

The Use of the Terms “Negro” and “Black” to Include Persons of Native American Ancestry in “Anglo” North America

Jack D. Forbes

In 1854 the California State Supreme Court sought to bar all non-Caucasians from equal citizenship and civil rights. The court stated:

The word “Black” may include all Negroes, but the term “Negro” does not include all Black persons. . . . We are of the opinion that the words “White,” “Negro,” “Mulatto” and “Black person,” whenever they occur in our constitution . . . must be taken in their generic sense . . . that the words “Black person,” in the 14th section must be taken as contra distinguished from White, and necessarily includes all races other than the Caucasian.¹

As convoluted as the quote may be, it tends to express a strong tendency in the history of the United States, toward creating two broad classes of people: white and non-white, citizen and non-citizen (or semi-citizen).

The tendency to create a two-caste society often clashed with the reality of a territory which included many different types of people, of all colors and different degrees of intermixture of European, American, African, and Asian. Native American people, whether of unmixed ancestry or mixed with other stocks, were at times affected by the tendency to create a purely white-black social system, especially when living away from a reservation or the ancestral homeland.²

In the British slave colonies of North America along the Atlantic coast, many persons of American ancestry were at times classified as blacks, negroes, mulattoes, or people of color, and these terms were, of course, used for people of African ancestry. The manner in which Americans and part-Americans were sometimes classified as “mulattoes” and “people of color” from New England to South Carolina and in the Spanish Empire are explored elsewhere.³ The purpose here is to illustrate how the term “negro” has also been applied to people of American descent.

The possibility that Native Americans were quite commonly called “negroes” is very much supported by Portuguese usage. During the colonial period Brazilian Indians were repeatedly referred to as negroes or as “negros da terra” (“Negroes of the land”). A great many examples from the sixteenth- and later centuries are cited by Georg Friederici in his analysis of Portuguese sources. These do not have to be repeated here, but suffice to say that it was so common that finally in 1755 a royal decree had to be issued as follows:

Among the regrettable practices . . . which have resulted in the disparagement of the Indians, one prime abuse is the unjustifiable and scandalous practice of calling them *negroes*. Perhaps by so doing the intent was no other than to induce in them the belief that by their origins they had been destined to be the slaves of whites, as is generally conceded to be the case of blacks from the coast of Africa . . . The directors will not permit henceforth that anybody may refer to an Indian as a *negro*, nor that they themselves may use this epithet among themselves, as is currently the case.

This Portuguese usage is extremely significant, not only because American or part-American slaves could be referred to as “negroes” in early shipment records but also because it very much affects one’s analysis of population statistics in colonial Brazil (where, in fact, the categories of “negro” and “mulatto” must have often included domesticated or enslaved Indians and mixed-bloods).

Insofar as the term “negro” became synonymous with slave or a servile status, it lost any specific color reference and became a general term of abuse (darker people preferring to be called *preto* as a result). It is highly likely that the Spaniards also referred to slaves generally as *negros* in the Caribbean and that the Dutch took over the same general practice, since *negro* and *neger* were not Dutch words and had no immediate equivalent except *swart*, *donker* and *bruin*. A Dutch-French-Spanish dictionary of 1639 has the following entry for Spanish “negro”: noir, sombre, obscur, offusqué, brun (French), swart, doncker, bruin (Dutch). Thus, Spanish “negro” could be translated as “dark” or “brown” as well as “black” (*swart*). Undoubtedly this usage facilitated making reference to all slaves as “negroes” or “negers” in the Dutch language. Moreover, it is significant that a Spaniard residing in Antwerp in the early seventeenth-century (the preparer of the dictionary) saw “negro” as being translated in a number of ways in both French and Dutch.⁴

By the latter-half of the sixteenth century the English were referring to the people of Africa as Ethiopians, Blackamoors, Negroes, and Moors, somewhat interchangeably. “Negro” gradually came to be the dominant term, especially after exhaustive contact with the Spanish

and the Portuguese.⁵ What is not clear is the extent to which the term “negro” was consciously translated as “black.” The automatic association of “negro” with “black” color cannot be assumed since many “Black” Africans are actually of medium or dark brown color.

In any case, another association gradually arose, and that was between “negro” and “slave.” Early legislation commonly referred to “negro and other slaves” or to “negro, mulatto, and Indian slaves.” Over the years “negro” and “black” both became synonymous with enslavement.

In 1702 an observer wrote that the wealth of Virginia consisted of “slaves or negroes.” By 1806 Virginia judges ruled that a person who was of a white appearance was to be presumed free but “in the case of a person visibly appearing to be of the slave race, it is incumbent upon him to make out his freedom.” In 1819 South Carolina judges stated flatly: “The word ‘negroes’ has a fixed meaning (slaves).”⁶

What the English meant by the term “negro” when they first began to use it is not clear. Certainly, it was not then synonymous with slave as a great many persons so classified were free, both in England and in Virginia. Did it mean an African, a “black” person, or any dark-skinned individual? Today the term is not widely employed in Britain, although the word “black” is used to refer to people of various skin colors from all of South Asia, the Middle East, the West Indies, and Africa. Most Native Americans, if living in Britain today, would be regarded as being “black,” especially if their ancestry were not known.

“Negro” was also used in a general way in the North American colonies. Some examples illustrate the use of “negro” and “black” as applied to people of American ancestry.

An example from the West Indies is especially illuminating. In 1764 William Young was sent to St. Vincent as a part of the British occupation of that island. Living on St. Vincent were about 3,000 “Black Charaibs, or free negroes,” about one hundred “Red Charaibs or Indians,” and some 4,000 French and their slaves, according to Young. The British found it difficult to control the Caribs and wars were fought with them in 1771-1772 and again during 1795-1796. During the latter crisis Young wrote an extremely anti-Carib tract designed to prove that the Caribs should be removed from St. Vincent; they were eventually defeated and some 5,000 were shipped to an island near the coast of Honduras.

Young was anxious to prove that the so-called “Black” Caribs were not true aborigines but were in fact “Negro colonists, Free Negroes, or

Negro usurpers.” This was important to him because he wanted to show they had no bonafide land-rights or aboriginal title.

For our purposes, the interesting point admitted by Young is that the so-called “Blacks” or “Negroes” were occasionally of “tawney and mixed complexion” because of American ancestry and that their customs, personal names, and language were those of the native Caribs. Still further, Young admitted that they had repeatedly intermarried with American women. He consistently refers to them as “Negroes,” nonetheless.

Young also relayed a great deal of hearsay information about how the “Black” Caribs had originated, which is without foundation for analysis here. The important point is this: that a people thoroughly American in identity, culture, and language were called “black” and “negro” solely because of being mixed with African ancestry.⁷ This tendency continues, incidentally, among white scholars who, even today, refuse to accept the Caribs’ avowed feelings of “Indianness” and continue to call them “Black.”⁸

In 1619 some twenty “negroes” were brought to Virginia. At least eleven have names of Spanish or probably Spanish character. Later they were joined by “negroes” and “mulattoes” with names such as Antonio (several) and John Pedro. These Spanish-derived servants could well have been of part-American ancestry; however, no evidence is available except that they were largely secured from captured Spanish vessels.⁹

In 1676 one Gowin, “an Indian servant,” acquired his freedom in Virginia. Two decades earlier Mihill Gowen, called “a negro,” also acquired his freedom. It would appear that the “negro” was probably father to the “Indian” in this case.¹⁰

In 1670 the population of the Virginia colony was said to be 40,000 including 2,000 “black slaves.” Evidence indicates that there could not have been that many Africans there and also that there were a great many American slaves or servants. Thus the total of “blacks” must have included a good many Americans.¹¹

In 1698 three fugitive “negroes” were reported in North Carolina, of whom one was an American.¹² Similarly, a list of “Negroes” imported into Virginia, 1710-1718, by sea includes at least sixty-nine “Indians,” mostly from the Carolinas. Likewise, lists of “Negroes” brought into New York from 1715 to 1736 include many slaves of probable (or stated) American ancestry from Campeche, Jamaica, Honduras, the Carolinas, and Virginia.¹³

In the 1715-1717 period the Vestry Book of King Williams Parish, Virginia, records one year "Robin an Indian" and two years later, "Robin a negro."¹⁴ In a similar manner a 1691 list of "negro" slaves in York County, Virginia, includes "Kate Indian" while a 1728 list of "Negroes" at the "home house" of a Virginia planter includes "Indian Robin" (Robin, incidentally, is a common name for slaves of American ancestry). In 1748 there was an advertisement in New York for a "Negro man servant called Robbin, almost of the complexion of an Indian . . . talks good English, can read and write, and plays on the fiddle."¹⁵ In 1723 Virginia adopted a law depriving free "negroes, mulattoes, and Indians" of certain basic civil rights. The act was disallowed by British officials but in 1735 Lt. Governor Gooch defended it by asserting that he wanted to make "a perpetual brand upon free negroes and mulattoes by excluding them from that great privilege of a Freeman." He wanted to make the "free negroes sensible that a distinction ought to be made between their offspring and the descendants of an Englishman, with whom they never were to be accounted equal."¹⁶ Since the act applied to Native Americans and half-Americans ("mulattoes"), Gooch's language would seem to include them under the general category of "free negroes and mulattoes."

A welcome clarification of terminology was provided in 1719 by the government of South Carolina when it decided: ". . . and for preventing all doubts and scruples that may arise what ought to be [taxed] on mustees, mulattoes, etc., all such slaves as are not entirely Indian shall be accounted as negroe."¹⁷ The significance of this act is that all later enumerations of "negro" and "Indian" slaves in South Carolina have to be analyzed with the thought in mind that many "negroes" were probably one-half or other fractions of American ancestry.

New Jersey was also an area where Americans and Africans intermixed with considerable frequency. In 1734 an advertisement appeared for the recovery of "Wan (Juan?). He is half Indian and half negro; . . . he plays the fiddle and speaks good English and his country Indian." Wan was not specifically called a "negro," but a 1747 advertisement reads:

Runaway on the 20th of September last, from Cohansie a very lusty negro fellow named Sampson, aged about 53 years, and had some Indian blood in him . . . he had with him a boy about 12 or 13 years of age named Sam, was born of an Indian woman, and looks like an Indian, only his hair . . . they both talk Indian very well, and it is likely they have dressed themselves in the Indian dress and gone to Carolina.

Similarly in a 1778 advertisement we read:

Was stolen from her mother, a negro girl, about 9 or 10 years of age, named Dianah, her mother's name is Cash, was married to an Indian named Lewis Wollis, near six feet high, about 35 years of age. They have a male child with them, between 3 and 4 years of age. Any person who takes up the said negroes and Indian . . . shall have the above reward.¹⁸

From these examples we can see that people of mixed American-African ancestry could be called "negroes" in New Jersey. Cyrus Bustill, a Philadelphia baker ("black") born in 1732 at Burlington, New Jersey, married a Delaware Indian woman. His son became a Quaker and an anti-slavery leader and was known as a "negro."¹⁹

In Canada in 1747 four "Negroes" and a "Panis" (American slave) escaped from Montreal. A French writer referred to them simply as "negroes."²⁰ In 1759 one Saunders, a runaway slave, was described in South Carolina as a "Negro man . . . of the mustee breed." Mustee meant either European-American or European-American-African.²¹ In 1775 authorities in South Carolina were ordered to apprehend "John Swan, a reported free negro or mestizo man."²²

In the 1780s certain white Virginians began to agitate for the termination of the Gingaskin Indian Reservation in Northampton County. The reserve was described as an "asylum for free negroes" and it was alleged that the Americans ". . . have at length become nearly extinct, there being at this time not more than 3 or 4 genuine Indian at most . . . the place is a harbour and convenient asylum for an idle set of free negroes." In 1812 it was argued that

the place is now inhabited by as many black men as Indians . . . the Indian women have many of them married black men, and a majority probably, of the inhabitants are blacks or have black-blood in them . . . the real Indians [are few].

The reserve was divided (allotted) in 1813 and by 1832 whites had acquired most of it. In 1828 the Gingaskin descendants were described as respectable "Negro landowners."²³

This episode reminds one of Young's attack upon the Caribs of St. Vincent in 1795 and also of more recent attempts to allot and acquire Indian lands. A similar attack took place upon the Pamunkey-Mattaponi in 1843 (which failed) and against the Nottoway from 1830 to 1878 (which succeeded). By the 1840s at least two Nottoways were registered as "free negroes." The heirs of one family were described in 1878 as "all being negroes and very poor."²⁴

Aside from Virginia, where persons descended from female Americans imported after a certain date could obtain their freedom, all slaves of American ancestry remained slaves throughout the entire

duration of slavery unless they were emancipated or ran away. At the end of the eighteenth-century “Bob, a carpenter fellow, of a yellowish complexion, mustee, has bushy hair . . .” ran away. He was said to speak “more proper than Negroes in general.”²⁵

Other persons of American ancestry who were free also were called “black” or “negro.” Paul Cuffe, the noted half-American, half-African merchant was called, at various times, an Indian, “a blackman,” and “this free and enlightened African”; he signed petitions with “Indian men” and “all free Negroes and mulattoes.”²⁶ Other examples of a similar nature abound—one author writes that “. . . the Sampsons and Gallees, property owners and school teachers, though predominantly of Indian blood were leaders among the free Negroes of Petersburg, Virginia, in 1860.”²⁷

Virginia tax-rolls and census records from the 1780s to 1850 have numerous examples of people of Indian tribal identity being classified as “free people of color” or as “mulattoes,” in fact, the practice was almost universal; some were also classified as F.N. (free negro) or as “B” (black) in various records. In certain counties (such as Southampton) in 1830, and in parts of Delaware, virtually all free non-whites were categorized as “F.N.” although enumerated under the “free people of color” column. These lists included people of the Nanticoke and other tribal groups.²⁸

Under certain conditions persons of African descent could be legally classified as members of an Indian tribe or as Indians. In a treaty with the Creek Nation the commissioner of Indian Affairs noted in 1832:

... an Indian, whether of full or half blood, who has a female slave living with him as his wife, is the head of a family and entitled to a reservation [of land] also ... free blacks who have been admitted as members of the Creek Nation, and are regarded as such by the tribe, if they have families are entitled to reservations of land.

In the 1860s all persons of African ancestry who had been slaves were granted, by treaty, citizenship in the “five civilized tribes” of Indian Territory. The general trend, however, was to enroll the more visibly part-African persons as “Freedmen” citizens and to restrict their tribal status. When lands were allotted in the 1880s to the early 1900s most such persons were not allowed to assert American ancestry and were, therefore, denied future rights as “Indians.”²⁹

During the Seminole wars a new term seems to have been coined, that of “Indian-Negroes.” One source, General Wiley Thompson, asserted in 1835 that “they are descended from the Seminoles, and are connected by consanguinity.” Other writers referred to them as the

“hostile negroes and mulattoes in the Seminole nation” or simply, “Indian negroes.”³⁰ Few white writers seem to have continued the use of “Indian-negro.” However, in the Euchee language mixed people of that type were referred to as “Goshpi-tchala” or “Red-Black People.”³¹

In North Carolina many people of Lumbee Indian identity were categorized, at times, as “negroes.” In 1837 Charles Oxendine of Robeson County was punished as “a free negro.” In 1842 one of the Braveboy family was called a “negro” while in 1857 a Chavers was charged as “a free person of color” with carrying a shotgun. He was not convicted because the act specified “free negroes” and he was charged as a “free colored.” The court stated that “Free persons of color may be . . . persons colored by Indian blood . . . the indictment cannot be sustained.”³²

In a similar situation, some white men took away guns from the Pamunkey people in Virginia in 1857. The governor had them returned but stated: “if any become one fourth mixed with the negro race then they may be treated as free negroes or mulattoes” (Virginia at this time defined a “mulatto” as one-fourth or more African).³³

In Louisiana in 1856 the “Black Code” was said to refer to offenses involving “slaves, Indians, and free persons of color.”³⁴ Many narratives of ex-slaves, recorded in the 1830s, reveal Indian ancestry. One such person, called an Indian, was Uncle Moble Hopsan of Virginia. He says: “et come time tuh marry” and he married a black woman. “Dat mak me black, ah’ ’spose.”³⁵ In 1871 a white writer of Maryland observed:

In [Dorchester] county at Indian Creek, some of the last Indians of the peninsula struck their wigwams towards the close of the last century, and there are now no full-blooded aborigines on the Eastern Shore, although many of the free-born negroes show Indian traces.³⁶

Quite commonly, however, some of the “free-born negroes” of the Eastern Shore continued to identify and survive as Native People. The whites often tried to deny their Indianness, as in 1856 when a marker was erected to commemorate a woman who had testified that the Nanticoke people of Delaware had African ancestry. The Indians were referred to on the marker as “arrogant negroes that assumed to be what they were not.”³⁷

During the eighteenth-century most persons of mixed race, especially if free, were classified as “mulattoes, mustees, or persons of color.” The term “negro” was perhaps less likely to be used for such people, except as noted in the examples above. This usage continued in some states—such as the Carolinas and Virginia—well into the nineteenth-century.

For example, the jurists of South Carolina noted in 1852: "It is not according to the use of language in this region to speak of one altogether black as a person of color. The phrase is almost exclusively applied to one of mixed blood and color."³⁸ A change took place in such states as Indiana (1817), Kentucky (1852), and elsewhere (1850s- early 1900s) as the term "negro" came to encompass most persons of part-African descent.³⁹

This change may not have affected people of solely African and American descent, especially if the African ancestry predominated. Since many (but not all) Native Americans were "brown" or dark-colored *without* African ancestry, their descendants when mixed *only* with African blood would very likely be seen as "negroes" by most Europeans (especially in North America where special terms for such persons—such as Zambo, Grifo, Lobo, Cafuso, Cabra, and Cabore never became current).⁴⁰

The United States census also tended to expand the use of the terms "black" or "negro." In 1890 "black" was to be used for all persons having three-fourths or more "black blood." In 1910 "black" was supposed to be applied only to "full-blooded negroes" while the matter of who was an Indian was left to the enumerator. The term "mulatto" was to be used for "all other persons having some proportion or perceptible trace of Negro blood." It is certain that large numbers of Americans or part-Americans were classified as negro or mulatto under these rules. For example, of the Mattaponi only one person was counted as "Indian" by the census out of a reservation population of at least forty persons. Similarly, the Poosapatuck of Long Island had only one person counted as "Indian," doubtless because the rest were enumerated as negroes or mulattoes.

The 1910 census counted "2,255 negroes" who were part-Indian and were enrolled members of tribes. Another group of 1,793 tribal members were of mixed European, African and American ancestry. Thus only slightly more than 3,000 persons who were part-African were counted with the Indian population as compared with the hundreds of thousands who were doubtless counted as "negro" or "mulatto" because of living away from a federally-recognized reservation area.

In 1930 a person of mixed Indian and Negro blood ". . . shall be returned as a Negro unless the Indian blood predominates and the status as an Indian is generally accepted in the community." By 1940 all African-American hybrids were to be counted as "negroes" unless the Indian ancestry "*very definitely* predominates and he is *uni-*

versally accepted . . . as an Indian.”⁴¹

Even “pure-blood” Indians could be counted as “blacks” as in Nevada in 1880 when the census enumerator categorized ninety members of the Duckwater Shoshone Tribe in that manner. In the state of Delaware more recent decades found that “if a person said he was an Indian, he was recorded as either black or white depending upon his appearance.” The 1980 census was so arranged that any American-African mixed-blood who checked both “black” and “Indian” boxes was counted solely as “black.”

In summary, it seems clear that many persons of Native American ancestry, in whole or part, have been at times classified as “negroes” or “blacks.” This is a matter of considerable significance for the scholar seeking to understand the actual ethnic or racial identity of non-white persons in the North American British colonies and in the United States over the centuries.

Earlier studies have shown the significance of the terms “mulatto, mustee, sambo (zambo), and colored,” as indicating persons of American (or possible part-American) ancestry.⁴³ Collectively, these studies served to show the probability of a much greater degree of intermixture between Africans and Native Americans than has hitherto been widely acknowledged.

But, of course, it might be argued that this is “old hat,” especially to people in the Afroamerican community who have long been aware of extensive Indian ancestry and who have, at least since the Civil War, self-consciously utilized the terms “negro” or “black” (and, of course, “colored”) to encompass people of mixed Native American and African descent. Individuals such as Ann Plato, Paul Cuffe, Crispus Attucks, Hiram Revels, and many others have long been referred to as “negroes” in spite of having perhaps at least as much Native American as African ancestry—and even when living in Indian communities, as was the case with Attucks and Cuffe.

From the scholarly perspective, the “logic” of white racism (which has tended to classify people in very arbitrary ways) is neither the logic of genetics nor of bonafide ethnicity. The mixture of African and American does not make a person “black” or “negro” anymore than it makes one automatically “Indian.” Ethnic scholars must aver that it is both pernicious and dangerous to read into the evidence, and to affirm for earlier times, the pronouncements of a dominant social caste. Their myths, their prejudices, and their systems of classification and nomenclature must all be subjected to critical and empirical reevaluation.

Notes

¹The People v. Hall, October 1, 1854 in Robert Heizer and Alan J. Almquist, eds. *The Other Californians*. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1971) 232-233.

²I use the term "American" to refer to the native American race during the colonial period to avoid confusion with other people called "Indians." Likewise, whites will be called "Europeans" and black Africans will be "Africans."

³See Jack D. Forbes. "The Evolution of the Term Mulatto: A Chapter in Black-Native American Relations." *Journal of Ethnic Studies*. Vol. 10, No. 2 (Summer, 1982) 45-66. "Mulattoes and People of Color in Anglo North America: Implications for Black-Indian Relations." Unpublished Mss. and "Mustees, Half-Breeds and Zambos in Anglo-North America." *The American Indian Quarterly*. Vol. 7, No. 1 (1983) 57-83.

⁴Georg Friederici. *Amerikanistisches Worterbuch*. (Hamburg: De Gruyter, 1947) 446-447; "Directorio que se deve observar nas Povoacaens dos Indios do Pard, Maranhao" as cited by A.J.R. Russell-Wood. *The Black Man in Slavery and Freedom in Colonial Brazil*. (London: MacMillan, 1982) 42-43; and Juan Francisco Rodrigues (reputed author). *Den Grooten Dictionaris en Schat van Drij Talen*. (Antwerp: Trogneseus, 1639) "negro."

⁵Almon W. Lauber. *Indian Slavery in Colonial Times Within the Present Limits of the United States*. (New York: AMS Press, Inc., 1913) 311; John S. Bassett, ed. *The Writings of Colonial William Byrd*. (New York: Doubleday, 1901) 8-9; John Codman Hurd, ed. *The Law of Freedom and Bondage in the United States*. Vol. 2 (New York: Negro Universities Press, 1968) 95; *The Oxford English Dictionary*. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1933) "Negro."

⁶Elizabeth Donnan. *Documents Illustrative of the History of the Slave Trade*. Vol. 4 (Washington, DC: Carnegie, 1932) 68; James Hugo Johnston. *Race Relations in Virginia and Miscegenation in the South 1776-1860*. (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1970) 194; Exparte Leland is cited in Helen T. Catterall. *Judicial Cases Concerning America and the Negro*. Vol. 2 (Washington, DC: Carnegie, 1929) 311.

⁷William Young. *An Account of the Black Charaibs*. (London: Cass, 1971) 98, 13-14, 18, 23, 27, 30, 42.

⁸See, for example, Nancy L. Solien. "West Indian Characteristics of the Black Carib." *Peoples and Cultures of the Caribbean*. Michael M. Horowitz, ed. (New York: National History Press, 1971) 133ff; see also: David Lowenthal. *West Indian Societies*. (London: Oxford University Press, 1972) 178-186.

⁹Helen T. Catterall. *Judicial Cases Concerning American and the Negro*. Vol. 1 (Washington, DC: Carnegie, 1929) 55-56, 60.

¹⁰*Ibid.*, 58, 78.

¹¹John Codman Hurd, ed. *The Law of Freedom and Bondage in the United States*. Vol. 1 (New York: Negro Universities Press, 1968) 233m; Catterall, Vol. 1, 63; Wesley Frank Craven. *White, Red and Black: The Seventeenth Century Virginian*. (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1971) 98.

¹²Mattie Emma Edwards Parker, ed. *North Carolina Higher Court Records, 1697-1701*. (Raleigh: Department of Archives and History, 1971) 528.

¹³Elizabeth Donnan. *Documents Illustrative of the History of the Slave Trade*. Vol. 3 (Washington, DC: Carnegie, 1932) 463, 466, 470, 477, 499-500; Vol. 4, 175-179.

¹⁴Vestry Book of King William Parish. *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography*. Vol. XII (New York: Kraus Reprint Corporation, 1968; originally published by Virginia Historical Society, Richmond, Virginia, 1905) 23, 26.

¹⁵J. Leitch Wright. *The Only Land They Knew: The Tragic Story of the Indians of the Old South*. (New York: Free Press, 1981) 252; "Eighteenth—Century Slave Advertisements." *Journal of Negro History*. Vol. 1, No. 2 (April, 1915) 176.

- ¹⁶Wilbert E. Moore. "Slave Law and the Social Structure." *Journal of Negro History*. Vol. 26, No. 2 (April, 1941) 182-183.
- ¹⁷Peter H. Wood. *Black Majority: Negroes in Colonial South Carolina*. (New York: Knopf, 1974) 99m.
- ¹⁸James Hugo Johnston. *Race Relations in Virginia and Miscegenation in the South 1776-1860*. (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1970) 275m, 276.
- ¹⁹Anna Bustill Smith. "The Bustill Family." *Journal of Negro History*. Vol. 10, No. 4 (October, 1925) 638-644.
- ²⁰A. Judd Northrup. *Slavery in New York: Historical Sketch*. (New York State Library Bulletin, History #4, 1900) 306.
- ²¹J. Leitch Wright. *The Only Land They Knew: The Tragic Story of the Indians of the Old South*. (New York: Free Press, 1981) 256. See also: Jack D. Forbes. "Mustees, Half-Breeds and Zambos in Anglo North America: Aspects of Black-Indian Relations." *The American Indian Quarterly*. Vol. 7, No. 1 (1983) 57-83.
- ²²William A. Craigie and James R. Hulbert. *A Dictionary of American English*. Vol. 3 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1940) 1512.
- ²³Johnston, 280; Helen C. Roundtree. "The Indians of Virginia: A Third Race in a Biracial State." Mss. in Virginia State Library Indian File, 1976.
- ²⁴Roundtree, 8, 10.
- ²⁵"Eighteenth-Century Slave Advertisements." *Journal of Negro History*. Vol. 1, No. 2 (April, 1915) 172.
- ²⁶H.N. Sherwood. "Paul Cuffe." *Journal of Negro History*. Vol. 8, No. 2 (April, 1923) 153, 163, 164, 165, 172.
- ²⁷Luther P. Jackson. "Free Negroes of Petersburg, Virginia." *Journal of Negro History*. Vol. 12, No. 3 (July, 1927) 368, 380-381.
- ²⁸See discussions of such records in Jack D. Forbes. "Mulattoes and People of Color in Anglo North America: Implications for Black—Indian Relations." Unpublished Mss.
- ²⁹Johnston, 285.
- ³⁰Kenneth W. Porter. "Florida Slaves and Free Negroes in the Seminole War, 1835-1842." *Journal of Negro History*. Vol. 28, No. 4 (October, 1943) 397; Johnston, 230.
- ³¹Gunter Wagner. *Yuchi Tales*. (New York: G.E. Stechert and Co., 1931) 352-353.
- ³²Catterall, Vol. 2, 79, 209, 381.
- ³³Helen C. Roundtree. "The Indians of Virginia: A Third Race in a Biracial State." Mss. in Virginia State Library Indian File, 1976, 13.
- ³⁴John Codman Hurd, ed. *The Law of Freedom and Bondage in the United States*. Vol. 2 (New York: Negro Universities Press, 1968) 165.
- ³⁵J. Leitch Wright. *The Only Land They Knew: The Tragic Story of the Indians of the Old South*. (New York: Free Press, 1981) 259.
- ³⁶George Chamberlain. "African and American." *Science*. Vol. 17 (February, 1891) 87.
- ³⁷C.A. Weslager. *Delaware's Forgotten Folk*. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1943) 38.
- ³⁸Catterall, Vol. 2, 431.
- ³⁹Catterall, Vol. 1, 231, Vol. 11, 132, 176; Hurd, Vol. 11, 17-19, 128; Edward Byron Reuther. *Race Mixture*. (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1931) 96-97.

⁴⁰Jack D. Forbes. "Mustees, Half-Breeds and Zambos in Anglo North America: Aspects of Black-Indian Relations." *The American Indian Quarterly*. Vol. 7, No. 1 (1983) 57-83; See also, William Bartram. *Travels Through North and South Carolina, Georgia, East and West Florida*. (Savannah: Beehive Press, 1973) 481-488.

⁴¹*Negro Populations in the United States, 1790-1915*. (Washington, DC: Bureau of the Census, 1917) 207; Felix Cohen. *Handbook of Federal Indian Law*. (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1942) 2, 2m; Arthur C. Parker. "The Status and Progress of Indians as Shown by the Thirteenth Census." *The Quarterly Journal of the Society of American Indians*. Vol. 3, No. 3 (July-September, 1915) 188-190; James Mooney. "The Powhatan Confederacy: Past and Present." *The American Anthropologist*. New Series. Vol. 9, No. 1 (January-March, 1907) 148.

⁴²Elmer Rusco. *Good Time Coming? Black Nevadans in the 19th Century*. (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1975) 217-219; Weslager, 18.

⁴³Jack D. Forbes. "Mustees, Half-Breeds and Zambos in Anglo-North America." *The American Indian Quarterly*. Vol. 7, No. 1 (1983) 57-83.

Critique

The article is well written and researched. The author has searched the literature pertaining to blacks and Indians and found that there are many cases of confused and deliberate distortions. These distortions had and have a profound impact on the way we behave.

Many examples of the use of overgeneralization are given. The reasons for this behavior are complex and varied. As an example we find the white Virginians agitating for the termination of the Gingaskin Indian Reservation in Northampton County. Forbes cites the reason for this agitation as the area was an "asylum for free negroes" and the presence of Indians was small if any. The date for this event is given as 1780.

In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries immigrants coming into the United States were often confused by the many languages that were spoken at the port of entry into this "new" land. The Spanish, for example, used Negro to refer to a black man and Negra to refer to a black woman. Mulatto had many meanings. Among these were mule (mulatto) or a person of mixed ancestry) part black and part white.

To associate word usage with racism is quite proper, but it is not always so. There is no inflexible relationship between a stereotype and behavior.

Indian children of high school age at a funeral of an Indian attended by a black man used the words Nigger, Gigolo, and so forth,