

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,

to describe him. To say they were racists is to miss the point. Indian young people are not abstractionists. They are more naturalists. To the Indian children, these stereotypes were expressions of how they felt more than expressions attached to the black man. The man married an Indian woman and is now living on or near an Indian reservation.

The use of stereotypes is a bad habit of many western people. But what is a concept? When are we guilty of an over-generalization? When is a generalization warranted? (See Gordon Allport's book, *The Nature of Prejudice*.) Language is not a science. It is a subject of the humanities.

To go beyond the stereotypical language and study the behavior of people would be a most interesting pursuit. For example, the Menominee of Wisconsin are alleged to have been a way station on the Underground Railway prior to the Civil War. The Menominee are noted for their tolerance. Some of the members of that underground system were so impressed that they did not go on to Canada but remained to become Menominee. I was sitting in the Blue Gold Room of the University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire with a friend who was Ojibwa (Chippewa). Making conversation, I said of a woman walking by, "What a beautiful and striking" person that black was. My Ojibwa friend acknowledged with a nod of her head. A short time later, the woman retraced her steps with a small Indian child who said, "Why do I have to come now, Mommie?" I looked at my friend and she was laughing at me. "She is a Menominee," I was told. There should be folklore that would verify this mixture still among the older Menominee.

Forbes suggests another tribe for this type of an extended study. It would be among the Lumbee. The study of the so called "Black Indians" of Mississippi would be still another fascinating study. A former student said that his mother was Indian and his father was black. They lived in Laurel, Mississippi. These examples are testimony to the fact that biology does not conform to our racial stereotypes.

Forbes seems to suggest that our behavior conforms to the stereotypes we use. Could the reverse also be true? That our behavior shapes our stereotypes. It is sort of a chicken and egg dilemma. To draw an illustration from kinship terms used by the cultural anthropologist, in Hawaiian kinship patterns we distinguish generational differences with the term father-mother and son-daughter. The Navajo do not. They distinguish verbally between the sex of their uncles and aunts on mother's side and a term for aunt on father's side. The terms for an aunt on mother's side and a term for aunt on father's side suggest that

the behavior came first and the name came later. We need to study both the manner in which behavior influences language and the effect language has on behavior.

The article is extremely interesting and thought provoking. I welcome the chance to read about the ways in which our language influences our thoughts and actions. I hope Forbes will continue working on the dilemma that language presents to us.

—John M. Hunnicutt
University of Wisconsin, Eau Claire

Critique

In investigating the use of “Negro” and “black” to include persons of Native American ancestry, Jack D. Forbes brings together a large number of wide-ranging references on an elusive topic. The preliminary nature of Forbes’s study and the inevitably problematic status of the data make his work thus far more valuable in suggestive than definitive terms. For example, while the conclusions regarding practices in King Williams Parish, Virginia, in the early 18th century seem generally acceptable, a heavy dependence on given names such as *Robin* as clues to classification should probably be avoided (*Robin* is the diminutive of the common name *Robert*, and can be either masculine or feminine), but there is little question about the rather cavalier and arbitrary willingness of the power elite to impose names on their “inferiors,” names that reflect a complex mixture of assumptions, prejudices, and needs. This is simply to say that the critical reevaluation that Forbes calls for in closing is less difficult to engage in than the equally valuable empirical reevaluation.

Of particular interest in the Forbes study are the motives or reasons for the blurring of racial and ethnic distinctions that come about when Native Americans are classified variously as Negroes, blacks, mulattos, or slaves. The confusion can, of course, be a matter of ignorance, although this would finally seem to be the least interesting cause. The confusion can grow out of carelessness, as seems to have been the case in 17th century Virginia. Similarly, laziness and a penchant for the convenient solution can result in a blurring of vital distinctions, as in the use of the “Black Code” in 1850s Louisiana. Most crucially, however, the blurring of racial and ethnic distinctions can be quite conscious and insidious in intent—part of a systematic effort to deprive a specific group of civil rights, most especially