show these large structures as Machu Picchu and Teotihuacan as examples of the culture of the Indigenous peoples. It does not, however, use these archaeological sites as source material.

By comparing these Eurocentric, historical sources with the Indigenous archaeological data we get a more decolonized image of the initial contacts in the Caribbean and the Americas. By providing an Indigenous perspective we move our view on these contacts from Westernized, biased sources and create more contrast in the discussion regarding the initial contacts in the Caribbean and the Americas.

Chapter 4: Christopher Columbus and the Taíno.

One major misinterpretation of the Taíno Indians who lived on Hispaniola was the idea that they were a homogenous culture, spread across the Caribbean Islands. Historical writing has presented these Indigenous peoples as one cultural whole, which would only show differences between islands themselves. Archaeological evidence, however, shows a much closer spread of cultural differences. Cultural locations could vary on islands as well, and even between villages in building methods, funeral practices, and idols (Curet, 2002, 269). These villages consisted of several houses built around a square. Between these houses, built irregular without streets, were vacant slots of land which could be used as town squares, ball courts and gardens (Samson et al, 2015, 328). The example made by Las Casas is one of a town that consisted of one thousand houses and three thousand people, but this is the exception among the islands as most villages were smaller or even consisted of no more than a handful of houses. (Samson et al, 2015, 328). Despite the separation of the Caribbean Islands the populations of these islands would still be very much in contact with each other. On a daily basis men and women went out in canoes of many sizes to stay in contact with tribes in other areas of the islands or on other islands (Corcoran-Tadd, 2021, 475).

The Taíno lived in villages of different sizes, with houses built of clay walls, wooden poles and thatch roofs on top of earthen mounds, as were found at the site of En Bas Saline, a large Indigenous site on Hispaniola (Deagan, 2002, 72). At the centre of society stood a person who the Spanish called *Cacique*; a word derived from the Taíno word for "Chief". The Spanish, for their convenience, also divided the island into several *cacicazgos* or chiefdoms. Here we see the historical sources draw cultural lines on a map and take it as fact. Several of the earliest historical sources writing about the Taíno by the Spanish were written by men who either wrote later in their lives, or never set foot on the island themselves (Hofman et al, 2018, 205).

The diet of the Taíno consisted for the majority of cultivated vegetables such as yucca and maize, combined with animal proteins by means of fishing or hunting small game (Delsol, 2016, 400). Being part of the Caribbean Islands, maritime fishing was a large part of their daily life and provided ample sources of food. Needing to catch their prey far out to sea, the Taíno had developed a multitude of fishing strategies to capture their prey. From regular nets and fishing rods to catch small fish, to fishing with harpoons for sea turtles and manatees. In contrast the Indigenous peoples of mainland Central America hardly developed their fishing strategies further because of the existence of Piranhas in rivers (Delsol, 2016, 400). The historical images of a culture which was more presented to be primitive hunter-gatherers, therefore, are incorrect.

Where modern historians place the population estimate of the island at several thousands, De las Casas suggested that several million Taíno lived on the island. Along with archaeological sources the estimate can be placed at anywhere between three to eight million inhabitants at the arrival of Columbus (Deagan, 2002, 71). Archaeological research in the late 20th and early 21st centuries have yielded an incredible amount of data and finds, with over 300 sites. These sites spread across the north-western coast of the island, inwards following the *Ruta de Colon* and into the Cibao-valley (Corcoran-Tadd, 2021, 472). Several archaeological sites have been brought into contact with routes. These routes would be used in a node-like system of towns and villages. By connecting these settlements with routes, the Taíno could communicate with each other, while still maintaining a system of political and social class (Hofman, 2018, 208). Columbus was shown a track into the Cibao valley and built a road there, as well as basing his route from the Cibao valley towards the town of La Isabella on an Indigenous trade route (Hofman, 2018, 208, Corcoran-Tadd, 2021, 480).

Despite the large number of archaeological sites connected to the Taino of Hispaniola, there is no visible proof of contact with the Spanish colonizers. The find assemblies of these finds consist mostly of Indigenous materials or animal remains. It would make sense that the Taíno were left to live mostly in their villages, while the Spanish divided the land into *repartimientos* and *encomienda's*. By leaving the Indigenous peoples in their own villages and respecting their social stratification, they ensured cooperation of the *Caciques*. At the site of En Bas Saline, however, contact with the Spanish colonizers is visible. This site might be the same site as where Columbus built his first fort of *La Navidad* after his ship wrecked on the coast. Columbus was taken in by the *Cacique* Guacanacari and decided to build a fort there, as he could not transport the remainder of his men back. After Columbus came back in 1493, he discovered the fort burnt and his men dead. The *Cacique* blamed it on the undisciplined Spanish; they would have fought among themselves, deserted, died from disease, or been killed by a neighbouring *Cacique* for stealing their women. Whatever the case may be, we find at the site of En Bas Saline traces of massive disturbance and charred wood, suggesting that the entire village was torched after Columbus returned (Deagan, 2002, 72).

Chapter 5: Hernan Cortes and the Aztec Empire

When we discuss Cortes and his conquest of the Aztec Empire, we see once again a stigma concerning the Indigenous peoples of this area. According to their origin story the Indigenous people of the Mexico Valley came from a cave named *Aztecatl* (Weaver, 1993, 439). It is from the name of *Aztecatl* that the Spanish would name these peoples the Aztecs, not understanding that they said this to indicate where they originated from. These peoples travelled south together until the god Huitzilopochtli appeared in a vision and called upon a group to split off from the other 'Aztecs' and proclaim the name of *Mexica*. The *Mexica* were the ones to eventually make their way south-westwards and found the great city of Tenochtitlan. This name derived from the *Nhuatl* language word "*Tenochtlí*" meaning 'place of the cactus', in accordance with the origin myth of the *Mexica* people.

When the *Mexica* ventured south towards lake Texcoco many locations were already occupied. In another vision *Huitzilopochtli* showed them an eagle perched on a cactus in a lake, holding a serpent in its beak. This place would signify the location of where the tribe would have to locate to and start building their city. Eventually settling on the swampy islands on the western coast of lake Texcoco, the *Mexica* built their city on poles, constructed causeways with removable bridges and grew their food on floating islands called *Chinampas* (Weaver, 1993, 440). It is estimated that the Aztecs founded Tenochtitlan in 1372 under their first ruler Acamapichtli, the first Aztec 'emperor'. Only after several years in 1428 could they improve their standing in the valley by joining with their sister city of Tlatelolco. Eventually assimilating Tlatelolco as an independent trade city which made Tenochtitlán the biggest city-state in the Mexico valley (Berdan, 2014, 137).

Much is known about the Aztec Empire and its history because of their extensive bureaucratic apparatus and the writing of *Codices*. These *Codices* were pictographic reports of daily life in the Aztec Empire and handled topics such as commerce, law, medicine and religion. Although many of these *Codices* were destroyed during the Spanish conquest of the Empire, several remain and the practice of writing *Codices* continued until after the fall of the Empire (Weaver, 1993, 144). The Aztecs had an iconographic system of writing. These images or icons represented actions or people and were either written in *Codices*, chiselled on buildings, or painted on surfaces.

Archaeology concerning Tenochtitlán provided a large problem as the city of Mexico City was built directly on its ruins. Despite the fact that across present-day Mexico numerous Aztec sites were uncovered the capital of the Empire remained unexcavated. In 1978 during excavations the Templo Mayor was discovered and subsequently a large part of the square had been uncovered (Weaver, 1993, 445). This meant that the sacred precinct of the city was excavated, and a number of temples, shrines, palaces, and houses were uncovered. These buildings contained over six thousand artefacts including religious sacrifices, artworks, pottery, tools, and musical instruments but more importantly many glyphs engraved in these buildings (Weaver, 1993, 445).

When we investigate the archaeological and historical sources regarding Cortes and the Aztecs, we see many similarities between those. Where the descriptions and historical sources made by both the Spaniards and the Aztecs at the time of conquest do match, we see archaeological evidence back these up. Nevertheless, are there many misconceptions concerning the Aztec cult of death and the nature of sacrifices. Both in the descriptions of Cortes' men as well in Aztec pictographs the meaning of human sacrifices is misunderstood, misinterpreted, or straight-up imagined.

The majority of sources written about the nature of human sacrifice within the Aztec culture have been collected after the conquest of the Empire. Most eye-witness reports make unclear descriptions of these sacrifices (Jansen, 2019, 6). Some of the first descriptions we receive from the Spanish differ

amongst themselves. Descriptions of temple-like structures which were covered with what was presumed human blood. Pots with human limbs were seen being 'cooked' over fire for cannibalistic consumption (Jansen, 2019, 5). In Aztec writing there are multiple depictions of people being sacrificed at the top of temples, their hearts cut out with obsidian blades, decapitated and their bodies thrown down the stairs. Archaeological evidence to support these accusations of large-scale human sacrifice and cannibalism does not exist. More importantly the nature of Aztec sacrifices has been grossly exaggerated and misinterpreted by scared Spanish soldiers, who saw their comrades being dragged up the *templo mayor* to be sacrificed.

The act of cannibalism in the Aztec Empire has never been archaeologically proven. An explanation is given according to several coastal burial practices, moreover the practice of mummification. In this process, as any modern-day hunter would use when cleaning a hunted animal, the remains are cooked or boiled to remove the carcass of its flesh. What the Spaniards might have thought to have been limbs ready to be cannibalized, was most likely a step in the mummification process (Jansen, 2019, 8).

The idea of a blood sacrifice, too, is a misconception about not only the Aztec world but for the majority of Latin-America and the Caribbean. Many religions in this area have, in some form of another, the practice of sacrificing blood. Both human and animalistic (Jansen, 2019, 5). In Aztec religion, the universe has a cyclic cause of events from life to death to rebirth, and to avoid the death of the universe in their time the Aztecs believed the gods were owed life. This in the form of blood, as blood is the life fluid of humankind. The fact that the Aztecs were the most notorious regarding human sacrifices comes from the timing that the Spanish had when arriving. Human, or more common, blood sacrifices have been common in Meso- and South America for decades. The Aztecs, however, had suffered a period of extreme drought for four years between 1451 and 1455 (Weaver, 1993, 443). Because of this and subsequent rebellions they increased the number of sacrifices for periods of time. It also has to be said that during the finishing of the Templo Mayor in 1478, over 20.000 captives were sacrificed in the celebration, meaning that these amounts only took place in extraordinary circumstances.

Two of the most important misconceptions about Aztec 'sacrifice' is that it was a form of capital punishment. The same as in any other European state at that time. Though being very ritualistic in nature and performance, the act of sacrificing humans to the gods was in almost all cases acted out on either convicts, or prisoners of war. The last of which gives us an explanation to the tall tales of 'thousands of sacrifices' that the Spaniards described. It is only logic that in a period of great conflict and turmoil, as was the civil war in the Aztec Empire combined with the incursion of the Spaniards, which caused an increase in prisoners of war. The second misconception comes from the Aztec sources themselves, as in many *codices* we see images of skulls, blood, and gruesome acts such as sacrificing people. The distinction has to be made however, that the pictographic image that is the act of sacrificing someone is nothing less than the Aztec 'word' for 'death' or 'to kill' (Jansen, 2019, 11). In the same way as we present images of skulls on the packaging of harmful substances, so did the Aztec present their way of purveying warnings.

Chapter 6: Francisco Pizarro and the Inca Empire

As we have seen in historical sources, the conquest of the Inca Empire took significantly longer than the other encounters. Between the first encounter by Pizarro and the final defeat of the last Sapa Inca, Tupac Amaru, in Vilcabamba in 1572 a period of almost forty years passed (Bauer & Cruz, 2015, 3). From Pizarro and his men, who were for the majority illiterate we receive hardly any eye-witness reports. Most of the sources made by chroniclers, where get more 'accurate' descriptions of what they saw, were written several years after Pizarro's landing (Moseley, 2001, 13). As Pizarro is sailing down the coast he captures an ocean-worthy raft with twenty Indigenous peoples from the Inca Empire (Hemming, 1970, 25). These rafts are also an example of how the Inca people adapted themselves to their environment, as the arid Chilean plains offer little wood for boats or canoes (Moseley, 2001, 39). The historic description of the materials which the Inca transported shows the stereotypical 'wealth' of these peoples. The Inca had with them to use for trade: fine alpaca textiles, beads, woodwork, mirrors, silver and gemstones (Malpass, 1993,150).

Inca archaeology has been for the majority of its existence, graverobbing. The Spanish conquistadores in the 16th century discovered that the Inca had buried their dead in large, underground tombs called *Paracas*. These tombs consisted of a structure above ground, followed by a shaft and a final burial chamber where several mummies were positioned (Mosely, 2001, 161). Along these mummies were positioned a large quantity of grave goods, most often made from precious metals. Throughout the ages these tombs have been dug up for the wealth they possessed and filled collections and museums. The problem with this archaeological basis is that it is based on grave goods that were most likely only available for the wealthy and powerful and in this way becomes more art-historical than archaeological (Moseley, 2001, 17).

Similar to this is the major re-discovery of the Inca temple city of Machu Picchu by Hiram Bingham in 1911. As this city was built purposely as a summer palace and temple city for the wealthy, we can only hold it partly representable for Incan archaeology in its entirety. Machu Picchu is, however, an excellent archaeological example, together with the site of Tampu Machay (Mosely, 2001, 56), of the Incan masonry. This type of masonry is unique in the world, as it fits stones together perfectly, relying on gravity to hold them together rather than applying mortar or glue. Many Inca towns, houses and temples in the Andes are built in the same manner, most likely to be topped with sturdy wooden beams and a thatch roof. The same type of house, although having replaced stone blocks with wooden posts, can be found in the lower coastal and jungle areas (Moseley, 2001, 81).

This type of masonry can also be seen with the terraced farms the Incas used. The mountainous areas from the lower foothills upward to the Andean highlands are ill suited for agriculture. Both the slope of the mountains as well as the low nutritional value of the soil makes agriculture difficult. The Incas, however, developed a system of terraced farms where, with a symbiotic system of keeping livestock and farming, they could yield crops all year round (Mosely, 2001, 31. Malpass, 1993, 26). The system they implemented was designed in such a way that specific crops would be grown at suitable altitudes and climate zones. Combined with fertilizer from Alpacas and Llamas they could keep the soil fed with nutrients and an elaborate system of aqueducts and irrigation supplied a steady flow of water to these fields (Mosely, 2001, 32). One of the more impressive feats of the Inca Empire also lay in the diversity of the landscape it consisted of. From mountainous highlands and arid lowlands towards the sea in the West, to the tropical rainforest in the east.

Citizens of the Inca Empire were supposed to work these lands based on *Mit'a* service (Mosely, 2001, 72). This system was made up of a mandatory draft out of every able-bodied male to be used for labour. The type of labour could vary from farming, building, crafts, or military campaigns. Because of the size of the Incan Empire this draft provided a surplus workforce of several millions of people, which explained the almost impossible feats the Incas managed to accomplish. Out of these *Mit'a* servicemembers, artisans and fine craftsmen emerged. The economy of the Incas was based on reciprocity and an exchange of goods. With this came elaborate designed pottery, sculpted woodwork and fine gold and silver ornaments (Mosely, 2001, 72).

Chapter 7: Discussion

The historical sources describing the peoples of the Caribbean, Mexico and the Andes contain a lot of bias and prejudiced views. In a lot of cases these sources were written by men who did not understand the events, rituals, and cultures that they saw as they had contact with Indigenous peoples. More than often these sources, at that time, were written much later after these contacts took place, which led to misinterpretations and context which was lost in translation. These historical sources have been used in further historical writing, whereas the Indigenous point of view has been mostly left aside. In most cases this had been because of the lack of an Indigenous written record. By having compared these historical sources with the archaeological context we have given an Indigenous perspective to the historical sources. A more nuanced image regarding the three initial moments of contact, and three major historical prejudices has been provided by using this Indigenous perspective.

When Columbus contacted the *Taino* Indians of the Caribbean he and his men changed their original mission from trade and colonization to subjugation and forced labour. The Spanish sources depicted these Indians as simple, poor, and almost prehistoric. At the same time, they presented an idea of a 'noble savage' who had to be civilized and baptised by the Spanish. In a period of three decades Columbus and his men, along with later Spanish colonizers had decimated the Indigenous populations by forced labour in mines and on *Encomiendas*. This fast decline of the Indigenous population provided a difficulty in presenting their perspective on the contact with the Spanish. In archaeological sources we see the *Taino* Indians as part of the Arawak speaking peoples of the Caribbean. The *Taino* peoples were a society with strong familiar ties that lived in many villages spread along these islands. Their subsistence economy was only partially hunter-gatherer, as the majority of their diet consisted of grown produce, only to be supplemented by an extensive range of seafood and fish. The latter of which required them to invent a myriad of fishing techniques. This subsistence economy, and the fact that the Spanish did not allow them time to farm, is the main reason the majority of the Indigenous population died under Spanish rule.

When talking about the Aztecs in historical context, we see eye-witness reports of the city of Tenochtitlan. This city would have been as large as Paris or London in that day but held a cult of death that, at the time of Spanish conquest, sacrificed hundreds of men at the top of the *Templo Mayor* in a gruesome matter. The entire Aztec state, religion and war machine seemed to be centred around the acquisition of men for sacrifice and this is one of the largest reasons that they lost their Empire to the Spanish.

By using archaeological sources, we see that this idea of human sacrifice, and cannibalistic practices, has been exaggerated and repeated until current historical sources. The Aztec cult of death, although it being different from Christianity, was not centred around human sacrifice. As many other religions spread across the Caribbean and American regions, the sacrificial giving of blood has been around for centuries. By closer examining the Aztec pictographic sources and archaeology we can understand that the sacrifice was for the majority reserved for criminals and prisoners of war. Sacrifice was, at all times, a ritualistic undertaking and only in times of extreme suffering or war did the amount of complete human sacrifices increase. Never to the amount that the historical sources have exaggerated it to.

The Inca Empire, in historic writing, is an Empire which holds both the unknown as well as vast wealth. As they themselves did not have a writing system except for the ropes and knots of the *Quipu*, they did not leave a written record of their culture and society. As the party of Pizarro was for

the majority illiterate and did not take time to chronicle their efforts, or the observations they made, the majority of writing was done after the conquest of the Empire.

Early archaeological research into the Inca society has been based upon grave robbing. From the 16th century onwards the tombs of Inca royals and nobility has been plundered for their precious objects and expensive fabrics or materials. Only recent late 19th and 20th century archaeological research gives us a better image of Inca life, rather than the story of the downfall of an Empire. We see an incredible network of roads connecting towns, villages and estates all built without mortar. These incredible feats of work all had been done without the use of metal or iron tools, the use of the wheel or beasts of burden and all at an altitude stretching from coastal plains to high mountains. We see an extensive system of agriculture with terraces reaching the peaks of mountains, all designed to yield specific crops in their own designated altitudes and times of year.

Chapter 8: Conclusion

The Spanish Colonization, or conquest, of the Caribbean islands and the Empires of the Aztec and the Inca was a process in world history that took less than 80 years. From the moment Columbus arrived in the Caribbean until the final remnants of the Inca Empire were destroyed, interactions with Indigenous peoples were at the forefront of this process. By comparing historical with archaeological sources, we have received a better understanding of these Indigenous societies, as well as brought to light the stigmas the historical sources contained.

The colonization of the Caribbean islands, and in this specific case Hispaniola was the first contact between the Spanish and the Indigenous peoples of the Americas. The Indigenous peoples who the Spanish called “*Indios*” have been renamed to the *Taíno* Indians in the mid-19th century. Not understanding that the term *Taíno* might not have signified a people but a social class, this term has been copied and remains in use to this day. While Columbus and his men had material superiority, without the help of the local *Caciques* and the local infrastructure they would not have succeeded in capturing the island as quickly as they did. The Indigenous peoples of Hispaniola aided the Spanish in setting up their *Incomienda's* which led to forced labour and the deaths of the majority of the Indigenous population on the island. Despite the fact that many historical works have been written about this interaction, and the many archaeological sites found on Hispaniola, these two co-exist more than confirm or deny one another. As there are historical descriptions about the *Taíno* peoples of Hispaniola meeting their demise at the hands of the Spaniards, actual archaeological sources confirming this are absent.

For the conquest of the Aztec Empire our sources are more abundant not only historically, but archaeologically. The Aztecs, or more accurately *Mexica* themselves wrote in their pictorial writing about themselves, their origins, their customs and their daily lives, both in *Codices* as on public buildings. Even after the fall of Tenochtitlán the survivors and heirs of the Aztec culture still wrote these works. This, combined with the historical accounts of Cortes and his men, provides us already with a nuanced picture of Aztec society and their interactions with the Spanish Conquistadores. The Aztec Empire remains one of the fastest and largest empires in the world to rise, and fall. When the Spanish landed in Veracruz in 1518, they discovered an Empire stretching from east to west, with a city as beautiful and large as Rome or Paris. They also discovered a large part of the population of the Aztec empire being conquered, oppressed and more than willing to join the Spanish side in the upcoming war. The Empire was depicted by the Spanish as one of rich culture, trade, and politics, but the image that stuck with Europeans was the human sacrifices. By misunderstanding the Aztec death cult and the reasons human sacrifices were held the image of the Aztecs mass murderers stuck in historical writing and has found its way into historical consensus.

By delving deeper into archaeological sources and using Indigenous *Codices* we have better understood the nature and reasons of these human sacrifices. The ritualistic sacrifice of blood, being it one's own or that of an animal, has been a common factor in several religions of the Americas and Caribbean. Human sacrifice was in almost all cases the ritualistic execution of criminals or prisoners of war. This last one provides an explanation of the increase in sacrifices the Spanish saw in the 16th century, as they themselves incited civil war and conquest and thus provided an increase in prisoners. In Aztec *Codices* and pictographic depictions on temples and buildings, the image of a man being sacrificed does not necessarily mean sacrifice. Most likely it meant either the function of a priest, which is to say the ‘word’ for priest, or it was meant to be used as a warning, the same way modern-day humans use skulls as a danger warning.

The Inca Empire in historical sources is also the subject of many prejudices and biases. Most historical sources written by contemporaries of Pizarro wrote only after the conquest of the Empire. The majority of the company of Pizarro was illiterate, and thus eye-witness reports were documented much later and also would be less accurate. Archaeology too, has had a slight influence in the bias regarding the Inca Empire, as for a large part since the 16th century to the late 19th century focused on grave goods. Therefore, we had the image of Inca culture as one being incredibly wealthy, with citizens wearing ornamented jewellery, precious objects and clad in the finest alpaca furs. The most famous Inca archaeological site was that of Machu Picchu, a palace high in the Andes and the image most associated with the Incas.

With the archaeology of the late 19th and 20th century we have gotten a better image of the more localized subjects that made the Inca Empire as great as it was. The work system with which its inhabitants worked, the extensive network of roads connecting supply bases and towns. The mortarless type of masonry which supported houses, roads, and palaces throughout several levels of altitude. The extensive terraced farms with an agricultural system that yielded year-round crops, all designed to be grown on specific heights at specific times of the year. By using these smaller, more Indigenous archaeological sources we have taken a step down from the 'grandeur' and using Machu Picchu as a representation of basic Inca society and Indigenous culture.

When comparing these three moments of contact between the Spanish and the Indigenous peoples of the Americas and the Caribbean we see only moderate differences. Even though all three areas and their inhabitants differ from each other, the results are mostly the same. In the most general way of describing the results of the contacts between the Spanish and the Indigenous peoples we can determine that the Indigenous peoples were subjugated, colonized or in several ways murdered. Contrary to the historical writing however, they discovered Indigenous peoples who were well-established. Villages, roads and trade networks were abundant and extensively used by the Spanish. Where Columbus came to the Caribbean to set up trade and friendly relations with the Indigenous peoples, Cortes and Pizarro came clearly to conquer Indigenous territory. It is here where a distinction between these two can be made, and why most historical sources call Cortes and Pizarro 'Conquistadores'. Where Cortes' colonization relied heavily on Indigenous support to incite a civil war, Pizarro's colonization of the Inca Empire arrived in the aftermath of a civil war. Even though the Inca Empire was already fractured and in a weakened state, it held on the longest and the Spanish were only victorious in 1572.

With this thesis a comparison has been made between historical sources and archaeological Indigenous perspectives. By using these archaeological sources, we have given a more two-sided view on these three points of contact between the Spanish and the Indigenous peoples of the Caribbean, Mexico and the Andes. By using the Indigenous perspective, we have been able to better present the role of Indigenous peoples during those contacts, as well as provide more nuance to the historical consensus. Most historical sources in the past, as well as present-day, contain many biases based on the Spanish reports of that time. The Indigenous archaeological sources provide a clear contrast to these historical sources. From a decolonization perspective the use of Indigenous sources is a step forward from accepting historical sources, as well as providing more outreach for understanding the contributions of Indigenous peoples in the past.

Abstract

Over five centuries ago, the Spanish under Christopher Columbus landed in the Caribbean. They encountered Indigenous peoples on these islands, who they named '*Indios*'. Within no more than 30 years this entire Indigenous population had been enslaved and exploited as forced labour for the Spanish. The Spanish continued their expansion into mainland America where Hernan Cortes encountered an Indigenous Empire stretching from the Caribbean coast to the Pacific Ocean. The conquest of Cortes of this Empire is as legendary in historical writing as is the city of Tenochtitlan itself, before the Spanish destroyed it and built México city on its ruins. The final contact between Spanish and the Indigenous peoples described in this essay is Fransisco Pizarro and his contact with the Inca Empire. A vast Empire stretching for 2500 miles from north to south on the Chilean coast, containing tropical rainforest, arid plains, and high mountain passes. This empire as well, was vanquished by the Spanish over a period of 40 years. These descriptions are well-known in present day historical writing and is what most of the general public is familiar with. These descriptions are however very Eurocentric representations of these initial contacts and have almost no regard for the Indigenous perspective of these contacts. This thesis hopes to provide a more nuanced, decolonized view on the initial contact between the Spanish and the Indigenous peoples of the Caribbean and Americas. By comparing historical sources to Indigenous archaeological finds we can provide a better image of the bias and prejudices that are present in present-day historical writing and get a better idea of how these Indigenous peoples reacted to the Spanish colonization.

Bibliography

- Barker, R. (2014). *Duration and Political Nature of the Inca Empire*. New York: The Edwin Mellen Press.
- Bauer, B., Fonseca Santa Cruz, J., & Aráoz Silva, M. (2015). *Vilcabamba and the Archaeology of Inca Resistance*. EScholarship, University of California
- Bauer, B.S. et al. (2016) *Voices from Vilcabamba: Accounts chronicling the fall of the Inca Empire*. Colorado University Press, Colorado.
- Berdan, F. (2014). *Aztec Archaeology and Ethnohistory* (Cambridge World Archaeology). West Nyack: Cambridge University Press.
- Casas, B. (1957). *Diario de a bordo de Cristobal Colon. Primer viaje* (Coleccion Espana heroica. Vol. 1). Barcelona.
- Corcoran-Tadd, N. et al. (2021) *Indigenous Routes and Resource Materialities in the Early Spanish Colonial World: Comparative Archaeological Approaches*. Cambridge University Press, UK.
- Cortés, H. (2014). *Five Letters 1519-1526*. Routledge.
- Curet, A. (2018). William F. Keegan & Corinne L. Hofman. *The Caribbean before Columbus*. 2017. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press, 978-0-19-060525-4 *Antiquity*, 92(362), 546-548.
- Curet, E. L. (2002). *Ethnohistory: the bulletin of the Ohio Valley historic Indian conference* Vol. 49, No. 2 (2002), p. 259-280.
- Deagan, K. (2022) *Spanish-Indian interaction in Sixteenth century Florida and Hispaniola*. University of Florida press, Florida.
- Deagan, K. and Cruxent, J.M. (2002) *From Contact to Criollos: The Archaeology of Spanish Colonization in Hispaniola*. University of Florida press, Florida.
- Delsol, N., & Grouard, S. (2016). Comments on Amerindian Hunting Practices in Trinidad (West Indies): Tetrapods from the Manzanilla Site (Late Ceramic Age 300-900 AD). *Journal of Island and Coastal Archaeology*, 11(3), 385-410.
- Hemming, J. (1970). *The conquest of the Incas*. Macmillan and Co Ltd, London.
- Hofman, C.L. Rostain, S. Mans, J.L.J.A, Hoogland, M.L.P. (2022) *Constructing from the invisible: conceptualizing Indigenous village layout and dynamics in the Circum-Caribbean, ethnoarchaeology*.
- Hofman, L.C. et al (2018) *Indigenous Caribbean perspectives: Archaeologies and legacies of the first colonised region in the New World*. *Antiquity*. 92. 200-216.
- Jansen, M.E.R.G.N. (2019) *Deconstruction the Aztec Human Sacrifice*. Leiden University, Leiden.

Lefebvre, M.J. (2015). *Animals, food, and social life among the pre-Columbian Taíno of En Bas Saline, Hispaniola*. University of Florida press, Florida.

Lovén, S. (2010). *Origins of the Tainan culture, West Indies* (University of Alabama Press pbk. ed., Caribbean archaeology and ethnohistory). Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.

Malpass, M. (1993). *Provincial Inca Archaeological and Ethnohistorical Assessment of the Impact of the Inca State*. Iowa: University of Iowa Press.

Mason, P. (1990) *Deconstructing America: representation of the other*. New York: Routledge.

McKay, et al. (2006). *A history of western society*. Boston: Bedford St. Martin's.

Mignolo, W. (2011) *Crossing Gazes and the Silence of the "Indians": Theodore de Bry and Guaman Poma de Ayala*. Duke University press, North Carolina.

Moseley, M.E. (2001) *The Incas and their Ancestors; the archaeology of Peru*. Thames & London, United Kingdom.

Oliver, J.R. (2009). *Caciques and cemí idols: the web spun by Taíno rulers between Hispaniola and Puerto Rico*. The university of Alabama press, Alabama.

Reid, B.A. (2018). *The archaeology of Caribbean and circum-Caribbean farmers 6000BC-AD 1500*. Routledge, New York.

Rouse, I. (1992). *The Taínos : Rise & decline of the people who greeted Columbus*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Samson, A., Crawford, C., Hoogland, M., & Hofman, C. (2015). Resilience in Pre-Columbian Caribbean House-Building: Dialogue Between Archaeology and Humanitarian Shelter. *Human Ecology : An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 43(2), 323-337.

Valcárcel Rojas, R., Laffoon, J., Weston, D., Hoogland, M., & Hofman, C. (2019). Slavery of Indigenous People in the Caribbean: An Archaeological Perspective. *International Journal of Historical Archaeology*, 24(3), 51casas7-545.

Weaver, M. (1993). *The Aztecs, Maya, and their predecessors: Archaeology of Mesoamerica* (3rd ed.). San Diego [etc.]: Academic Press.