BEYOND THE FAIRY TALE

An OSINT investigation of Disney’s Pocahontas (1995), the “Savages” sequence, historical representation and child-audience accountability

FULL INVESTIGATIVE PAPER + PUBLIC SERVICE ANNOUNCEMENT

Marie Landry Spy Shop | Landry Industries

Evidence review and source audit · November 1, 2026

Prepared by Marie-Soleil Seshat Landry

marielandryspyshop.com

Central question
What responsibilities arise when a G-rated family film presents colonial history through a fictionalized romance while featuring a musical sequence built around racial dehumanization and exterminationist rhetoric?

Research standard: documented facts, attributed statements, identifiable research findings and clearly labelled hypotheses. This report does not allege subliminal programming or deliberate criminal incitement by Disney.

ABSTRACT

This open-source intelligence investigation examines Disney’s *Pocahontas* (1995), with particular attention to the “Savages” musical sequence, the film’s historical framing, its family-market positioning, and questions of child-audience accountability. It reviews publicly available production statements, historical and Indigenous perspectives, academic criticism, contemporary reporting, audience-suitability guidance, and psychological research. The analysis finds that the sequence deliberately depicts racist dehumanization and calls to violence as part of the film’s dramatic conflict; this is not evidence that its creators endorsed those views. The reviewed record does not establish subliminal programming, deliberate criminal incitement, or measurable song-specific harm to children. The report distinguishes documented facts from interpretation and unresolved hypotheses, then proposes an evidence-led public-service response centred on media literacy, historical accuracy, age-appropriate context, and Indigenous voices.

Research notice and scope

This report is an open-source intelligence (OSINT) desk investigation. It evaluates publicly accessible material concerning the film, the song, the historical figure, selected production artefacts, contemporary reporting, academic criticism and audience-suitability guidance. It is not a legal finding, a clinical assessment, an archival examination of Disney's internal files, or an experimental study of viewers.

The phrase "Savages" is used as the title of the film's musical sequence and is not adopted as a description of Indigenous peoples. The report avoids reproducing extended copyrighted lyrics. Short lyric references are used only where necessary for analysis.

Contents

1. Executive summary and principal findings
2. Methodology and evidentiary standards
3. Historical record: Pocahontas and the Powhatan people
4. Film narrative, song structure and rhetoric
5. What the lyric revision establishes—and does not establish
6. Production evidence and alternate material
7. Marketing, family positioning and child-audience suitability
8. Psychological research: what can and cannot be inferred
9. Indigenous representation, consultation and cultural rights
10. Legal boundary: depiction, incitement and genocide
11. Findings matrix, gaps and next investigative steps
12. Public Service Announcement
13. Bibliography and source register

1. Executive summary and principal findings

Disney’s Pocahontas (1995) is officially presented as a G-rated animated family feature. Its own synopsis frames the story as a friendship bridging two cultures. The film’s musical sequence “Savages,” however, depicts racialized fear, collective blame, dehumanization and explicit calls for killing and destruction. The central public-interest issue is not whether the film contains a hidden instruction; no evidence reviewed establishes subliminal programming. The issue is whether the film’s family-market positioning, historical simplification and emotionally memorable performance of exterminationist rhetoric were handled with adequate context and care. [1, 2, 4]

The investigation establishes five principal findings:

Finding 1 — The racist rhetoric was intentional as dramatic representation. Lyricist Stephen Schwartz has described “Savages” as a non-comic display of racism led by the villain Ratcliffe. This supports the conclusion that the racist content was consciously written to dramatize the film’s conflict; it does not show that the creators endorsed the rhetoric. [4]

Finding 2 — At least one inflammatory lyric was revised. In an archived Q&A on Schwartz’s own website, he acknowledged that a line originally describing an entire race as a curse was changed to a line referring to racial diversity. He said he did not remember the specific reason for the change. The questioner—not Schwartz—asserted that the earlier wording had been tested and found inflammatory. The cause of the revision therefore remains unverified. [3]

Finding 3 — The film substantially fictionalizes Pocahontas’s life. Smithsonian material documents her capture by English colonists in 1613, captivity, conversion, marriage to John Rolfe, travel to England and death in 1617. The romantic John Smith narrative is a later legend, not an established historical romance. [6, 7, 8, 21]

Finding 4 — The film was extensively marketed as family entertainment. Disney identifies the film as G-rated. Contemporary reporting documents a major promotional campaign, licensed goods, soundtrack products and a Burger King children’s meal promotion. This establishes commercial reach and child-oriented marketing; it does not establish that every child watched the film or that marketing itself caused harm. [1, 15–17]

Finding 5 — The song’s specific effect on children remains untested in the evidence located. Experiments show that violent song lyrics can increase hostile feelings and aggressive thoughts in college-student samples. Those findings do not prove that “Savages” produces anti-Indigenous prejudice, support for genocide or violent behaviour in children. A film-specific study is needed. [12]

Overall assessment: the strongest evidence-based critique concerns historical accountability, representation, developmental suitability and corporate responsibility—not an unsubstantiated allegation of covert incitement.

2. Methodology and evidentiary standards

The audit uses source triangulation: official Disney and creator material; Smithsonian and university educational resources; peer-reviewed academic publications; contemporary newspaper and trade-press reporting; an official soundtrack catalogue; child-media review guidance; and relevant international and Canadian legal texts. Sources are ranked by proximity to the fact being asserted.

Evidence grades used in this report

Grade	Meaning
A — Primary / authoritative	Official film, creator statement, government or museum record, treaty text, original soundtrack catalogue.
B — Scholarly / specialist	Peer-reviewed article, university research or specialist child-media review.
C — Contemporary reporting	News or trade publication close to the 1995 release and marketing period.
D — Lead only	Unverified secondary transcription, auction description or claim requiring original artefact corroboration.

A distinction is maintained between (a) what is visible or audible in the released film, (b) what creators have said about their intentions, (c) what audience research demonstrates in other contexts, and (d) what remains a hypothesis. A statement that a proposition has not been disproven is not evidence that it is true. Equally, a lack of public documentation does not prove that no internal discussion occurred.

The source register includes a duplicate official soundtrack listing and the Disney film page as both institutional metadata and primary-film reference. These are retained for navigational clarity, not counted as independent corroboration.

3. Historical record: Pocahontas and the Powhatan people

Pocahontas, also known as Matoaka and later Rebecca Rolfe, was born around 1595 and belonged to the Powhatan world of coastal Virginia. The Smithsonian National Portrait Gallery records that after English representatives established Jamestown, she sometimes served as an intermediary. In 1613, English colonists captured and ransomed her. During captivity she converted to Christianity, married tobacco planter John Rolfe, had a son, travelled to England in 1616 and died in 1617. [6, 7]

The well-known rescue story involving John Smith is historically disputed. The Smithsonian’s staff research page notes the problem with treating the familiar rescue narrative as settled fact; the Lehigh University Pocahontas Archive compares Smith’s contemporary accounts and documents how the story changed over time. [7, 21]

Disney’s film changes the age, chronology and relationship structure to create a romance narrative. Contemporary reporting in February 1995 records objections from Shirley Little Dove Custalow McGowan, a consultant who said the original story concerned a child and that the romance with Smith was invented. Producer James Pentecost acknowledged that the film was more a love story than a history lesson. Other Indigenous participants, including Russell Means and Hanay Geiogamah, expressed more supportive views. The record therefore shows disagreement, not a single unanimous Indigenous response. [14]

Historical context also matters. The film’s conflict is not simply a symmetrical misunderstanding between two equivalent groups. English settlement occurred in territory inhabited and governed by Powhatan communities. The historical record includes coercion, captivity, land pressure and colonial expansion. A film that centres a romance can make those structures less visible, even when it condemns individual racism.

4. Film narrative, song structure and rhetoric

The film’s official synopsis describes a friendship that bridges two cultures, and its G rating positions it within general family entertainment. The song “Savages” is credited to lyricist Stephen Schwartz and composer Alan Menken. The sequence is part of the film’s dramatic escalation toward armed confrontation. [1, 2]

The sequence uses recognizable rhetorical mechanisms:

Mechanism	Operation in the sequence	Potential audience-facing function
Dehumanization	The opposing population is described through animalizing and subhuman labels.	Can reduce perceived individuality and empathy.
Collective blame	An entire population is treated as a single hostile group.	Can make punishment of individuals appear justified by group membership.
Threat amplification	The other group is framed as an existential danger.	Can heighten fear and urgency.
Authority and mobilization	A leader converts fear into calls for organized violence.	Connects prejudice with collective action.
Musical repetition	A repeated label and choral delivery make the conflict memorable.	May aid recall and emotional engagement; specific effects require testing.

The sequence also includes reciprocal hostile language from Powhatan characters. That dramatic symmetry may communicate that fear and hatred can escalate on both sides. But symmetrical staging should not be confused with historical equivalence: the colonial relationship involved unequal power, settlement and territorial claims. The film’s structure can make the conflict appear more balanced than the historical context warrants.

The analysis identifies rhetorical features in the text; it does not establish a secret psychological programme. Depicting propaganda to condemn it is different from endorsing propaganda. The unresolved issue is how effectively the film’s narrative cues communicate that distinction to different age groups.

5. What the lyric revision establishes—and does not establish

The strongest newly identified primary-source lead is an archived Q&A on Stephen Schwartz’s own website. A questioner quoted an earlier line that characterized an entire race as a curse and compared it with the released line referring to racial diversity. Schwartz replied that he did not remember the specific reason for the change, that he was accustomed to rewriting, and that he preferred the final line in some respects. [3]

This is direct evidence that the lyric was revised and that Schwartz acknowledged the revision. It is not evidence that test audiences objected. That assertion appears in the question posed to Schwartz, and his answer does not confirm it. The reason for the revision—artistic preference, narrative clarity, internal review, audience response, consultation or another factor—remains unknown.

The change is nevertheless analytically relevant. The earlier wording, as quoted in the exchange, was more directly categorical. The final wording changes the expression but leaves the broader song’s racialized hostility and exterminationist content intact. This supports a narrow finding: one inflammatory formulation was revised while the sequence continued to dramatize extreme racist rhetoric. It does not prove a deliberate attempt to conceal the song’s meaning.

6. Production evidence and alternate material

The official Stephen Schwartz page credits Alan Menken with the music and Schwartz with the lyrics, and lists “Savages” among the film’s songs. The official Disney Music Emporium listing for the Legacy Collection identifies the released “Savages” track and an alternate version titled “Epiphany/Savages (Part 2).” This establishes that alternate musical material exists in an officially marketed archival soundtrack. It does not, without listening and comparison, establish the exact nature or significance of every change. [2, 5]

A full production audit would compare authenticated lyric sheets, dated drafts, demos, rehearsal recordings, alternate mixes, storyboards, animation timing and the final theatrical master. Auction descriptions and third-party screenplay transcriptions can be useful discovery leads, but should not be treated as authenticated studio records unless provenance is established.

The key production questions are: who proposed the lyric revision; when it occurred; what rationale was recorded; whether the sequence was tested with audiences; whether Indigenous consultants reviewed the final song; what feedback they provided; and how the song’s staging and mix changed between early and final versions.

7. Marketing, family positioning and child-audience suitability

Disney’s official film page lists Pocahontas as G-rated, released June 23, 1995, with a family genre classification. Contemporary reporting documents a large campaign involving consumer-product promotions, soundtrack products, a major public premiere and Burger King’s children’s meal promotion. A July 1995 Los Angeles Times report said Burger King described the tie-in as its most successful promotion to that point and reported a rate of eight million themed Kids Club meals per week at the time. These are reported corporate claims, not independently audited sales figures. [1, 15–17]

This matters because the film’s distribution context was not limited to adult cinephiles or specialist history audiences. The campaign embedded the characters and associated music in children’s consumer culture. That establishes a strong child/family market orientation. It does not prove that the company intended children to absorb the song’s racist rhetoric, nor does it prove a harmful effect.

The Australian Council on Children and the Media reviewed the film in October 2023 and advised that it was not suitable for children under five, recommended parental guidance for ages five to seven because of violent themes and the need for historical context, and considered it suitable for ages eight and older. This is one specialist review body’s guidance, not a universal age classification. [13, 24]

A G rating is not a developmental assessment of every scene for every child. Nor does a G rating mean that a film is intended exclusively for children. The defensible point is narrower: the official family positioning and child-oriented marketing make age suitability and contextual responsibility legitimate questions.

8. Psychological research: what can and cannot be inferred

Anderson, Carnagey and Eubanks (2003) reported five experiments on songs with violent lyrics. In their college-student samples, violent songs increased hostile feelings in four experiments and aggressive thoughts in four experiments compared with similar nonviolent songs. The authors discussed short-term effects and the need to distinguish immediate responses from longer-term outcomes. [12]

This study supplies a plausible mechanism for investigating violent lyrics. It does not test “Savages,” does not establish effects in children, and does not demonstrate anti-Indigenous prejudice or real-world violence.

It is scientifically inappropriate to move directly from “violent lyrics can affect short-term cognition in some experimental settings” to “this Disney song causes children to hate Indigenous people.”

Amy Aidman’s 1999 conference paper, available through ERIC, examined conversations with Native American and Euro-American girls about Disney’s Pocahontas. It is relevant to audience interpretation and cultural difference, but it does not isolate the “Savages” sequence as an experimental stimulus. It should be treated as exploratory audience research rather than proof of a song-specific causal effect. [9]

A defensible next study would compare: (A) the complete scene; (B) audio only; (C) lyrics presented as text; (D) a matched nonviolent musical control; and (E) the scene preceded by a brief historical context statement. Measures should separately assess recall, emotional arousal, recognition of dehumanization, perceived threat, understanding of the film’s moral position, and attitudes toward Indigenous people. Researchers should not collapse all outcomes into a single “aggression” score. Child participation would require ethics review, parental consent, age-appropriate safeguards and Indigenous research partnership.

9. Indigenous representation, consultation and cultural rights

Contemporary reporting from February 1995 shows that Disney consulted historians and Indigenous organizations and hired Native American performers for Native roles. It also documents disagreement among Indigenous commentators. Shirley Little Dove Custalow McGowan criticized historical distortions; Russell Means praised aspects of the portrayal; Hanay Geiogamah offered a more supportive assessment; Sonny Skyhawk raised concerns about industry consultation and control. These views should not be flattened into a single Indigenous position. [14]

The 1996 Buescher and Ono article argues that the film functions as neocolonial rhetoric by rewriting colonial history as a more palatable romance. Their 2001 article examines the commodification of Pocahontas and the marketing of goods through an Indigenous female figure. These are scholarly arguments, not neutral statements of fact, but they provide a serious critical framework for evaluating representation and commercial appropriation. [10, 11]

Canada’s United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples Act includes the text of UNDRIP provisions concerning Indigenous peoples’ histories, languages, education, cultural expression and the reflection of their cultures and histories in education and public information. UNDRIP is a declaration; Canada’s 2021 Act creates a domestic statutory framework for implementing it. These provisions support the broader principle that Indigenous histories should not be represented solely through external commercial narratives. They do not directly establish liability for a 1995 American film. [20]

10. Legal boundary: depiction, incitement and genocide

The UN Genocide Convention defines genocide by specified acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group as such. Article III separately identifies direct and public incitement to commit genocide as a punishable act. The existence of genocidal language in a fictional film does not automatically establish the legal offence of direct and public incitement. Legal assessment requires context, the nature of the communication, directness, public character and the relevant intent and jurisdictional standards. [18, 19]

> This report makes no allegation that Disney committed genocide, incited genocide or violated criminal law. The song’s rhetoric is discussed as a representation of exterminationist ideology, not as a legal finding about the corporation or its employees.

11. Findings matrix, gaps and next investigative steps

Question	Assessment	Confidence
Were racist ideas deliberately written into the song as dramatic content?	Yes. Schwartz described the song as a display of racism.	High
Was at least one lyric revised?	Yes. Schwartz acknowledged a specific revision.	High
Was the revision caused by test-audience complaints?	Not established. The claim appears in the question, not in Schwartz's confirmation.	Unverified
Was the film marketed as family entertainment and to children?	Yes. Official rating and contemporaneous marketing reports support this.	High
Does violent-lyrics research prove effects from this song on children?	No. Existing study is not song-specific and used college-student samples.	High
Was there subliminal programming or covert anti-Indigenous incitement?	No supporting evidence identified in the sources reviewed.	Unsupported
Did Indigenous consultants approve the final song?	No song-specific approval record located.	Unresolved

Priority evidence requests

1. Authenticated dated lyric drafts and copyright deposits for the complete song.
2. The 2015 Legacy Collection alternate "Epiphany/Savages (Part 2)" recording and any surviving demos, compared with the final film mix.
3. Original storyboard panels with provenance, compared shot-by-shot with the released sequence.
4. Disney press kit, production notes, audience-testing documentation and internal revision memoranda.
5. Records of Indigenous consultation specifically concerning the song, lyrics and final edit.
6. A controlled audience study designed with Indigenous scholars and community partners.

12. Public Service Announcement

The following PSA is designed as a standalone public-facing communication. It is deliberately shorter than the investigative paper and does not claim more than the evidence supports.

BEYOND THE FAIRY TALE

WHAT CHILDREN SHOULD KNOW ABOUT DISNEY'S POCAHONTAS (1995)

A PUBLIC-INTEREST MEDIA-LITERACY NOTICE

A family film deserves critical examination.

Disney's Pocahontas is widely recognized as an animated story about love, tolerance, nature and reconciliation. But its musical sequence "Savages" contains explicit racial dehumanization, collective hatred and exterminationist language directed at Indigenous people.

The sequence's dramatic purpose is to portray the destructive consequences of racism and fear. But an anti-racist message does not automatically resolve every concern about how that message is delivered to a young audience.

WHAT PARENTS AND EDUCATORS SHOULD KNOW

1. The language is explicit. The song contains dehumanizing descriptions and calls for killing and collective destruction. These are audible lyrics, not hidden instructions.

2. The historical story is heavily fictionalized. Pocahontas was a real Powhatan child. Historical records document her capture by English colonists, captivity, conversion, marriage to John Rolfe, journey to England and death in 1617. The Disney romance with John Smith is not an established historical relationship. [6–8, 21]

3. The film's moral framing deserves examination. The film condemns overt racism, but it also simplifies colonial power, Indigenous sovereignty and the historical consequences of European settlement. [10, 11, 14]

4. A G rating is not a substitute for parental judgment. One specialist Australian child-media reviewer recommends that the film not be shown to children under five and that children aged five to seven watch with parental guidance and historical context. [13]

WHAT DOES THE RESEARCH SAY?

Experimental research has found that violent song lyrics can increase hostile thoughts and feelings in college-student samples. That research does not prove that "Savages" causes children to develop anti-Indigenous prejudice or support violence. The film-specific question remains open and deserves careful study. [12]

WHAT CAN ADULTS DO?

- Review the film before showing it to younger children.
- Explain the historical context of the Powhatan people.
- Discuss dehumanization, stereotyping and collective blame.
- Distinguish the historical Pocahontas from Disney's fictional character.
- Include Indigenous-authored historical and cultural resources.
- Encourage children to question how films portray different communities.

Marie-Soleil Seshat Landry | marielandryspyshop.com

OUR POSITION

Children deserve historically responsible storytelling. Colonialism, racism and genocide are important subjects that can and should be taught appropriately. They deserve accuracy, context and respect for the communities whose histories are represented.

We are not claiming that Disney secretly programmed children, that the song contains subliminal instructions, or that its creators intended to incite anti-Indigenous violence. Those claims are not established by the evidence reviewed.

We are asking a legitimate public-interest question:
When a family-entertainment company turns colonial history and exterminationist rhetoric into a memorable musical experience, what responsibility does it have to its young audience?

WATCH CRITICALLY. RESEARCH INDEPENDENTLY. TEACH HISTORICALLY. LISTEN TO INDIGENOUS VOICES.

Marie Landry Spy Shop | Landry Industries

Independent OSINT · Ethical Intelligence · Public-Interest Research

Evidence standard: documented facts, attributed statements, peer-reviewed research and clearly identified investigative hypotheses. This PSA is not an allegation of criminal conduct.

Marie-Soleil Seshat Landry | marielandryspyshop.com

13. Bibliography and source register

The bibliography below lists the principal sources used in this report. Links are provided for independent verification. Accessed November 1, 2026. Where an online source is a contemporary news report or commercial product page, it is cited for the specific claim it supports rather than treated as a neutral or comprehensive historical authority.

[1] The Walt Disney Company. “Pocahontas.” Official film page. Release date, rating, runtime, synopsis and credits. https://movies.disney.com/pocahontas

[2] Schwartz, Stephen. “Pocahontas.” Official works page. Music by Alan Menken; lyrics by Stephen Schwartz; song list and production synopsis. https://stephenschwartz.com/works/pocahontas/

[3] Schwartz, Stephen. “Comments on Disney’s Pocahontas.” Archived Q&A PDF, copyright notice 2010. Includes Schwartz’s response about a revised “Savages” lyric. https://stephenschwartz.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/Disney-Pocahontas.pdf

[4] “Writing Villain Songs (with Stephen Schwartz).” MusicalWriters.com. Interview discussing Ratcliffe, “Mine, Mine, Mine” and “Savages.” https://www.musicalwriters.com/writing-a-musical/writing-songs-for-villains-an-interview-with-stephen-schwartz/

[5] Walt Disney Records / Disney Music Emporium. “Legacy Collection: Pocahontas.” Official track listing, including “Savages” and “Epiphany/Savages (Part 2) — Alternate Version.” https://www.disneymusicemporium.com/product/XVCD12/legacy-collection-pocahontas-cd

[6] Smithsonian National Portrait Gallery. “Pocahontas (c.1595–1617).” Historical overview of her capture, captivity, conversion, marriage, travel to England and death. https://npg.si.edu/learn/classroom-resource/pocahontas-c1595%E2%80%931617

[7] Smithsonian National Portrait Gallery. “Pocahontas.” Staff research page discussing the historical record and the disputed John Smith rescue narrative. https://npg.si.edu/staff/pocahontas

[8] House, Christine Y. “Pocahontas, From Fiction to Fact: Using Disney’s Film to Teach the True Story.” Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute, 1996. https://teachersinstitute.yale.edu/curriculum/units/1996/3/96.03.06.x.html

[9] Aidman, Amy. “Disney’s Pocahontas: Conversations with Native American and Euro-American Girls.” Conference paper, International Communication Association, 1999; ERIC ED427892. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED427892.pdf

[10] Buescher, Derek T., and Kent A. Ono. “Civilized Colonialism: Pocahontas as Neocolonial Rhetoric.” Women’s Studies in Communication 19, no. 2 (1996): 127–153. DOI: 10.1080/07491409.1996.11089810. https://doi.org/10.1080/07491409.1996.11089810

[11] Ono, Kent A., and Derek T. Buescher. “Deciphering Pocahontas: Unpackaging the Commodification of a Native American Woman.” Critical Studies in Media Communication 18, no. 1 (2001): 23–43. DOI: 10.1080/15295030109367122. https://doi.org/10.1080/15295030109367122

[12] Anderson, Craig A., Nicholas L. Carnagey, and Janie Eubanks. “Exposure to Violent Media: The Effects of Songs with Violent Lyrics on Aggressive Thoughts and Feelings.” Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 84, no. 5 (2003): 960–971. DOI: 10.1037/0022-3514.84.5.960. PMID: 12757141. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/12757141/

[13] Australian Council on Children and the Media. “Pocahontas.” Review completed October 26, 2023; age guidance and content notes. https://childrenandmedia.org.au/movie-reviews/movies/pocahontas

[14] Dutka, Elaine. “Disney’s History Lesson: ‘Pocahontas’ Has Its Share of Supporters, Detractors.” Los Angeles Times, February 9, 1995. https://www.latimes.com/archives/la-xpm-1995-02-09-ca-29997-story.html

[15] Sanger, Elizabeth. “Disney Has Classic Plans for ‘Pocahontas’.” Roanoke Times, June 10, 1995. Contemporary account of launch and marketing campaign. https://scholar.lib.vt.edu/VA-news/ROA-Times/issues/1995/rt9506/950610/06130037.htm

[16] Gellene, Denise. “Pocahontas Is Blazing a Trail for Burger King.” Los Angeles Times, July 27, 1995. Contemporary report on the Burger King promotion. https://www.latimes.com/archives/la-xpm-1995-07-27-fi-28353-story.html

[17] McCormick, Moira. “Disney Hits the Promotional Warpath for ‘Pocahontas’.” Billboard, June 10, 1995. https://www.worldradiohistory.com/Archive-All-Music/Billboard/90s/1995/BB-1995-06-10.pdf

[18] United Nations. Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, 1948. Article II definition and Article III prohibited acts. https://www.un.org/en/genocideprevention/documents/publications-and-resources/Genocide_Convention_75thAnniversary_2023.pdf

[19] International Committee of the Red Cross. “Genocide Convention, Article III.” Treaty text, including direct and public incitement to genocide.

https://ihl-databases.icrc.org/en/ihl-treaties/genocide-conv-1948/article-3

[20] United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples Act, S.C. 2021, c. 14 (Canada), including provisions reproducing UNDRIP Articles 13–16 and 31.
https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/u-2.2/FullText.html

[21] Lehigh University. “The Pocahontas Archive: The Historical Record.” Compilation and analysis of contemporaneous references, including John Smith’s accounts.
https://history-on-trial.lib.lehigh.edu/trial/pocahontas/history.php

[22] Disney Music Emporium. “Legacy Collection: Pocahontas.” Alternate official product page and track listing.
https://www.disneymusicemporium.com/product/XVCOMBO09/legacy-collection-pocahontas-cd

[23] Disney, Pocahontas (1995). Feature film. Directed by Mike Gabriel and Eric Goldberg. Primary audiovisual source.
https://movies.disney.com/pocahontas

[24] “Pocahontas.” Raising Children Network / Children & Media Australia. Age suitability and review summary.
https://raisingchildren.net.au/guides/movie-reviews/pocahontas

Publication note

This document is a preliminary OSINT investigation, not a completed archival audit. Some production questions remain unresolved because original studio correspondence, authenticated dated drafts, consultation records and original storyboard materials were not available in the public sources reviewed. Any future revision should preserve the distinction between verified evidence, attributed claims, inference and open hypotheses.

Prepared for public-interest research and media-literacy use by Marie Landry Spy Shop, a division of Landry Industries.