PROBLEM AND PROMISE: SCIENTIFIC EXPERTS AND THE MIXED-BLOOD IN THE MODERN U.S., 1870-1970

By

Michell Chresfield

Dissertation
Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate School of Vanderbilt University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
in

History
August, 2016
Nashville, Tennessee

Approved:

Sarah Igo, Ph.D.

Daniel Sharfstein, J.D.

Arleen Tuchman, Ph.D.

Daniel Usner, Ph.D.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This dissertation is the result of many years of hard work and sacrifice, only some of which was my own. First and foremost I'd like to thank my parents, including my "bonus mom," for encouraging my love of learning and for providing me with every opportunity to pursue my education. Although school has taken me far away from you, I am forever grateful for your patience, understanding, and love.

My most heartfelt thanks also go to my advisor, Sarah Igo. I could not have asked for a more patient, encouraging, and thoughtful advisor. Her incisive comments, generous feedback, and gentle spirit have served as my guideposts through one of the most challenging endeavors of my life. I am so fortunate to have had the opportunity to grow as a scholar under her tutelage. I'd also like to thank my dissertation committee members: Arleen Tuchman, Daniel Sharfstein, and Daniel Usner for their thoughtful comments and support throughout the writing process. I'd especially like to thank Arleen Tuchman for her many pep talks, interventions, and earnest feedback; they made all the difference. I'd be remiss if I didn't also thank my mentors from Notre Dame who first pushed me towards a life of the mind. To Richard Pierce, Alvin Tillery, and Heidi Ardizzone, thank you for seeing potential in me and for pushing me to be a better scholar. I hope to do you all proud.

This project could not have been possible without the financial support of the Department of History and the Graduate School at Vanderbilt University. I'd also like to thank the American Philosophical Society for their generous support. The final year of the dissertation was funded through a generous completion fellowship provided by the Robert Penn Warren Center of the Humanities. Special thanks to Mona Frederick, Edward Friedman, Joy Ramirez, and Terry Tripp

for cultivating this wonderful space where scholars can come and share ideas. My research is better for it.

I'd also like to express my sincerest gratitude to my wonderful friends, family and colleagues that have journeyed alongside me on the road to the Ph.D. To Franchella Janette, Shawn Sanford, and Richelle Thomas, thank you for lifting me up and supporting me since our days at Notre Dame. I am thankful to call you ladies my friends. To Jason Bates, Tizoc Chavez, Lance Ingwersen, Alexander Jacobs, Ashish Koul, and Sonja Ostrow, thank you for asking such great questions and for your generous feedback. Although we started as colleagues I am so happy to count you all amongst my closest friends. To Jessica Burch, my sister-friend, thank you for reading so many drafts, for making sense of what I thought but never quite articulated, and for your friendship. To Mary Bridges, I'Nasah Crockett, Melanie Duncan, Lauren Ingwersen, Juliet Larkin-Gilmore, Trey Mack, Adrianne Jacobs, Carly Rush, and Herrica Telus, my sincerest gratitude for all the ways in which you lifted me up and shared your light with me. Each of you in your own way has been my rainbow in the clouds. I'd also like to express my gratitude to my nieces and nephews: Kaelyn Chresfield, Kiersten Chresfield, Elias Chresfield, and Demitre Greene, for enduring my absences but still loving me as their aunt. I'd especially like to thank my niece Kiersten who started alongside me at Vanderbilt but graduated long before auntie got it together. Even still, I am so very thankful to have gotten to know you and I thank you for being one of my biggest sources of encouragement.

Last but certainly not least, I'd like to express my gratitude to my church family, the members of St. Vincent DePaul Church, but especially to Karen and Charlie Mtshali, the Finney-Shelton Family, the Robinson Family, Yvonne Bertrand (we did it!), Stephanie Colter, Grace Mason, Mimi Hernandez, Deborah Jackson, Carl Tate, Thyneice Taylor-Bowden, Matthew

Walden, and Pauline Wilson. You all have been my village of support through some of the most trying times. The abundance of love that I've come to know through you is just one of the many ways in which I have experienced Christ's love in this world. I am forever grateful to you all.

A NOTE ON TERMINOLOGY

The racial labels used in this study are archaic and often pejorative terms, and constitute the erasure of the people on which they were bestowed. And yet, these were the only terms by which these communities were known before they reconstituted as tribal groups in the 1970s. The one exception being the Piscataway who christened themselves the "Wesorts." To avoid recommitting the documentary erasure of their identity I have chosen to place quotations around their group appellations --thus, the Ramapough Indians are the "Jackson Whites," the Monacan Indians are the "Issues," and the Piscataway are the "Wesorts." The use of these terms is not meant to privilege them, but to explore their meaning through an analysis of the scientific writing that deplored them. To avoid repetitiveness, I will also designate each group by their geographic location. Thus the Ramapough are referred to as the "Ramapo" because they reside in the Ramapo Mountains. Similarly, I refer to the Monacan Indians as the "Amherst Indians" because that was the county of their residence. This study takes seriously the avowed identity of these groups as Native Americans and thus, the use of quotations is meant to signify the constructed nature of these categories. However, that is not to suggest that the other racial terms used are not constructed. While I do not place the terms: "white," "Indian," "Negro" or their derivatives in quotations, I realize that they too, like all racial categories, are constructed. Generally, I use the term "mixed-blood" as my subjects used it, which was to refer to those mixtures with Native American ancestry regardless of its proportions. The term "mulatto" is a particularly fraught because its usage has changed over time. In popular parlance a "mulatto" was generally considered a person with any measure of white or African ancestry. However, many writing in the first half of the twentieth century defined a "mulatto" as a person with one "pure blood" white parent and one "pure blood" black parent, although they too often followed popular

convention and used the term for all mixtures. Complicating the usage of the term "mulatto" in the fact that during the antebellum era states like Louisiana, Virginia, and South Carolina also listed the offspring of Indian and White unions as "mulatto." This study refers to as Native American all those persons identified as indigenous to North America. To that end I use the terms American Indian, and "native," as well, and use them interchangeably.[1]

[1] For a discussion of the historical usage of the term see, Jack D. Forbes *Africans and Native Americans: The Language of Race and the Evolution of Red-Black Peoples* (Urbana-Champagne: University of Illinois Press, 1993), 145.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

"Who are the Wesorts, Melungeons, Jackson Whites, Ramps, Guinies, Red Bones, and Brass Ankles?" asked noted African American author and literary critic J. Saunders Redding in his 1963 review of *Almost White*."[1] According to sociologist Brewton Berry, the book's author, they were socially marginalized "racial orphans." Berry asserted that the white, Indian, and Negro ancestry of groups like the "Wesorts" had precluded them from admission to America's racial caste system, which refused to recognize persons of mixed-race ancestry. Unlike the "mulatto," who Berry argued thought of himself as a "Negro" and was accepted as such, these triracial communities were not only shunned by whites, but the communities themselves avowed a racial identity that was both separate and distinct from whiteness and blackness. As Berry made note, triracial communities worked especially hard to avoid being classed with black Americans. "Not quite white, not quite black, not quite red," groups like the Wesorts and Melungeons, as Berry saw it, stood outside the boundaries of America's racial system and as such were excluded from benefitting from the economic, political, and social privileges that derived from inclusion. Noting the political advances gained by African Americans as a result of their pursuits within the Civil Rights Movement, Berry urged triracial communities to cast their lots with black Americans so as to improve their poor economic and social conditions.[2]

Although agreeing with Berry's characterization of the communities as socially and economically degraded, Redding took issue with Berry's refusal to class groups like the "Jackson Whites" as "colored" or "mulatto." Drawing upon the logic of the one-drop rule, whereby one drop of black blood cancelled out all other ancestry, Redding asserted that it was wrongheaded to

[1] J. Saunders Redding, "Ignorant as Monkeys," *Afro-American*, Mary 2, 1963, A6.

[2] Brewton Berry, *Almost White* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1963), 71-72.

think of these groups as anything other than "colored" because, "by definition this is what they are."[3] Furthermore, Redding argued that as colored people, the "Wesorts" and other groups of mixed white, Indian, and Negro ancestry were the unfortunate victims of internalized racism. "For all the advances that colored Americans have made," Redding contended, "the white man's prejudice against them has created an image of them that is so distorted, so shameful and so debasing that, rather than be seen in this image, the mestizos prefer to live in absolute degradation, ignorance, and poverty as almost white."[4]

The communities that Berry described as "raceless," and Redding claimed as "colored" have largely self-identified as Native American. More commonly however, they have been called "triracial isolates," a label used to signify a presumed tripartite racial mixture, as well as their geographic and reproductive isolation in the eastern United States. Not only were these communities believed to reside in some of the most inhospitable and remote areas of the country, they were accused of having engaged in centuries of inbreeding in order to preserve their distinct racial position as a people that were neither black nor white. Believed to be the descendants of freed slaves, American Indians, and Anglo-Saxon mountaineers, scholars have estimated that anywhere from 200 to 500 triracial groups have existed throughout history.[5] Although groups have been found as far West as Indianapolis, Indiana, as in the case of the "Tribe of Ishmael," most triracial isolates were located in the eastern United States, particularly in areas that border the Appalachian Mountains.[6] Each triracial isolate was known by a unique name that signified

[3] Redding, "Ignorant as Monkeys," A6.

[4] Ibid.

[5] Calvin Beale coined the term "tri-racial isolates" although these communities are known by a number of derisive names like "racial dropouts," "racial miscreants," and sometimes "racial islands." Calvin Beale, "American Triracial Isolates: Their Status and Pertinence to Genetic Research," *Eugenics Quarterly* 4 (1957): 187.

[6] Ibid, 189.

their social position as well as their presumed blackness. For instance, the present-day Monacan Indians of Virginia, a group of native-descended people residing in Amherst County Virginia, were commonly referred to as "Issues," a term that originated during the antebellum period to designate free blacks.[7] Although the "Issues" began to more publicly avow their Native American identity during the early twentieth-century, because they lacked the physical appearance and cultural practices associated with the stereotype of the noble savage, white elites refused to acknowledge their avowed identity. Rather they dismissed these claims as a subversive attempt to use the "Indian" label in order to avoid the stigma of blackness.

The disparity between the Monacans' avowed self-identity and what outsiders understood them to be highlights the important role that racial classification has served in the maintenance of white supremacy. Because America, like other places in the West, used racial classification to protect white hegemonic power by denying social, political, and economic opportunity to non-whites, it was essential that ruling white elites be able to accurately sort whites from non-whites.[8] In order to establish the strict racial boundaries needed to protect white supremacy elites worked to enshrine into law and social custom the folk belief that one drop of black blood negated the presence of all other ancestry. Yet, what about groups like the "Wesorts" who, as Berry claimed, had "no difficulty in going as white, especially when far from home?"[9]

---

[7] Samuel Cook, "The Monacan Indians: Asserting Sovereignty in the Absence of Federal Acknowledgement," *Wicoza Sa Review* 17, no. 2 (2002): 91-116.

[8] Grace Elizabeth Hale, *Making Whiteness: The Culture of Segregation in the South, 1890-1940* (New York: Vintage, 1999), 4-5. See also, Elise Lemire: *"Miscegenation:" Making Race in America* (Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press, 2002); Peggy Pascoe, *What Comes Naturally*: *Miscegenation Law and the Making of Race in America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010).

[9] Brewton Berry, *Almost White*, 73.

In order to curtail the threat that near-white populations like the "Issues" posed to the preservation of white supremacy, ruling white elites often turned to social and biological scientists to get to the "truth" of how to classify these mixed-race groups. Biological and social scientific investigations of triracial communities not only shaped the racial categories and systems of meaning in which triracial communities became legible to outsiders, this work also profoundly impacted their political and social organization well into the twenty-first century. For example, when Virginia's emergent Anglo-Saxon Clubs of America wished to garner support for the Racial Integrity Act of 1924, a law that reclassified the state's 10,000 Indians as "colored," they looked to the scientific authority of eugenics to provide the racial "truths" that would substantiate their contention that Virginia lacked any Indians free of black admixture. The study, published in 1926 under the title *Mongrel Virginians: The WIN Tribe*, used family pedigrees and sociological investigation to verify the claim that Virginia Indians did indeed possess black ancestry. *Mongrel Virginians* lent credibility to the Anglo-Saxon Clubs' push to have all of Virginia's Indians reclassified as "colored," a documentary erasure that lasted for most of the twentieth century.[10]

As the Virginia case makes clear, racial misclassification carried real material consequences. This was especially true for Native Americans residing in the eastern U.S. who were largely excluded from the federal trust relationship, which conferred on acknowledged tribal communities special political, economic, and social protections. As stated above, this exclusion had much to do with the folk belief that Native Americans no longer resided in the East. Yet, so too were judgments about the authenticity of eastern Indians informed by racialized

[10] Arthur H Estabrook and Ivan E. McDougle, *Mongrel Virginians: The Win Tribe* (Baltimore: The William & Wilkins Co. 1926), 175

assumptions of what it meant to be Indian. Self-identified Indians who were racially misclassified as black were in a sense doubly victimized. Not only were they lumped into the black underclass and subjected to defacto and dejure segregation and other injustices, their presumed black ancestry precluded them from making any political and economic claims that derived from their avowed Native American identity.

And yet, while social and biological investigators often undermined the identity claims of their subjects, their work also provided an opportunity for mixed-blood groups to advance their own claims. Anthropologists Frank Speck and James Mooney served important roles in this regard. Although both men acknowledged that there were few Indians residing in the eastern U.S. that were free of black admixture, their studies privileged the cultural continuity found among these populations and took seriously their self-identification as Indians, and accepted them as such. Speck's advocacy on behalf of those Virginia Indians who claimed descent from the Powhatan Confederacy provided a formidable challenge to state efforts to reclassify them as "colored." Speck and Mooney lent scientific legitimacy to the identity claims of mixed-blood Indians and used their research to authenticate that identity. As such, their work illustrates that racial classification was a synergetic exercise that involved many diverse and competing voices.

Biological and social scientific studies of race provide a useful opportunity to study how mixed-race identity has been contested, determined, and asserted in the United States. Although U.S. race relations have existed largely within a black-white binary system, individuals outside of that binary have not only challenged the maintenance of neat racial delineations but the very meaning of the categories themselves. The belief that "one drop" of "black blood" endowed an individual with all the believed cultural and biological markers of blackness heavily influenced how biological and social scientists depicted mixed-race groups. And yet, mixed-blood Indians

were not passive victims of compulsory racial classification nor were they passive subjects of scientific scrutiny. By establishing their own educational and religious institutions and by working with their own scientific experts and other advocates in order to legitimize their identity claims, triracial groups worked hard to establish an identity that was neither black nor white.

Regardless of whether one considers the "Wesorts" to be a mixed-race people or a group of remnant Indians, their story highlights the plight of groups attempting to negotiate their identities under the auspices of white supremacy. "Third" races, be they non-black or multiracial have had to negotiate racial meaning within the black and white binary of Jim Crow's racial caste system. Yet the experiences of mixed-blood people who self-identified as Native American were also unique because their racial formation projects were circumscribed by essentialized ideas of blackness as well as what it meant to Indian. Take for instance the fact that historically a faint amount of black blood was all it took to be placed (even involuntarily) in the "colored" category, meanwhile those wishing to be accepted as American Indians were forced to establish proof of a high blood quanta in order for their identity claims to be regarded as legitimate.[11] And yet, the history of these triracial communities reveal that a number of groups were successful in advancing their identity claims. Their success indicates that despite a public commitment to monoracial thinking—whereby an individual is granted one and only one race—white elites proved willing to invite racial others into the existing hierarchy, especially if it meant that their privileged position remained unchanged.

This dissertation breaks new ground by exploring the prehistory of officially recognized "multiracial" identities in the modern U.S., with special attention to how biological and social

[11] Eva Marie Garroutte, "The Racial Formation of American Indians: Negotiating Legitimate Identities within Tribal and Federal Law," *American Indian Quarterly 25* (2001): 231.

scientists construed racial mixture and shaped its public meanings. The "problem" of mixed blood was in the U.S. tightly linked to debates over American Indians, and so the study begins in 1870 as ethnologists turned their attention to investigating the existence and condition of surviving Indian communities in the eastern United States. Believing that the nation's Native peoples were on the brink of extinction—through displacement and disease, but more commonly as the result of racial mixture and assimilation—scientists turned to those Indian-descended peoples believed to have undergone serious admixture with both their black and white neighbors. For scholars like James Mooney and Frank Speck, the goal was to understand how racial mixture influenced the development and maintenance of American Indian culture. Utilizing a variety of published and archival sources—scientific studies, newspapers, field notes, personal correspondence, and records of state agencies—this project traces major developments in scientific theories of race across the next century and their impact on the social and political organization of mixed-race native communities. The project ends in the 1970s, as these resurgent communities sought both state and federal acknowledgement as Native American tribes, spurred in large part by the new social and identity movements of the period, but also in part by a new genetic conception of race that stressed genetic variation over typological and morphological difference.

This study focuses on four communities of presumed white, Indian, and African American ancestry: The Monacan Indians of Virginia, the Ramapough Mountain Indians of New York and New Jersey, the Piscataway Indians of Maryland, and the Nanticoke Indians of Delaware. Although these communities occupied different geographical, social, and political spaces, what they have in common is that they garnered a great deal of scientific interest. Scientific experts of various stripes—sociologists, anthropologists, geneticists—repeatedly came

into these communities to diagnose their social ills, deduce their racial composition, or determine their degree of cultural authenticity, leaving behind an immense documentary record that is impressive considering the relative obscurity of these communities prior to their political resurgence during the 1970s.

Before the 1970s each community lacked formal recognition and other markers of identity commonly associated with federally recognized tribes. Prior to this period they were known as the "Issues," "Wesorts," "Jackson Whites," and "Moors," respectively. These pejorative labels were meant to signify the denial of their Indian identity and the presumption of their blackness. Although all of these communities were known as triracial, each has experienced a different degree of success in terms of their identity formation projects. For instance, the Nanticoke Indians were able to gain recognition by their state legislature in 1903 in order to establish their own school.[12] In contrast, the "Wesorts" of Maryland had a harder time acquiring formal acknowledgement of their identity and were not granted state recognition until 2012.

In bringing together the histories of northeastern and southern Indians this study departs from previous treatments of Native American identity formation that have focused overwhelmingly on the southeastern United States. Native communities like the Lumbee of North Carolina and "the five tribes" of the southeast (the Cherokee, Choctaw, Chickasaw, Creek, and Seminole) are especially represented in these works.[13] In her study of the Lumbee Indians,

[12] State Laws of Delaware XVI Part 1 Chapter 369, 378.

[13] For examples see: Karen Blu, *The Lumbee Problem: The Making of an American Indian People* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980); Gilder Sider, *Lumbee Indian Histories: Race, Ethnicity, and Indian Identity in the Southern United States* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993); Christopher Arris Oakley, *Keeping the Circle: American Identity in Eastern North Carolina 1885-2004* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2005); Scholarship on black-Indian identity has flourished in the last decade. See also, James E. Brooks ed., *Confounding the Color Line: The Indian-Black Experience in North America* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2002); Celia Naylor, *African Cherokees in Indian Territory: From Chattel to Citizens* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina

Melinda Maynor Lowery has argued that white America's preoccupation with "blood quantum," enshrined into the legal codes of the Jim Crow South, exacerbated crises of identity and fostered animosity against Indians who intermarried with black Americans." [14] Yet, the Lumbee were not the only native communities to contend with white racial expectations of Indianess in their identity formation projects, nor were they the only communities struggling to protect their identity claims against efforts to lump them in the black underclass. Despite their geographical differences the Monacans, Piscataway, Nanticoke, and Ramapough were all tasked with negotiating their lived identities and public performances of Indianess under the auspices of white supremacy. Lacking the characteristics of presumed "Indianess," all four communities developed alternative signifiers of identity and group belonging. Identity markers like attending a mission school, residing in a particular community location, and drawing on specific kinship networks were central to how the Monacans, Piscataway, Nanticoke, and Ramapough lent credibility to their ethnoracial status.

In the broadest sense this study contributes to the scholarship on America's apartheid system, otherwise known as Jim Crow. Much of the foundational work in this field has tended to focus on the creation of racial caste by tracing the enactment of various legal codes that separated individual life experiences according to race.[15] In addition to tracing the origin, nature, and timing of Jim Crow, this scholarship traces the "the culture of segregation" that emerged

---

Press, 2008); and Malinda Maynor Lowery, *Lumbee Indians in the Jim Crow South: Race, Identity, and the Making of a Nation* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2010).

[14] Lowery, *Lumbee Indians in the Jim Crow South*, 6-9.

[15] For examples of more traditional Jim Crow histories see: Grace Elizabeth Gilmore, *Gender and Jim Crow: Womanhood and the Politics of White Supremacy in North Carolina, 1896-192*0 (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996); Leon Litwack, *Trouble in Mind: Black Southerners in the Age of Jim Crow* (New York: Vintage, 1999); Charles Frank Robinson, *Dangerous Liaisons: Sex and Love in the Segregated South* (Fayetteville: University of Arkansas Press, 2003); Peter Wallerstein, *Tell the Court I Love My Wife: Race, Marriage, and Law-An American History* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002).

during this era. In their respective path-breaking treatments, Grace Elizabeth Hale and Elise Lemire argue that cultural institutions also participated in the construction of racial meaning.[16] Scientific practices and theories also informed the production of racial categories and lived racial identities. Indeed, anthropologists, and geneticists were amongst the first in the modern U.S. to grapple with the existence and nature of multiracial populations. Despite the wide purchase of the one-drop rule, social and biological investigations of race constituted a space in which mixed-race persons engendered but made legible to the outside world. As such, scientific efforts were as significant as legal and political ones in shaping the Jim Crow caste-system. Their focus on "inbetween people" or "racial outliers," helped to produce new categories of racial identity alongside competing efforts to collapse racial differences into neat categories. Attention to their efforts to carry out both projects highlights in striking fashion the many contradictions and tensions that lay at the root of America's racial system.

This study also traces how American Indians participated in and negotiated racial hierarchies. The emphasis on racial discourses created by whites has tended to obscure the participation of non-white groups in the creation of racial meaning. This study treats mixed-blood Indians as both the victims and perpetrators of racial oppression. Historians of southeastern Indians like the Creek and Choctaw have been adamant in their assertion that Native Indians understood racial hierarchy, devoting studies to illustrating how this understanding influenced their relationships with whites, blacks, and black-Indians.[17] At times

[16] Grace Elizabeth Hale, *Making Whiteness: The Culture of Segregation in the South, 1890-1940* (Vintage, 1999), 4-5. See also, Elise Lemire, "*Miscegenation:" Making Race in America* (Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press, 2002); Peggy Pascoe, *What Comes Naturally*: *Miscegenation Law and the Making of Race in America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010).

[17] For a discussion of Indian understandings of racial hierarchies see, Claudio Saunt et al., "Rethinking Race and Culture in the Early South," *Ethnohistory* 53 (2006): 399–400; For examples of scholarship that argues for the centrality of race to Indian experiences in antebellum and post-bellum years see: Tiya Miles, *Ties That Bind: The*

however, the historian's focus on black, Indian, and white relations has obscured the importance of black-Indian relations. Claudio Saunt's micro-history of family relationships across three generations of African and non-African Creeks elucidates the creative ways in which groups developed their own ideas about racial stratification.[18] This study also treats "black Indians," but defines them as groups with real or imagined black ancestry that often times have lacked tribal affiliation and other standard markers of Indian identity.[19] The Monacans, Ramapough, Piscataway, and Nanticoke are all populations that by today's standards would fall under this heading. Whether or not they would agree with this categorization is a matter this study takes up.

In treating a century of biological and social scientific research on triracial populations this study seeks to bridge the gap between earlier histories of scientific racism and more contemporary scholarship on race in the genomic era. It contends that despite the shifting frames through which anthropologists, eugenicists, sociologists, and geneticists have justified their study of tri-racial populations, they remained committed to the core belief that "race" is both measurable and determinable. Additionally, this study argues that these links illustrate that race, identity, and culture are still largely presumed to reside in biology. Attention to the biological and social sciences allows the tracking of continuities that are otherwise obscured in a study focusing on social and biological science alone. For example, in his treatment of sociologists and anthropologists, Elazar Barkan posits that scientific racism lost its footing in the United States

---

Story of an Afro-Cherokee Family in Slavery and Freedom (Berkeley: University of California, 2005); Circe Sturm, *Blood Politics: Race, Culture and Identity in the Cherokee Nation of Oklahoma* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002).

[18] Claudio Saunt, *Black, White, and Indian: Race and the Unmaking of an American Family* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 3-5.

[19] Saunt et al., "Rethinking Race and Culture in the Early South," 400.

after World War II.[20] This study builds upon the work of scholars like George Stocking and Jenny Reardon and traces the "survival" of older forms of race knowledge and their newer iterations in the genomic age.[21]

And finally, this study contributes to the histories on the lived experiences of people who confounded the black-white color line.[22] Recent scholarship on the history of immigration and the establishment of anti-miscegenation law offer useful examples of works including previously marginalized or multiracial populations.[23] Peggy Pascoe's study of miscegenation law in the West has made it necessary to think about racial oppression beyond black and white, a move that reveals "the multiracial character of the white supremacy project." Her work represents new historical interest in groups usually omitted from the narrative of segregation-notably Japanese, Chinese, and American Indians.[24] Mae Ngai makes a similar move in her history of the illegal

---

[20] Elazar Barkan, *The Retreat of Scientific Racism: Changing Concepts of Race in Britain and the United States* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992); Audrey Smedley, *Race in North America: Origin and Evolution of a Worldview* (Boulder: Westview Press, 1999).

[21] Daniel Kevles, *In the Name of Eugenics: Genetics and the Uses of Human Heredity* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2007), 20; Jenny Reardon, *Race to the Finish: Identity Governance in the Age of Genomics* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005); Keith Wailoo, Alondra Nelson, and Catherine Lee, *Genetics and the Unsettled Past: The Collision of DNA, Race, and History* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 2012); George Stocking, *Race, Culture, and Evolution: Essays in the History of Anthropology* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968).

[22]For examples of scholarship that inform the dissertations treatment of multiracial people See, Ariella Gross, *What Blood Won't Tell: A History of Race on Trial in America* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2008); Ian Haney Lopez, *White By Law: The Legal Construction of Race* (New York: NYU Press, 1996); Virginia Dominguez, *White by Definition: Social Classification in Creole Louisiana* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1993); F. James Davis, *Who is Black? One Nation's Definition* (University Park: Penn St. University Press, 1991); Walter Johnson, "The Slave Trader, the White Slave, and the Politics of Racial Determination in the 1850s," *The Journal of American History* (2000): 13-38; and Daniel J. Sharfstein, "The Secret History of Race in the United States," *Yale Law Journa*l 112 (2003): 1473-1509.

[23] For examples of this work see, Alex Lubin. *Romance and Rights: The Politics of Interracial Intimacy, 1945-1954* (Jackson: University of Mississippi, 2003); Ronald Takaki, *Strangers from a Different Shore: A History of Asian Americans* (Boston: Little Brown & Co., 1989); Natalie Molina, *Fit to be Citizens: Public Health and Race in Los Angeles, 1879-1939* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006); J. Douglass Smith, *Managing White Supremacy: Race, Politics, and Citizenship in Jim Crow Virginia* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002); and Orlan Svingen, "Jim Crow, Indian Style" *Indian American Quarterly* 11:4 (1987): 275-286.

[24] Pascoe, *What Comes Naturally*, 6-7.

alien in America. Ngai argues that the legal construction of Japanese, Chinese and Filipino immigrants as "alien citizens" or as 'aliens ineligible for citizenship" was based on a racialized idea of the nation, which led to the social construction of these individuals as permanently foreign and therefore outside of the body politic.[25] Despite their desire to be recognized as Native Americans, the Ramapough, Monacans, Nanticoke, and Piscataway were also forced to grapple with the presence or presumption of black ancestry.

This dissertation is composed of five chapters. Chapter One, "Biological Disharmonies, Legal Impossibilities, and Anomalous Races: The Construction of the Mixed-Blood Problem, 1870-1930," explores how social and political anxiety over the maintenance of white supremacy influenced scientific theories regarding the advisability of race mixture. Beginning in the 1870s, the chapter traces biological and social scientific discussions of "mixedness," i.e., the state of being of mixed-blood people, and racial mixing through across various disciplines as scientists engage such disparate topics as America Indian cultural survival, the psychological condition of the "mulatto," and the racial destiny of the Negro. Together their work helped to ground some of the foundational theories describing "white, Indian, and Negro" identity.

Chapter Two, "'Mestizos of the Mountains': Social Science and the Rethinking of Appalachian Whiteness, 1870-1940, examines how the view of Appalachia as overwhelmingly white and impoverished shaped the identity formation of non-whites residing in the region. It argues that the romanticism and mythology of the region blinded social scientific researchers to the presence of other peoples and cultures residing there. As such, this chapter pushes for a reconsideration of whiteness as a monolithic identity describing the inhabitants of Appalachia.

[25] Mae Ngai, *Impossible Subjects: Illegal Aliens and the Making of Modern America* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004) 7-8.

By exploring how tri-racial and Scotch-Irish residents of Appalachia were configured along the same lines, this chapter contends that both groups were fashioned outside the boundaries of acceptable whiteness, but not far enough outside as to disqualify them from those social services typically designated for poor degenerate whites.

Chapter Three, "'This Indian Stuff Has Gone Far Enough': Scientific Expertise and the Fight for Racial Integrity, 1920-1940," traces the passage and enforcement of Virginia's Racial Integrity Act of 1924, a measure that reclassified the state's 10,000 Indians as "colored." Although the architects of the racial integrity measure hoped to establish a strict color line separating black and white, in devising the categories and language with which to identify the state's mixed-blood Indians their efforts actually helped to imbue these categories with meaning. Hoping to gather scientific support for their contention that the state's Indian population possessed black ancestry, supporters of the Racial Integrity Act appealed to the promise of eugenics to establish the racial truths regarding the Indians' identity. Refusing to submit to documentary erasure of their identity, Virginia's citizen Indians worked to enshrine their identity against the ascription of blackness, and worked with their own scientific experts to advance separate identity claims. This chapter explores the back and forth over identity ascription and the role that scientific authority played in influencing who gets to make those claims.

Chapter Four, "Making Indians, Recovering History: Salvage Anthropology Among Eastern Indian Remnants, 1900-1950," details how the Ramapough, Monacan, Piscataway, and Nanticoke worked on their own as well with sympathetic researchers, most notably Frank Speck, and Clinton Weslager, to advance their own identity claims. Whereas earlier studies concerned themselves with the groups' racial mixture, Speck and Weslager's commitment to studying cultural continuity among eastern Indians, even to the point of inventing it, helped the triracial

groups live up to white expectations of their identity. This chapter treats Speck and Weslager's intervention as one of many strategies deployed by the communities in order to maintain a separate identity apart from both their white and black neighbors.

Chapter Five, "It's in the Blood: Physical Anthropology, Genetics, and the Making of America's Triracial Isolates, 1950-1970," examines the attempts made by physical anthropologists and blood serologists to link the racial and ethnic identity of triracial communities to the ABO blood types. This chapter argues that although these scientists framed their work as a departure from the biological determinism of the older race science, their work continued under a paradigm that treated race, biology, and culture as constituting forces.

The dissertation concludes with an epilogue that traces how the biological and social scientific studies of the previous century continued to impact the racial formation projects of the Ramapough, Nanticoke, Piscataway, and Monacans into the twenty-first century.

Chapter 1

BIOLOGICAL DISHARMONIES, LEGAL IMPOSSIBILITIES AND ANOMALOUS RACES: THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE MIXED-BLOOD PROBLEM, 1870-1930[1]

What a 'race' is no one seems to know, but everyone is most anxious to tell.

M.F. Ashley Montagu[2]

In 1889, four years following his death, Frederick Douglass, the noted African American leader and abolitionist, was embroiled in yet another race scandal, this one even more controversial than his interracial marriage to Helen Pitts in 1884—Frederick Douglass was posthumously declared "white." At least he was according to Caroline H. Dall, suffragist and founder of the American Social Science Association. Dall claimed that shortly before his death Douglass confided in her that there was "not a drop" of Negro blood in his veins. During his lifetime, Douglass did acknowledge having some white ancestry on his father's side. According to Dall, not only was Douglass's father white but his maternal grandmother was a "full-blooded Potomac Indian" thus making his mother a "white and Indian half-breed." By Dall's estimation Frederick Douglass was now at least three-quarters white.[3] The implications of Dall's claim were especially clear for those wanting to undermine African American access to full equality—the exemplar of Negro potential was no Negro at all.[4] Lewis Douglass, Frederick's son, wrote a

---

[1] The term "mixed-blood" came into vogue during the nineteenth century to describe persons of white and Native American ancestry while those with black and Native American ancestry have been called Black Indians or sometimes red-black people. In this chapter I use the term mixed-blood as a term signifying triracial heritage and will use it interchangeably with the term "triracial." For more on the use of the term "mixed-blood" as a descriptor of white and Indian ancestry see, Theda Purdue, '*Mixed Blood' Indians: Racial Construction in the Early South* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2003).

[2] Montague Francis Ashley-Montagu, *Man's Most Dangerous Myth: The Fallacy of Race* (New York: Harper, 1942), 370.

[3] Caroline H. Dall, "The Late Frederick Douglass. No Negro Blood in the Veins: Interesting Reminiscences by Mrs. Dall," *Springfield Republican*, December 22, 1899, 5.

[4] "No Negro in Douglass," *Watertown Daily Times*, February 3, 1900, 1.

rejoinder to Dall that ran just a few weeks later. In his response Lewis Douglass took exception to Dall's account and pointed out that his family's racial ancestry featured "black relatives," "partly white relatives," as well as "white kinfolk." Furthermore, Lewis Douglass was adamant that his father had "Indian blood," "Negro blood" and "Anglo-Saxon blood" and was proud of it all.[5]

The Douglass controversy demonstrates one of the inherent features of America's racial formation project—the dichotomization of whiteness and blackness. Dall's assertion of Douglass' whiteness was dependent upon the absence of blackness. Any recognition of Douglass' black ancestry would have undermined Dall's attempt to claim for Douglass the social purchase that came from being white. Legal scholar Cheryl Harris has argued that whiteness is both property and a valued social position protected from those signified as "others" through the process of racial categorization.[6] As both the progenitors and arbiters of racial caste, white Americans ensured that political, social, and economic privilege remain tethered to ideas of race and caste. While whiteness has historically functioned by delimiting those who can access it, one-drop of black blood was all it took to outweigh any other racial ancestry.

Navigating the space between blackness and whiteness has been especially difficult for those who fail to fit between these two poles. Efforts to pin down the appropriate racial classification for triracial groups like the Ramapough, Piscataway, Monacans, and Nanticoke have entailed a complicated back-and-forth over the nature of racial boundaries and identity not unlike the one between Caroline Dall and Lewis Douglass. Multiple voices have entered the

[5] "Frederick Douglass's Ancestry, What His Son Has to Say About It," *Springfield Republican,* February 12, 1900, 6.

[6] Cheryl I. Harris, "Whiteness as Property," *Harvard Law Review* 106 (June 1993): 1758.

debate at one time or another in order to arbitrate the issue. The public, bureaucrats, scientists, and neighbors have all voiced their opinions about the racial identity of these communities thereby impacting the identity claims they have been able to make. The triracial populations at the center of this study have historically claimed to be Native American. And yet, because their white neighbors believed that they had black ancestry, they made every effort to lump these triracial communities into the black underclass. Historian Patrick Wolfe has provided an excellent summation of how the one-drop rule has impacted the racial formation of native descended people: "The one-drop rule makes black unhypenable…there is no such category of red-black people---indeed, no such category as anything-black people."[7]

And yet, while Wolfe's analysis is a useful articulation of how white hegemonic ideas of blackness informed racial thinking, his comments elide the many exceptions, contradictions, and fictions that stood at the heart of America's racial formation project. Although all four groups were presumed to be triracial, the Ramapough, Piscataway, Monacans, and Nanticoke were all classed differently based on the particular social climate of their region. For instance, outsiders aware of the group's mixed-ancestry generally dismissed the indigenous heritage of the Ramapough Indians of New York and New Jersey, then known as the "Jackson-Whites," by referring to them as "white hillbillies."[8] In contrast, residents of Charles County Maryland accepted the "Wesorts" as Indians since the nineteenth century.[9] Their so-called "light red complexion and Indian features" gave them an intermediate position in the racial hierarchy of

[7] Patrick Wolfe, "Land, Labor, Difference: Elementary Structures of Race," *American Historical Review* 106 (2001): 893.

[8] "Jersey Hillbillies to Get State Aid," *Trenton Evening Times*, April 26, 1937, 3.

[9] Alice L. Ferguson and Henry G. Ferguson, *The Piscataway Indians of Southern Maryland* (Accokeek: Alice Ferguson Foundation, 1960), 8.

Upper Marlboro Maryland. The groups would eventually become embedded in what some newspapers described as Maryland's "Double Jim Crow" system.[10] Therefore we might consider that the one-drop rule represented white elites' articulation of how they hoped racial classification to proceed and not necessarily a reflection of lived reality.

Biological and social scientific discourse on race mixture is one space in which to locate what historian Gary Nash has termed "the hidden history of mestizo America." While anti-miscegenation laws and rules of hypo-descent were believed to make multiracial identity a legal and social impossibility, the scientific arguments and studies explored in this chapter highlight the reality of multiracial subjects despite these obstacles.[11] Nash is joined by David Hollinger in his push for historians to move beyond a focus on the legal restrictions to multiracial identity which they argue obscures the ways in which individuals lived their lives in direct opposition to prevailing racial ideologies.[12] As later chapters will show, the scientific investigations into the social and biological conditions of these populations had a profound impact on the political and social organization available to them. Ultimately this research helped to constitute the racial categories and systems of meaning that informed how outsiders came to understand these communities.

Histories of America's racial system have often focused on the strengthening of white supremacy at the expense of examining its more permeable racial boundaries. Scholars like Joel Williamsoand F. James Davis suggest that the monoracial nature of America's racial system

[10] "Double Jim Crow in S. Maryland Church," *Afro-American*, June 8, 1935, 7.

[11] Gary Nash, "The Hidden History of Mestizo America," *The Journal of American History* 82 (1995): 941 and 947.

[12] David Hollinger, "Amalgamation and Hypodescent: The Question of Ethnoracial Mixture in the History of the United States," *The American Historical Review* 108 (2003): 1363-1390.

failed to accommodate those who defied easy classification. As a result, these individuals are largely absent in the social history of the nation. These scholars posit the removal of the "mulatto" category from the census, as well as the adoption of laws that declared as black any person with at least one-drop of black blood as evidence of the legal and social erasure of the "mulatto."[13] In other words, the adoption of these measures made mixed-race persons impossibilities in a legal and social sense. [14] Yet, biological and social scientific attempts to diagnose the social, biological, and psychological problems of mixed-race people provided an intellectual space in which they were recognized and contended with even after being dismissed as legal impossibilities. This chapters places non-white groups at the center of my analysis of the Jim Crow era and illustrates that biological and social scientific interest in race ensured that race mixture remained an animate discourse despite multiple shifts in the meaning of race.

[13] Joel Williamson, *New People: Miscegenation and Mulattoes in the United States* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1995), 25; F. James Davis, *Who is Black? One Nation's Definition* (University Park: Penn State Press, 1994), 40.

[14]This characterization is not meant to suggest that racial boundaries became somehow impermeable but only that a majority of scholarship has treated it as such. For examples of this work see: Alex Lubin. *Romance and Rights: The Politics of Interracial Intimacy, 1945-1954* (Jackson: University of Mississippi, 2003); Ronald Takaki, *Strangers from a Different Shore: A History of Asian Americans* (Boston: Little Brown & Co., 1989); Natalie Molina, *Fit to be Citizens: Public Health and Race in Los Angeles, 1879-1939* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006); J. Douglass Smith, *Managing White Supremacy: Race, Politics, and Citizenship in Jim Crow Virginia* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002); and Orlan Svingen, "Jim Crow, Indian Style," *American Indian Quarterly* 11 (1987): 275-286.

Additionally, this chapter looks to explain how separate enclaves of tri-racial persons came to represent by the 1930s, a distinct racial phenomenon in the United States. Focusing on the discourse surrounding the "mulatto" and the "vanishing Indian," I seek to uncover how biological and social sciences participated in the social construction of the "mixed-blood." I argue that social and biological investigations on vanishing Indians and degraded mulattos lead scholars to seek out and study triracial Indian remnants. It is my contention that scholars working to understand the lived experiences and biological conditions of these three communities helped to inform what it meant to be mixed race in twentieth century America.[15] Lastly, I argue that investigators' willingness to focus on individuals and communities that defied easy classification preserved a space where multiracial identity remained a possibility despite legal and social proscriptions saying otherwise.

Racial Destiny and the Vanishing Indian

The assimilation period in federal Indian policy, which lasted from 1887 until 1930, sought to bring "civilization" to the Indian through the introduction of American-style education, land ownership practices, the adoption of Christian religion, and patrilineal family organization. Indigenous population decline was well underway prior to the mid-nineteenth century, due in large part to centuries of disease, famine and warfare. However, government programs designed with the explicit goal of assimilating American Indians resulted in a significant amount of cultural erosion for these communities as they loss their family structures, land holdings, systems of government, and their general way of life. While many Americans applauded what they

[15] In this chapter I rely on Jill Olumide's definition of "mixed-race" which she defines as the patterns and commonality of experience among those who obstruct whatever purpose race is being put to at a particular time." Jill Olumide, *Raiding the Gene Pool: The Social Construction of Race* (London: Pluto Press, 2002). For a discussion of the mulatto in terms of white/black ancestry see Joel Williamson, *New People: Miscegenation and Mulattoes in the United States* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1980), xii.

viewed as the success of the assimilationist policy, others, particularly those devoted to the study of the Indian, worried that the "First American" and his distinctive culture would soon be lost forever.[16]

Although the federal government and other agents of "civilization" clearly had a hand in the decline of America's indigenous population, public commentary during the nineteenth century focused less on forced assimilation and more on racial destiny as a cause of the Indian's demise. Few disagreed with the notion that as "an inferior race of men…neither qualified to rise higher in the scale of being, nor to enjoy the benefits of the civilized and Christian state," Indians were fated to extinction.[17] White Americans also advanced theories about the racial destiny of the Negro, who like the Indian, was believed to be on a similar path to extinction. Historian George Frederickson has argued that projecting the decline of racial groups allowed white Americans to deny the development of a multiracial America, even as one emerged.[18]

Anyone who doubted the doctrine of racial destiny could look to the reports of the decennial census for proof that the Indian was on the decline. The 1890 census, which listed a total population of 244,000, is considered the nadir of the Indian population in the United States. Even by the turn of the century the number of Indians enumerated remained under 300,000.[19]

---

[16] Wilcombe E. Washburn, *Red Man's Land, White Man's Law: A Study of the Past and Present Status of the American Indian* (New York: Scribner's and Sons, 1971), 72-74.

[17] Brian Dippie, *The Vanishing American: White Attitudes and U.S. Indian Policy* (Middletown, Wesleyan Press, 1982), 10-11.

[18] George Frederickson, *The Black Image in the White Mind: The Debate on Afro-American Character and Destiny, 1817-1914* (Hanover, Wesleyan Press, 1971), xii-xiii.

[19] Harold E. Driver, "On the Population Nadir of Indians in the United States" *Current Anthropology* 9 (Oct., 1968): 330. Unlike previous enumerations, the 1890 census marks the first time that "Indians not taxed," that is Indians not confined to reservations, were also enumerated in the census.

[19] Brian W. Dippie, *The Vanishing American: White Attitudes and U.S. Indian Policy* (Middletown: Wesleyan University Press, 1982), xv.

While claiming to be a flat statistical representation of the United States population, the U.S. census actually reveals more about the assumptions that undergird racial categorization and boundary making than it does about the actual size of any particular population. For instance, while in 1890 one could be classed as "Indian" if community recognition affirmed that identity, that same individual could also be classed a "mulatto" if enumerators believed that individual possessed anywhere from "3/8 to 5/8 of black blood."[20] On the imprecision of the census in regards to the number of Native Americans, historian Brian Dippie opines that the subjective estimates of the census reflect "a desire to be (or not to be) considered Indian, as well as white assumptions about what an Indian is and what his ultimate destiny will be."[21]

No one fared more prominently in the vanishing Indian narrative than the descendants of the historical tribes remaining in the eastern U.S. after Indian Removal.[22] Believing that the Narragansett Indians of Rhode Island had vanished due to black admixture, state legislatures passed a bill stripping the Narragansett of their tribal status.[23] White Virginians made a similar move in 1842 when they circulated a petition to the governor alleging that the Pamunkey Indians had allowed blacks to live on their reservation and marry with their people "until all their Indian character vanished."[24] Although the Pamunkey and Narragansett possessed land bases that provided them with a documentary history verifying their identity, there were dozens of other

[20] U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Measuring America: The Decennial Censuses From 1790-2000* (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 2007), 27.

[21] Dippie, *The Vanishing American*, xv.

[22] Signed into law by President Andrew Jackson in 1880, The Indian Removal Act initiated the forced removal of tribes residing east of the Mississippi River.

[23] Jean M. Obrien, *Firsting and Lasting: Writing Indians out of Existence in New England* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2010), 205.

[24] Helen Rountree, *Pocahontas' People: The Powhatan Indians of Virginia Through Four Centuries* (Norman: University of Oaklahoma Press, 1990), 194.

enclaves of native descended people whose identity claims were much more tenuous because failed to fit white conceptions of Indianess. With the loss of their native identity came increased attempts to lump them with their black neighbors. Thus, by the beginning of the twentieth-century, groups like the "Jackson Whites," and "Wesorts," had only very tenuous claims to Indian identity. White Americans were invested in their racial erasure because to do otherwise would mean that they had to confront the reality of widespread race mixing taking place in America.

The Beginnings of Salvage Anthropology

At precisely the same moment that American Indians seemed on the brink of extinction anthropologists decided to exercise their newfound professionalism in the service of preserving American Indian culture. Through the creation of government funded institutions like the Smithsonian (1846) and the Bureau of American Ethnology (1876) researchers set out to collect information on indigenous languages, mythology, practices, and art. These institutions served as the clearinghouse for scientific inquiry into American Indians. By establishing the guidelines and standards of systematic field research, they helped to establish the epistemological basis of anthropological research.[25]

Under the direction of John Wesley Powell, the Bureau of American Ethnology, as it was renamed in 1897, pioneered the practice of what is now called "salvage anthropology." Salvage anthropology involved the explicit practice of preserving the rituals, language, and artifacts of cultures facing extinction through modernization or dislocation.[26] Initially, salvage anthropology

[25] L.G. Moses, *Indian Man: A Biography of James Mooney* (Urbana: University of Chicago Press, 1984), 13-14.

[26]Originally salvage anthropology was a method to preserve archaeology artifacts in the face of geological change. Eventually historians of anthropology began consider the ways in which early anthropological studies of Native Americans flowed from a similar philosophical tradition. See Robert Berkhofer, *The White Man's Indian: Images of*

was little more than the collection of data and artifacts to be stored in the repositories of America's museums. Eventually, however, researchers began to produce studies on the social condition of various Indian tribes with the goal of determining how social change impacted the preservation of indigenous identity. Researchers showed little interest in trying to understand these communities on their own terms, as persons attempting to grapple with the effects of industrial capitalism and urbanization. Instead, their work privileged the romanticized vision of the "noble savage" as the baseline by which to judge present-day conditions. The overall result was the depiction of communities more-or-less frozen in time.[27] That anthropological interest rarely extended to those communities that adopted black or Anglo-American culture represents yet another erasure of Native American identity.

Offering little in the way of cultural artifacts and often failing to look the part of an Indian, eastern Indians are virtually absent in the anthropological studies of this period. Because the present conditions of these communities failed to meet the investigator's expectation of authenticity many of these communities were often dismissed as racial subversives attempting to avoid the mark of blackness. Local reports that focused on the group's mixed-race identity often did much to further this claim. An 1892 article published in the *Jacksonian* claimed to be interested in the origin story of the Lumbee Indians of North Carolina. Yet, the bulk of their article spent time discussing the Lumbee's physical appearance, which was describes as a "striking peculiarity of their existence." Most notably because "their skin is not the same color

---

the Indian from Columbus to the Present (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1978); James J. Hester, "Pioneer Methods in Salvage Anthropology," A*nthropological Quarterly,* 41 (July 1968): 132; Frederic Gleach, "Anthropological Professionalization and the Virginia Indians at the Turn of the Century," *American Anthropologist*, 104 (Jun. 2002): 500; George Stocking, *Race, Culture, and Evolution: Essays in the History of Anthropology* (New York: Free Press, 1968).

[27] Sherry Smith, *Reimagining Indians: Native Americans Through Anglo Eyes, 1880-1940* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 8.

on all parts of their bodies. Some of them from the waist up are almost white, while their lower limbs are almost black."[28] However, as ethnologists began to exhaust the research potential of western tribes these marginal communities excited the interest of researchers who were sought to verify evidence of Indian survival east of the Mississippi.

In 1899, ethnographer William Babcock became the first to investigate the possibility of eastern survivals. After visiting the Nanticoke, a "mixed blood" group from Indian River, Delaware, Babcock concluded that although the group had little in the way of aboriginal culture, "the anthropological world may brighten matters a little for them by showing that in their long struggle for individual existence they have at least become visible to the scientific eye."[29] In that same year, James Mooney, an ethnographer with the Bureau of Ethnology mailed over a thousand questionnaires to physicians in Virginia, Maryland, Delaware, and North Carolina inquiring into the presence and condition of nearby "Indian remnants"[30] In keeping with the Bureau's mission to direct the course of anthropological research on American Indians, Mooney believed that if located, these communities would be an invaluable contribution to the field by challenging the theory that eastern Indians had vanished.[31] Compelling this interest was a desire to understand the links between biology and social condition on the one hand, and on the other, the link between race and culture. To that end, these communities served as the models through

---

[28] "Two Strange Tribes: People Who Have White, Negro And Indian Blood. One Of the Tribes," *The Jacksonian 10,* April 12, 1894, 3.

[29] William H. Babcock, "The Nanticoke Indians of Indian River Delaware," *American Anthropologist* (1899): 277.

[30] The Bureau of Ethnology, later renamed the Bureau of American Ethnology was established by Congress in 1879 as part of the Smithsonian Institute. The Bureau is now the Department of Anthropology, part of the National Museum of American History and remains part of the Smithsonian. See Curtis Hinsley, *The Smithsonian and the American Indian: Making a Moral Anthropology in Victorian America* (Washington D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1994).

[31] Brewton Berry, *Almost White* (New York: Macmillan, 1963), 1-2; Frank W. Porter III, *Strategies for Survival: American Indians in the Eastern United States* (Greenwood Press, 1986), 4.

which anthropologists developed theories about the impact of racial mixing on cultural development. Race mixing, for Babcock and Mooney at least, was not the express purpose of their research; rather it was a condition they believed had impacted the Indians cultural survival. Although not traditionally the purview of ethnography, racial mixture weighed heavily in how both Babcock and Mooney came to view their subjects.

Using the responses to the questionnaire Mooney produced a series of articles for the *American Anthropologist*, the flagship journal of the newly formed American Anthropological Association. His 1907 article entitled, "Powhatan Confederacy, Past and Present" did not refute the "vanishing Indian narrative," so much as complicate it. Mooney concluded that of the ten thousand or so Powhatan Indians residing in Virginia in 1607, "[the] aboriginal population [was now] entirely extinct, with the exception of the 700 mixed-bloods" who lived in distinct geographical communities corresponding to the locations of their ancestral tribes.[32] The presence of eastern descendants was now established although the nature of Indian identity was far from settled. Of the five communities included in the study, Mooney observed that:

> In all these bands the blood of three races is comingled, with the Indian blood sufficiently prepondering to give stamp to the physiognomy and hair characteristics. It is probable that from intermarriage nearly the same mixture is in all alike, although it does not show equally in the features. Thus, many would pass among strangers as ordinary negroes; a few show no trace of any but white blood; while a few families and individuals might pass as full-blood Indians in any western tribe.[33]

[32] James Mooney, "The Powhatan Confederacy, Past and Present," *American Anthropologist* 9 (Jan.-Mar. 1907): 132. The Indian remnants included the Pamunkey and Mattaponi, both of which were state recognized Indians with tribal reservations. The remaining groups: the Nansemond, Chickahominy, and Rappahannock were scattered along the Tidewater region.

[33] Ibid. 145.

What surprised Mooney most was that these communities clung spiritedly to their Indian identity.[34] Despite their self-identification, Mooney did not consider the Powhatan remnants ”real” Indians. In addition to racial amalgamation, the loss of their language and land base, and the adoption of Anglo-agricultural practices were, for Mooney, all signs that the Indians were too culturally and biologically diluted to be worthy of anthropological research.[35] Still, Mooney did not believe all eastern Indians were beyond the pale of anthropological research. Although his research did little to preserve the cultural artifacts of eastern Indians—Mooney was adamant in his claim that they had none worth preserving—he did provide many communities without prior knowledge with information about their tribal ancestors. For instance, Mooney's 1914 trip to the "Wesorts" of southern Maryland convinced him that they were descendants of the Piscataway Indians, a theory they would use in their twenty-first century quest for state acknowledgement.[36]

Salvage anthropology as far as eastern remnants was concerned involved little in the way of the actual recovery of artifacts. Most of the studies conducted by Mooney and Babcock were observational in nature and born of an interest in attempting to understand the social condition of these communities. In other words, these investigators were interested in how the cultural and physical appearance of Indians had been influenced by the introduction of black and white blood. In this regard their work is part of a longer tradition of scientific concern with the consequences of race mixture.

[34] The concern over mistaken racial ascription so concerned the Virginia Pamunkey Indians that members carried official certificates of their tribal status to avoid Jim Crow restrictions. For more on this matter see Chapter 3.

[35] Mooney, "The Powhatan Confederacy, Past and Present," 140.

[36] Daniel Scott Murphree, *Native America: A State-by-State Historical Encyclopedia*, (ABC-CLIO, 2012), 498. The Piscataway historically occupied parts of southern Maryland along the Potomac River. Their tribal holdings stretched from southern Maryland to the northern border of Pennsylvania.

Race Mixture and the Mulatto Threat

Scientific concern with the consequences of race mixing originated in nineteenth century debates over the origin of the separate races. Monogenicists claimed human origin derived from a single source with racial groups undergoing differential development. Polygenecists on the other hand argued that human races were as separate as biological species. Many notable American anthropologists subscribed to the theory of polygeny and their work represents the beginning of an American intellectual tradition independent of European influence. In fact, polygeny was so associated with American anthropology that it was often called the "American school." Although it proved difficult for scientists to agree on the origin of the races they did agree that the offspring of interracial unions held the key.

Early interest in race mixing then was an opportunity to understand the qualities of the single races—red, black, and white—as well as their relations to one another. Commentary on race mixture generally addressed three types of mixture—between individuals of the same race, between different but nearly related races, (i.e. Nordic and Mediterranean races), or between distantly related races (i.e. Negro and white).[37] For most race purists it was the last type of mixture that drew the most criticism. Regarding the biological consequences of black-white mixture, many scientists saw the "mulatto" as the human equivalent of crossing a donkey and horse.[38] Nevertheless, "mulattoes" were considered biologically and intellectually superior to the "pure-blood Negro," but less so than the "pure-blood Caucasian."[39] Additionally, "mulattoes" were not only infertile but physically weaker in terms of both stature and disease resistance.[40]

[37] R. Ruggles Gates, *Heredity in Man* (New York: Constable & Co., 1929), 329.

[38] John G. Mencke, *Mulattoes and Race Mixture: American Attitudes and Images, 1865-1918*, 9

[39] Wilson D. Wallis, "Variability in Race Hybrids," *American Anthropologist* 40 (Oct-Dec. 1938): 682.

By the twentieth-century major technological and demographic shifts that began during the late nineteenth century reignited scientific interest in race mixture. Amongst these shifts was the arrival of fifteen million southern and eastern Europeans, most of whom spoke languages never before heard by American ears. Additionally, another one and half million African Americans, former residents of the Confederate South, moved to the North in search of jobs in the new factories.[41] As the diversity of the American population increased so too did anxieties over the biological and social future of the nation. Many social commentators worried that the body politic had been polluted with inferior stock. Both the courts and state legislatures swiftly acted to protect white purity by passing anti-miscegenation statutes that prohibited sex and marriage across the color line while also helping to define racial identity through the language of blood quantum. As the century progressed, state legislatures increasingly expanded the definition of what it meant to be non-white. Between 1900 and 1935 at least a dozen states passed anti-miscegenation statutes that added new races to those already prohibited from intermarriage with whites.[42] Georgia's 1927 anti-miscegenation, one of the most expansive pieces of legislation passed, included Negroes, American Indians, West Indians, Asiatic Indians, Malays, Japanese, and Chinese as races prohibited from interracial marriage with whites.[43]

Although interracial couples suffered harsh legal and sometimes social consequences, the products of mixed-race unions also bore a great deal of racial antagonism. Individuals with

---

[40] Aikman believed that the process of racial mixing produced biologically inferior stock but he was also convinced that those participating in interracial unions were generally unhealthy.

[41] Glenda Elizabeth Gilmore, *Who Were the Progressives?* (New York: Bedford St Martins, 2002), 4.

[42] Montana (1909), Nebraska (1913), Oklahoma (1917), Arkansas (1911), Tennessee (1917), Virginia (1924), Alabama (1927) See Pascoe, *What Comes Naturally*, 118.

[43] "An Act to Define Who Are Persons of Color and Who Are White Persons, to Prohibit and Prevent Intermarriage of Such Persons, and to Provide a System of Registration and Marriage Licensing as a Means for Accomplishing the Principal Purpose," no. 317 sec. 14, 1927 Ga. Laws 272.

mixed ancestry presented a host of problems for twentieth century scientists and social reformers. From the biological standpoint, the failure of mixed-race unions to produce an easy classifiable type worried those who relied on physical characteristics to make group distinctions. The assumption that mixed-race people could and did slip out of racial categories at will antagonized those committed to the maintenance of strict racial separation. And finally, mixed-race people were believed to be mentally unstable. Sociologist Edward Byron Reuter's theory regarding the "psychic condition of the mulatto" is an illustrative example of how multi-racial individuals were imagined. According to Reuter, the "mulattoes" who failed to fulfill their "personal wish complex," that is to become white, were doomed to become "discontented, unhappy, unadjusted persons... mulattoes in the psychological and sociological senses."[44]

The ability to "pass" drew attention to the most worrisome aspect of America's racial system—that the racial divisions so feverishly guarded were in fact fictitious. According to sociologist Dvora Yanow, "'Passing'" both relies on the facticity of the race-ethnic category structure and highlights the un-'reality' of it at the same time."[45] In this vein, mixed-race people challenged the sociobiological arguments buttressing white racial privilege while making a mockery of those arguments in the process. If those with black ancestry could project the attributes believed to be in the biological purview of whites, then they not only posed a threat to white racial privilege but to the intellectual framework ordering all of society.

Aside from the racial trickery perpetrated by "mulattoes," members of both the black and white elite looked down upon mixing, believing that it involved the lower portions of both

[44] Edward B. Reuter, "The American Mulatto," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 140 (November, 1928): 42.

[45] Dvora Yanow, *Constructing "Race and "Ethnicity" in America: Category-Makin in Public Policy and Administration* (New York: M.E. Sharpe, 2002), 102.

groups. Numerous sociological investigations by African American scholars mirrored the conclusions of their white counterparts in attributing to "mulattoes" such moral transgressions as promiscuity, licentiousness, and vagrancy. In his Chicago-based family study sociologist E. Franklin Frazier reported that prostitution seemed to be concentrated in those neighborhoods with large concentrations of "mulattoes."[46] Many of the inquiries into the moral standing of mulattoes had a gendered component in terms of placing a great deal of culpability at the feet of mulatto women. Popular writer and physician John Van Evrie blamed mullato women for much of the interracial mixing taking place—likening sexual transgressions with mixed-race women to the act of soliciting a prostitute.[47]

Additionally, many black and white commentators maintained that the mulatto posed a serious threat to black racial advancement. Writer Charles Carroll, author of *The Negro a Beast*, warned that it was just a matter of time before the Negro will be "absorbed and destroyed, and their descendants will all be mixed-bloods."[48] Although chiefly concerned with the protection of white racial purity, A.H. Shannon argued that "full-blooded Negroes" could benefit from the same type of racial pride that he associated with whites. Shannon argued that since mulattoes could "pass" as white they were committing an injustice against "full-blooded Negroes" who were deprived of equal educational and social opportunities because they were more visibly

[46] E. Franklin Frazier, *The Negro Family in Chicago* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1932), 103. Other sociological studies include: Carter G. Woodson "The Beginnings of Miscegenation between Whites and Blacks," *Journal of Negro History* 3 (Oct. 1918): 339 and Charles S. Johnson, *Growing Up in the Black Belt: Negro Youth in the Rural South* (Washington D.C.: American Council on Education, 1941), 262.

[47] John H. Van Evrie, *White Supremacy and Negro Subordination* (Van Evrie: New York Horton & Co., 1868), 152.

[48] Charles Carroll, *The Negro A Beast, Or In The Image of God* (St. Louis: American Book and Bible House, 1900), 83.

black.[49] These works represent the great lengths to which racial purists were willing to go in order to maintain white privilege. Additionally, they showcase the boundary making that set of the "mulatto" off from the presumably pureblooded masses.

Biological Considerations of Race Mixture

The early decades of the twentieth century saw an abundance of literature discouraging and even sometimes touting the benefits of racial mixture. But with scientists admitting they still knew little about the mechanisms of heredity, the dominant opinion concerning race mixture was negative. Physician K.B Aikman argued that racial mixing was dangerous because inherited characteristics could become jumbled and contribute to the "chaotic constitution" of the offspring. Aikman pointed to skeletal "maladaptations" such as skulls too large to permit birth, or teeth too large for their jaws in order to substantiate his claim that miscegenation was a biologically dangerous endeavor.[50] Conversely, a small cohort of investigators subscribed to the theory of "hybrid vigor" and opined that racial hybrids were biologically stronger because they were the combination of the best of both parent stocks.[51] For instance, biologist Edwin Conklin, writing in 1915 argued that while some hybrids were inferior others could be vastly superior to both parent stocks.[52] The perceived moral character of a racial group also impacted whether commentators advised intermarriage. In her 1927 article on race mixing, Marjorie MacDill, a journalist who typically wrote on issues related to zoology and ecology, posited that the "thrift"

[49] Alexander Harvey Shannon, *The Racial Integrity of the American Negro* (Washington: Public Affairs Press, 1953), 23.

[50]K.B. Aikman, "Race Mixture," *The Eugenics Review* 25 (1933): 163.

[51] For an explanation of hybrid vigor and its consequences see, H. J. Mueller, "On the Variability of Mixed Races," *The American Naturalist* 70 (Sept.-Oct., 1936): 409-442.

[52] Edwin Conklin, *Heredity and Environment in the Development of Men* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1915), 15.

and "mental superiority" typical of the Chinese-Hawaiian qualified this group as a successful hybrid. In contrast, the Filipino-Hawaiian, a mixture of "Japanese, Chinese, Caucasian, and Negro blood" was "overly emotional and weakly inhibited," most likely due to the conflict of the various racial strains present.[53] The bulk of scientific opinion however stressed the biological dangers of race mixing over biological advantages.[54]

While the weight of the scientific community advocated against racial mixture, very few of the studies actually involved human populations. Investigators typically bred separate plant or animal species and then extrapolated those conclusions onto human populations. The use of plant and animal analogies also lent to the popular appeal of these studies as it offered the public readily accessible proxies for understanding racial mixing. Between 1910 and 1930, investigators increasingly turned their gaze to human populations in order to gather more accurate data regarding race mixture. Although social scientists performed much of the previous research on human populations, biological research proliferated during the twentieth century. Researchers went to such distant locales as the Yucatan, South Africa, India, and Hawaii to conduct their fieldwork. Not only did these locales have racially diverse populations but they also afforded researchers examples of other models of race relations that could illuminate the racial patterns they observed in the U.S.

One of the most widely referenced studies used to support arguments against mixture was J. Alfred Mjøen's 1926 investigation of crosses between Norwegian and Lapp rabbits. Mjøen cited such abnormalities as decreased sexual drive, higher incidences of mortality, and

[53] Marjorie MacDill, "Will the Blending of Races Produce Super-Men?" *Science News-Letter* 12 (Nov. 1927): 338.

[54] For examples of scholarship stressing the physical and psychological disadvantages of race crossing see: L.C. Dunn, "Some Results of Race Mixture in Hawaii," *Eugenics in Race and State* 2 (1921): 109; A. Dickinson, "Race Mixture: A Social or Biological Problem," *The Eugenics Review* 41(1949): 81-85; and John Alfred Mjoen, "Biological Consequences of Race Crossing," *The Journal of Heredity* (1926): 175-182.

diminished fertility as proof that those crosses were biologically disadvantageous. His study popularized the idea of "disharmonious crosses"— the name for "race-hybrids" exhibiting physical malformations.[55] Mjøen warned that possible disharmonies could be minor in the form of physiological maladjustments such as disproportional ear size or they could be more serious, such as the case of hybrids experiencing an increased susceptibility to disease.[56] Extrapolated to humans, Mjøen warned that a racial hybrid failed in "accommodating himself to human fellowship and of adapting to each of his various conflicting impulses and instincts, so that fatal obliquities will arise in his morals or mind."[57] Thus, Mjøen concluded that the threat of intermixture was not just biological but carried dangerous consequences for the psychic condition and general adaptability of the hybrid.[58]

In the same year of Mjøen's study on the Lapps, noted biologist and eugenicist Charles Davenport and his graduate student Morris Steggerda set out for Jamaica to conduct one of the first investigations on the consequences of Negro-white intermixture in a human population. Davenport, the director of the Eugenics Record Office at Cold Spring Harbor, noted physical disharmonies like individuals with a small jaw (white trait) coupled with large teeth (a negro trait) as well as individuals with a combination of long legs (negro trait) and short arms (white trait).[59] Davenport also observed the injurious consequences of racial mixture back home in the United States. For instance, he linked the large increase in orthodontia to overly crowded jaws caused by incessant intermixture. He also noted the presence of "temperamental abnormalities"

[55] Mjoen's study is noteworthy because it was often cited source for those opposed to all forms of racial mixing.

[56] Jon Alfred Mjoen, "Biological Consequences of Race Crossing," *Journal of Heredity* 17 (1926): 175-185.

[57] Ibid, 176.

[58] Ibid., 180

[59] Charles Davenport, *Race Crossing in Jamaica* (Washington D.C.: Carnegie Institute, 1929), 20.

in the "North American Mulatto" due to the combination of the white man's intelligence and ambition with the insufficient intelligence of the Negro.[60] Although Davenport agreed with MacDill, who declared the Hawaii-Chinese cross superior, he opined that "Negro-White" and "Filipino-European" crosses seemed, on the whole, socially inferior to their parent races.[61] As such, Davenport joined with MacDill in assessing race mixture according to the perceived social and biological benefits of the particular pairings.

The Negro as Triracial

As stated above, concerns about race mixing had a great deal to do with the demographic shifts occurring in the United States at the turn of the twentieth century. Many looked to the census reports to provide insight into just how the country was changing racially. One of the shifts that most concerned those committed to white supremacy was the increase in the "mulatto" population.[62] Believing that the census figures significantly underrepresented the size of the "mulatto" population, author and clergyman Alexander Harvey Shannon speculated that the mulatto represented well over 30 percent of the entire population.[63] Shannon most likely did not differentiate blood-fractions and thus probably counted as mulatto those with any perceptible trace of black ancestry. To prove his hypothesis Shannon conducted independent studies in Washington D.C., Philadelphia, Boston, and New York City, and discovered that the mulatto

[60] "Science News," *Science* 66 (Sept. 23, 1927): x.

[61] Ibid.

[62] Census enumeration of the mulatto began in 1870. Mulattoes were not enumerated in the 1880 or the 1900 census while the 1890 census enumerated *mulattoes*, *quadroons*, and *octaroons*. The 1920 census was the last time they were enumerated. In both the 1910 and 1920 census the mulatto category was for persons with any amount of black or white admixture.

[63] Shannon's the Racial Integrity of the American Negro went through several editions. Although he first began writing the tome in 1907 he published editions in 1925, 1926 and as late as 1951. Although he updated his information his central argument remained that the mulatto threat was the greatest evil facing America. G.B.J. "Review: The Racial Integrity of the American Negro," *Social Forces* 30, no. 4 (May 1952): 481.

population in each of these cities was no less than fifty percent. That figure stood in sharp contrast to the figures list in the 1910 census which recorded the mulatto populations at 24.9, 16.6 34.3, and 24 percent for each city respectively. Both the 1910 and 1920 census showed sharp increases in the mulatto population alongside a decrease in the "negro" population.[64]

Two major theories emerged out of the commentary on the 1910 and 1920 census data: the "Negro" was undergoing a bleaching to brown; and lighter Negroes were attempting to use the "Indian" category as a path to whiteness. These latter discussions were sparked by the concern over the amount of "passing,"—the act of "near white people" assuming the identity of the dominant group to avoid the stigma of believed racial inferiority. Many of the contemporary discussions of passing referred to it as the most dangerous form of racial mixing. While acknowledged racial mixture was deplorable, the idea that respectable whites were being tricked into marriage by "white-negroes" was so anxiety inducing for proponents of racial purity that they named it the "mulatto threat." [65]

Aside from the "mulatto" threat, the notion that African Americans were in the process of "whitening" gained increased traction during the 1920s. Anthropologist Melville Herskovits sought to build upon this theory his 1928 study, *The American Negro: A Study in Race Crossing*. According to Herskovits, the black Americans were "a new racial type in the process of becoming" an amalgam of white, Indian and Negro ancestry.[66] In evoking the concept to describe the almost 80 percent of black Americans he believed to be of mixed ancestry,

[64] A.H. Shannon, *The Racial Integrity of the American Negro* (Nashville: Lamar & Barton, 1925), 18-20.

[65] Melville J. Herskovits, *The American Negro: A Study in Racial Crossing* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1928), xiii.

[66] Ibid.

Herskovits set out to sharpen existing racial classifications. As such, he coined that the term "American Negro" to signify the biological change he believed took place.[67] Although Herskovits' described his investigation as a study of the Negro's physical form, in keeping with the racial thinking of his time, he also hoped to draw links between his biological character, mental development, and cultural development. As such, it was no surprise to him that the Negro's new physical form would emerge alongside the cultural "New Negro" of the Harlem Renaissance. Herskovits believed it fitting that black Americans were laying claim to a uniquely American identity at precisely the same time that anthropologists were discovering his new physical form.

In pursuing this line of inquiry Herskovits hoped his study might reveal the extent to which black Americans "mingled their blood with that of other peoples in this country?"[68] Herskovits suspected a higher incidence of racial mixture among black Americans than was generally recognized. For instance, the 1920 census indicated that 84.1 percent of the Negro population was of "pure" blood while 15.9 percent were classified as mulatto. His findings, based on anthropometric measurements and genealogical surveys of over 1500 respondents from Washington D.C, Harlem, and rural West Virginia, concluded that as much as 80 percent of the Negro population was of mixed ancestry while only 20 percent could be said to be unmixed. In a further move away from the pure/mixed dichotomy Herskovits sorted respondents into eight sub-categories to fully illustrate the range of racial mixing taking place in this population. These included: "Unmixed Negro;" "Negro mixed with Indian;" "More Negro than White;" "More Negro than White with Indian;" "About the same amount of Negro and White;" "About the same

[67] Ibid., 10, 16.

[68] Ibid., xiii.

amount of Negro and White with Indian mixture;" "More White Than Negro;" and "More White than Negro, with Indian." In drawing attention to the full degree of racial mixture occurring within black America, Herskovits helped to move the national discourse on race away from a strict focus on mulattoes and pure races.

The Social and Cultural Construction of the Mixed-Blood

Although both social scientists and biologists advanced questions relating to the biological consequences of racial mixture, not every scientist agreed that it was a particularly fruitful avenue of research. American geneticist William Earnest Castle provided a major retort to Mjøen's study by critiquing the whole foundation of the biological position stating:

> Human race problems are not biological problems any more than rabbit crosses are social problems. The sociologist who is satisfied with human society as constituted may reasonably decry race-crossing. But let him do so on social grounds only. He will wait in vain, if he waits to see mixed races vanish from any biological unfitness.[69]

Castle, who believed that there were inherent and immutable racial characteristics, was far from advocating for miscegenation. By his own admission, Castle was greatly opposed to racial mixing since it tended to involve anti-social and marginal peoples who were bound to reproduce similar qualities in their offspring.[70] In the end, "it is not necessary to invoke biological disharmonies in order to explain the poor results of many race mixtures. Social agencies afford a sufficient explanation."[71] Castle argued that it would be illogical to claim mixed-race persons of degraded status merely because they were mixed. Instead he pointed observers to the social conditions under which they were reared. Thus, Castle was not so much an advocate of racial

[69] Stuart A. Rice, "Biological Limits in the Development of Society," *Journal of Heredity* 15 (April, 1924): 183-186.

[70] Ibid.

[71] Ibid., 153-154.

mixture as he was a defender of genetics. As such, by vehemently opposing the conclusion that race mixing presented a biological danger Castle sought to protect the discipline from untrained inferences he believed damaging to the development of accurate scientific knowledge. Additionally, he criticized other commentators, mostly those outside of genetics, for lacking a firm grasp of the hereditary mechanisms of inheritance. In his critique of race propagandists using the authority of science to legitimate their claims Castle encouraged readers to inquire into the credentials of any "science," which so confidently proclaims one race superior and another inferior, and all mixtures worse than either."[72]

Castle was a prominent voice in the push to disaggregate biology from culture. This realignment in thinking was largely the byproduct of major shifts in the fields of genetics, anthropology, and sociology. Between 1908 and 1913 geneticists in both Europe and the United States determined that human development was the result of the interaction of heredity *and* environment rather than heredity alone. Accompanying this new theory was a reconfiguration of the mechanisms of inheritance. The old theory of unit inheritance was now replaced with a "multiple gene theory" that explained genetic inheritance as the result of multiple gene interactions. Thus by the late 1930s scientists were more forthright in acknowledging that race crossing was "not of the order of crosses between rigidly fixed and fundamentally different forms, but [was] merely the result of intermingling of varieties with a single species—varieties that have arisen as a result of the social conditions under which all human beings live and have lived."[73]

---

[72] W.E. Castle, "Biological and Social Consequences of Race Crossing" *American Journal of Physical Anthropology* 9 (Apr.-Jun. 1926): 147. H.S. Jennings also dismisses the argument that racial crossing would yield disharmonic crosses. See H.S. Jennings, *The Biological Basis of Human Nature* (New York, W.W. Norton & Company, 1930), 278.

[73] Melville Herskovits, *The American Negro*, 363.

Anthropologists and sociologists were also rethinking the links between culture, social position, and race. The two leading voices of this movement were anthropologists Franz Boas and Robert Lowie. In 1917, U.C. Berkeley professor Robert Lowie delivered a series of lectures at the Museum of Natural History in New York City that helped to decouple culture and biology. Lowie argued that culture was not biologically determined; nor was it determined by the physical environment or psychological factors.[74] Similarly, Frank Boas advocated that "cultures" are plural and relativistic and belong to all societies. His theory stood in opposition to the older notion of culture as absolute and singular.[75] The work of these scholars and the students they trained lent scholarly authority to new theories that reimagined social problems as the byproducts of poor social policies and institutions rather than poor biology.[76] The decoupling of culture and biology did not happen overnight of course and those hoping to link biology and culture continued to publish studies advancing their theories.

The new discipline of sociology matured when the link between biology and social condition was at its strongest. Whereas biological investigations relied on measurement and comparative analyses the new sociological investigations were characterized by observation, widespread data collection, and the use of statistical methods. As a result, sociologists departed from assumptions long held by their colleagues in the natural sciences while reinforcing others. For instance, like their natural science counterparts, social scientists argued that low social advancement represented a more primitive cultural and biological position.[77] Although racial

[74] Robert H. Lowie, *Culture and Ethnology* (New York: Horace Liveright, 1917), 8.

[75] George Stocking, *Race, Culture, and Evolution* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968), 231.

[76] James B. McKee, *Sociology and the Race Problem: The Failure of Perspective* (Urbana Champagne: University of Illinois Press, 1993) 66-67.

[77] McKee, *Sociology and the Race Problem, 59.*

studies were increasingly considered the purview of the social sciences researchers often reverted to biological explanations in order to explain social conditions.[78]

Sociologists concerned with developing theories on American race relations believed the ambiguous biology of the "mixed blood" mirrored his social position. Robert Park of the University of Chicago devoted a great deal of attention to the study of the social status of the mulatto during the 1930s. Park gained much of his training in race relations while at the Tuskegee Institute under the tutelage of Booker T. Washington. After his tenure at Tuskegee Park went on to the University of Chicago where he helped formulate "the race relations cycle," one of the most important race theories of the twentieth century. Park posited that race relations could be broken down into four stages: competition, conflict, accommodation, and assimilation with the latter representing the ultimate goal of successful race relations. In this model, the mulatto represented the physical manifestation of the race-relations cycle.[79]

The value of the "mulatto" was not only rooted in his social position but also in his mental state. Park along with colleagues like Everett Stonequist advanced the theory of the "marginal man" to explain the unique and conflicted nature of racially mixed people. Stonequist likened the internal conflict of the "mixed-blood" to DuBois' concept of "double consciousness" whereby a mixed-race person was doomed to "living and sharing intimately in the cultural life and traditions of two distinct peoples, never quite willing to break, even if he were permitted to do so, with his past and his traditions, and not quite accepted, because of racial prejudice, in the new society in which he now seeks to find a place."[80]As such the marginal man was "keenly

[78] Ibid., 61; McKee has termed this marriage of social and biological thinking "sociobiology."

[79] Robert E. Park, "Mentality of Racial Hybrids," *American Journal of Sociology* 36 (Jan. 1931): 534.

[80] Robert E. Park, "Human Migration and the Marginal Man," *American Journal of Sociology* (1928): 892.

conscious of his position. He feels, as he frequently says, the conflict of warring ancestry in his veins. The conflict of color is embodied, so to speak, in his person, [and] his mind."[81]

In addition to mapping out U.S. race relations the sociologists of the Chicago school had a secondary goal in terms of helping to salvage the perception of multiracial people. Considered racial liberals by their contemporaries, sociologists of the Chicago school departed from their colleagues in the natural sciences by refusing to take at face value the innate inferiority of the Negro. Their studies often advocated for better access to health care, education, and legal protection as the best remedies to the Negro problem. By appropriating DuBois' concept of the "talented tenth," investigators heralded mulattoes as the leaders of the Negro race who would lift up the masses through their service as educators as well as models of black middle-class respectability.[82]

One of most prominent scholars of the Chicago School to theorize on the mulatto was Edwin Byron Reuter, author of *The Mulatto in the United States*, hailed by one historian as the

[81] Ibid., 884. For More on Park and the work of the Chicago School see, Barbara Ballis Lai, "Black and Blue in Chicago: Robert E. Park's Perspective on Race Relations in Urban America, 1914-1944," *British Journal of Sociology* 38 (1987): 546-66; Vine Marotta, "Civilisation, Culture and the Hybrid Self in the Work of Robert Ezra Park," *Journal of Intercultural Studies* 27 (2006): 413-433; Fred H. Matthews, *Quest for an American Sociology: Robert E. Park and the Chicago School* (McGill: Queen's University Press, 1977); Fred H. Matthews, "Social Scientists and the Culture Concept, 1930–1950: The Conflict Between the Processual and Structural Approaches," *Sociological Theory* 7 (1989): 87–101; Winifred Raushenbush, *Robert E. Park: Biography of a Sociologist* (Duke University Press, 1979).

[82] Of the talented tenth DuBois states, "The Negro race, like all races, is going to be saved by its exceptional men. The problem of education, then, among Negroes must first of all deal with the Talented Tenth; it is the problem of developing the Best of this race that they may guide the Mass away from the contamination and death of the Worst, in their own and other races." W.E.B. DuBois, "The Talented Tenth" in *The Negro Problem: A Series of Articles by Representative American Negroes of Today,* ed. Booker T. Washington (New York: J. Pott & Company, 1903), 13-14.

Although DuBois did not coin the phrase "talented tenth," the term gained wide purchase after the publication of *The Negro Problem* and was often attributed as his invention. For a discussion of the term's origin see, Evelyn Brooks Higginbotham, *Righteous Discontent: The Women's Movement in the Black Baptist Church, 1880-1920* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1994).

"capstone of Pre-WWI efforts to understand the mixed blood in America."[83] It is worth mentioning that Reuter differentiated between the terms "mulatto" and "mixed-blood" although he used the two interchangeably throughout his work. Reuter defined the "mulatto" as the cross between a pure black and a pure white. It was the mixture between the pure types that gave the mulatto a more or less stable physical appearance. The "mixed-blood" represented a "distinctly unstable physical type" because their traits often "segregated and recombined in new and sometimes startling combinations. Individuals appear with dark skin and blue eyes, light skin and everted lips, blue eyes and tufted hair, and with various other disharmonious combinations of racial characteristics."[84] Although Reuter saw differences in the physical type of the "mulatto" and "mixed-blood," he often used the term "mulatto," to describe individuals with any perceptible trace of black blood.

Trained under Robert Park at the University of Chicago, Reuter believed that the mulatto represented every state in the social evolution and the intellectual and moral development of a people.[85] In his study Reuter compared the social achievement of the "mulatto" to those of the "pure races" to determine if race mixing was advantageous. The second major objective of his study was to investigate the consequences of race mixture on the psychic and moral development of the mulatto. Although he believed that mulattoes were among the most "wholesome personalities and the most valuable men that the [Negro] race has so far produced," he nonetheless deemed them a psychically disturbed people because "within the mulatto is the same conflict that exists externally between the two culture groups: he is a white man and a Negro."

---

[83] Edward Reuter, *The Mulatto in the United States: Including A Study of the Role of Mixed-Blood Races Throughout the World* (Boston: The Gorham Press, 1918), 78.

[84] Ibid. 37

[85] Ibid., 5.

The mulatto in the psychological and sociological sense was a "man of divided loyalties"[86] Despite the psychological trauma that came with being mixed race Reuter believed the "mulatto" was the archetype for Negro achievement. In this way he reached similar claims advanced by Park and the other sociologists who emerged out of the Chicago school.

Reuter devoted an entire chapter to the investigation of "Indian-White," "Indian-Negro," and "Indian-Negro-White" mixtures in the United States. His conclusions echoed many of those mentioned above. For instance, Reuter concluded that "Indian-white half-breeds" were more vigorous than pureblood Indians, meaning that they tended to be more fertile. Additionally, he found that in areas where there tended to be more Indian-white mixture those persons were more "white than red." In his discussion of Indian mixture in the eastern U.S., Reuter described those communities as the "mixture of wasted Indian tribes, forest voyeurs, and runaway slaves and other Negroes." Although he echoed many of the conclusions of his colleagues he was the first to talk about these communities as part of a collective phenomenon. In addition to estimating their total number—1,793, he also listed communities like the "Redbones" of South Carolina, the "Melungeons" of West Virginia and East Tennessee and the "Croatan Indians" of North Carolina, none of which had been previously mentioned in studies of eastern remnants. It was perhaps his tendency to dismiss these communities as "mulatto rather than Indian mixtures" that allowed him to make connections where previously none were believed to exist.[87]

Perhaps Reuter's most important contribution to the creation of racial knowledge was his understanding that the "mixed-blood" was actually becoming an abstraction. So long as "the color, or other racial marks, of one race may come to be a symbol of its inferior culture and so

[86] Ibid., 41.

[87] Ibid, 79 and 84-85.

come to stand in the thinking of the culturally superior group, for poverty, disease, dirt, ignorance, and all the undesirable concomitants of a backward race." The sociological value of the "mixed-blood" was that he could never be merely an individual; "he is inevitably the representation of a type. He is not merely a biologically product; he is a sociological phenomenon."[88]

Conclusion

The early twentieth century work of natural and social scientific investigations helped to transform the "mixed blood" from a physical type to an *idea*. As an idea, the "mixed-blood" had very little to do with physical appearance and everything to do with one's social condition. As such, the investigations of race-mixing and of mixed-race people became the sites through which white elites directed their anxieties about the changing shape of America, most notably the racial realignments taking place. Sensing the threat to white supremacy white elites appealed to the authority of science to in order to establish the essential "truths" about racial mixes.

Scientific experts of various stripes weighed in through their studies of mixed-race identity. Although their methods and disciplinary orientations differed, they all remained committed to the idea that the mixed-blood presented a problem, Drawing from the stigma attached to interracial sex, critics made the products of such liaisons biological problems. When scientific discovery unseated the theories linking biology to social condition the marginality of mixed race persons allowed it to remain a stigmatized social condition linked to feeblemindedness, inappropriate sexual behavior, but also to such social ills as poverty licentiousness, and pauperism. As a result of this trajectory, the biological and social

[88] Ibid., 18-19

construction of the mulatto and the Indian had a significant impact on the types of identity claims leveled against and claimed for eastern communities of triracial ancestry.

Chapter 2

'MESTIZOS OF THE MOUNTAINS': SOCIAL SCIENCE AND THE RETHINKING OF APALACHIAN WHITENESS, 1870-1940

"Let us now come to the Highlands—a land of promise, a land of romance, and a land about which, perhaps, more things are known that are not true than any other part of the country."

John C. Campbell (1921)[1]

On April 22, 1921, Mrs. William A. Servin and her daughter-in-law, both members of the Nyack Women's Club, went for a hike along Pearl River; a hamlet located roughly twenty miles from Manhattan and just north of the New Jersey border. After traveling along a grown-over path the two women happened upon four children they later described as, "so wretchedly clad and so encrusted with dirt as to seem scarcely human."[2] Disturbed by the children's unkempt appearance and fearful for their overall well-being, Mrs. Servin contacted the county truant officer and local law enforcement to investigate.

Investigators returning to the scene discovered an entire family—father, mother, and four children—occupying an abandoned shack that might have housed "primitive people."[3] Attempts to determine the origins of this "wild family," as the press dubbed them, were hampered by the family's inability to speak Standard English. Instead, according to multiple reports, the family communicated in "wild grunting noises."[4] The father, the only one capable of effectively communicating with authorities, revealed that the family's surname was "Thompson," although

[1] John C. Campbell, *The Southern Highlander and His Homeland* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1921), 121.

[2] "Hill Dwellers Live Like Nomads," *Duluth News Tribune,* May 29, 1921, 4.

[3] Ibid.

[4] "Town Puzzled by Wild Family," *New York Times*, May 2, 1921, 16.

he was unable to provide a first name for himself, his wife or any one of his children.[5]

Most reports covering the family's "discovery" concerned themselves with detailing their poor social conditions, a clear manifestation of their degraded mental condition. Reports indicated that the Thompson children had never been enrolled in school and some even claimed that they had never even seen pen and paper.[6] Authorities diagnosed the family as "feeble-minded, " a conclusion supported by the "dull, listless, and indifferent to life," demeanor of the mother. The degraded status of the Thompson's mental condition seemed only to be rivaled by their poor physical health. The children presented a series of skin conditions doctors attributed to unsanitary living conditions coupled with extreme vitamin deficiency.[7]

The Thompsons had traveled inland from the Ramapo Mountains—part of the northern region of the Appalachian Mountain Range—and home to a multiracial group known as the "Jackson Whites."[8] Believed to be a distinct race, the "Jackson Whites" were "not black, nor white, nor yet red, but an admixture of all three."[9] Although the Ramapo people stood out because of their triracial heritage, outsiders found them particularly noteworthy because despite their close proximity to one of the largest urban metropolises, the Ramapo resembled in both their appearance and way of life a people located centuries away from civilization.[10]

For whites residing near the Ramapo Mountains, the Jackson Whites exemplified the

[5] "Family Living Like Barbarians," *Tulsa World*, May, 22, 1921, 4.

[6] "Finds Wild Family From the Ramapos," *New York Times*, May 1, 1921, 7.

[7] Hill Dwellers Live Like Nomads," 4.

[8] "Finds Wild Family From the Ramapos," 7.

[9] "Hill Dwellers Live Like Nomads,"4

[10] Ibid.

consequences of insufficient civilizing forces. Although there were the occasional reports of moonshining or a drunken feud "their most serious offenses [were] against the laws of hygiene."[11] Although the Thompson's way of life closely resembled the Jackson Whites' county officials surmised that they were different. Instead, Pearl River authorities "claimed for the Thompsons the identity of a "pure-white people, in this respect different from the clan inhabiting the Ramapos."[12] Despite the attempt of Nayak officials to distance the Thompsons from the racially mixed people of the Ramapos, news outlets would continue to make that connection by labeling them the "Ramapo family."[13]

Historian Henry Shapiro has argued that depictions of Appalachian mountaineers reveal more about those participating in the creation of those depictions than it does about those being characterized.[14] In no way is this truer than in discussions of Appalachian whiteness. Throughout the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, novelists, social scientists, and social reformers of various stripes used the racial identity of the mountaineer to advance a host of social and political agendas. Nevertheless, present-day scholars have been hesitant to interrogate race in the Appalachian context. Those studies that have focused on race they have often served to reify the image of Appalachia as a predominantly white region inhabited by those of pure Scotch-Irish heritage. Their treatments not only exclude people of color, they privilege "whiteness" as a stable and monolithic identity. [15] The most popular examinations of Appalachian whiteness deal with

[11] Elizabeth M. Heath, "Children Yet Adults," *New York Times* Oct. 9, 1921, 93.

[12] "Hill Dwellers Live Like Nomads," *Duluth News Tribune,* May 29, 1921, 4.

[13] Heath, "Children Yet Adults," 93.

[14] Henry Shapiro, *Appalachia On Our Mind: The Southern Mountains and Mountaineers in the American Consciousness, 1870-1920* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1978), 30.

[15] Barbara Ellen Smith, "De-gradations of Whiteness: Appalachia and the Complexities of Race," *Journal of Appalachian Studies* 10 (2004): 40.

the stereotypes of "poor white trash" or "the hillbilly."[16] Although they position the inhabitants of Appalachia as a people apart, that is separate and different from mainstream urban industrializing America, those arguments often hedge on class instead of racial differences. When people of color are included, they are only useful in as much as they provide a point of juxtaposition that allowed whites to define themselves against what they are not.[17] Yet, as the discussion below reveals, whites have also been identified through their spatial, psychological, and "biological" proximity to non-whites and vice versa. The inclusion of Appalachians of color, particularly those triracial communities of white, Indian, and black extraction provide a promising opportunity to rethink the boundaries of whiteness in twentieth century America. Not only were triracial communities conceived as problematic populations vis-a-vis their biological racial mixture but the themes of poor biological, geographic isolation and general backwardness placed both populations as outside the bounds of normative whiteness.

The characterization of Appalachia as an Anglo-Saxon stronghold did more than just garner support to combat the region's socio-economic issues; it helped to reconcile Appalachia to the rest of America. By the turn of the twentieth century the rate of industrialization and modernization made the persistence of mountain ways of life conspicuous and further contributed to the depictions of mountain residents as strange and peculiar. The preoccupation of social scientists with diagnosing and explaining the pathologies of the region helped to underscore the distinctiveness of Appalachia as a region set-off from the rest of the United

[16] For examples of this approach see: Matt Wray and Annalee Newitz eds. *White Trash: Race and Class in America* (Routledge: New York, 1997); Anthony Harkins, *Hillbilly: A Cultural History of an American Icon* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005); James Branscome, "Annihilating the Hillbilly: The Appalachians with American Institutions," *Katallgate* 3 (1971): 20-39.

[17] Larry J. Griffin, "Whiteness and Southern Identity in the Mountain and Lowland South," *Journal of Appalachian Studies* 10 (2004): 13.

States. Geographer Ellen Churchill Semple blamed the rugged topography of the Cumberland region for preserving the anachronistic character of the mountaineer. Semple is representative of scholars attempting to grapple with how mountaineer culture had managed to survive amidst the modernizing progress taking place elsewhere in the country.[18] While most northerners reconciled themselves to the belief that "the retarded Anglo-Saxon of the highland [was] no myth," they saw in the primitive ways of the mountaineer a distinctly American past.[19]

The three sections that follow attempt to destabilize the idea of Appalachian whiteness by examining three moments in the racial construction of white mountaineers. The first section covers the period between 1870 and 1900 and details the creation of the myth of Appalachian whiteness. In this period regional reconciliation and nativist anxieties gave the racial purity of the mountaineer new meaning. This section details how myths about Appalachia's racial past, particularly in regards to the absence of slavery, served to construct the region as racially pure and deserving of the uplift efforts of northern reformers. The second section examines the discourses that fashioned the mountaineer as possessing a tainted whiteness through an exploration of the popular discourses surrounding the "hillbilly" and the "triracial isolate." These discussions were rooted in early twentieth century concerns over national health, race purity, and the nature of social change and isolation, by illustrating how the discourses on white and tri-racially mixed Appalachians aligned between 1900 and 1920, I hope to show how both helped to fashion the racial identity of the other. The final section examines the eugenic family studies taking place during this same period. In locating the roots of rural white degeneracy in mixed-

[18] Ellen Churchill Semple, "The Anglo-Saxons of the Kentucky Mountains: A Study in Anthropogeography," *The Geographical Journal* 17 (June 1901): 590.

[19] George E. Vincent, "A Retarded Frontier," *American Journal of Sociology* 4 (1898): 6.

blood ancestors, these eugenic studies illustrate the truly porous and often arbitrary nature of U.S. racial boundaries.

Appalachia in the Making

The "discovery" of the Thompson family, like the "discovery" of Appalachia, was a profoundly racial process. Between 1870 and 1900, the period of Appalachia's "first" discovery, scores of popular writing, newspaper articles, social scientific studies, and philanthropic reports, mostly from the North, used the region as a means to articulate a growing preoccupation with the racial purity of the nation.[20] Their writings served to transform Appalachia's residents into "the purest Anglo-Saxon stock in all the United States."[21] That Appalachia was both perceived and marketed as predominantly white reveals how national identity has been linked to notions of racial purity.

William Goddell Frost, president of Kentucky's Berea College, was a key figure in the exultation of the mountaineer's racial purity. Frost's depiction of the mountaineer gained significant traction throughout the late nineteenth and well into the twentieth century as missionaries, government agencies, and private and public aid agencies developed programs to combat the social and economic problems of the Appalachian region. Wishing to elicit the help of Northern philanthropic agencies in Berea's uplift efforts, Frost posited the racial purity of the mountaineer as the central justification for this intervention. In his 1899 article for the *Atlantic Monthly,* Frost introduced the reading public to "Appalachian Americans," a group he described as "a simple primitive people, showing the strong traits of their race—independence, respect for

[20] Shapiro, *Appalachia On Our Minds*, 20; Nina Silber, "What Does America Need So Much As Americans? Race and Northern Reconciliation with Southern Appalachia, 1870-1900," in *Appalachians and Race: The Mountain South From Slavery to Segregation*, John Inscoe ed. (Lexington: The University of Kentucky Press, 2001), 250-255.

[21] Semple, "The Anglo-Saxons of the Kentucky Mountains," 592.

religion, family affection, and patriotism."[22] Despite the region's poverty, violence, and the clannish nature of their social organization, Frost argued that the pure Anglo-Saxon stock of the inhabitants ensured that they would benefit from rehabilitative efforts.

The purported racial purity of the mountaineer not only helped to endear his unusual folkways to northern whites; it served in the re-writing of the region's racial history. While the rest of America appeared to be under siege by unchecked immigration and black urban migration Appalachia, it seemed, had effectively kept these elements at bay. Charles Dudley Warmer argued that the absence of foreign and Negro elements made the mountaineer "more distinctly American in his characteristics."[23] Remarking upon the promise of the mountaineer, Frost opined that, "they will offset the undesirable elements and give the South what it lacks, a sturdy middle class."[24] Part of the mountaineer's racial purity stemmed from what writers viewed as Appalachia's virtual inexperience with the institution of slavery. Ellen Semple sums up the contemporary view on this matter thusly: "The mountains did not offer conditions for plantation cultivation, the only system of agriculture in which slaves could be profitably employed. The absences of these conditions and of the capital wherewith to purchase Negroes made the whole Appalachian region a non-slave-holding section"[25] The absence of slavery also allowed writers to play up the region's Union loyalty. Throughout Appalachia's period of discovery writers made continuous mention of the region as a decidedly pro-Union block. These factors would eventually set the mountaineer apart as he lacked the "deep-seated prejudice to the social

[22] William Goddell Frost, "Our Contemporary Ancestors," *Atlantic Monthly* (1899): 242; William Goddell Frost, *University Extension in the Southern Mountains* (New York, 1898): 5.

[23] Charles Dudley Warner, *Studies in the South and West with Comments on Canada* (New York: Harper, 1889), 20.

[24] Frost, "Our Contemporary Ancestors," 6.

[25] Semple, "The Anglo-Saxons of the Kentucky Mountains," 595.

equality of blacks and whites" that characterized the lowland South.[26] This depiction established what Allen Batteau has labeled the myth of "Holy Appalachia."[27] The characterization of Appalachia as both free of slavery and devoid of racial prejudice informed a century of writing that served to essentially erase persons of color from Appalachian history.

Despite Appalachia being cast as an exclusively Anglo-Saxon stronghold, the region was actually home to a small yet visible population of non-white mountaineers. Because of the unreliability of the census it is impossible to know the precise number of non-whites inhabiting the region. However, according to the 1860 census a little under 200,000 blacks resided in central Appalachia, the geographic area consisting of Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, North Carolina, South Carolina, and the Virginias.[28] Appalachia's black population steadily increased as the industrial revolution continued. Between 1885 and 1930, thousands more black Americans relocated to the region for jobs in the new coal mining and timber industries. Although blacks represented a large percentage of Appalachia's industrial workforce they remained a small percentage of the overall population.[29] The boom of the industrial revolution also brought hundreds of Eastern Europeans into the region.

---

[26] Ibid.

[27] Allen Batteau, *The Invention of Appalachia* (Tucson: The University of Arizona Press, 1990), 78.

[28] William H. Turner, "The Demography of Black Appalachia: Past and Present" in *Blacks in Appalachia*, William H. Turner and Edward J. Cabbell eds. (Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1985), 237.

[29] The disproportional impact of the Great Depression on Appalachia's economy prompted many blacks to leave the region in order to seek opportunities elsewhere. Nevertheless, between 1940-2000 blacks continued to comprise between 8-10% of Appalachia's population. See "The Demography of Black Appalachia," 238; and Roberta M. Campbell ed, "Race, Ethnicity, and Identity," in *Encyclopedia of Appalachia*, ed., Rudy Abramson and Jean Haskell (Knoxville, University of Tennessee Press, 2011), 980.

Appalachia is also home to several major Native American tribes including the Cherokee and Creek Indians, as well as members of the Powhatan Confederacy.[30] The arrival of European settlers and the expansion of the slave trade into the American colonies greatly increased interactions between the settler, indigenous, and African populations. Several thousand Native Americans were held alongside Africans in bondage while other natives traded in African slaves or worked as slave trackers. Finally, many escaped slaves sought refuge among the Indian nations; the rugged topography of the tribal lands discouraged slave owners from pursuing their slaves into these areas.[31] Thus, even while Appalachia was being fashioned as a predominantly white region, Native Americans, African Americans, and eastern Europeans constituted at least 30 percent of the regions' population.[32]

The exclusion of mountaineers of color accounts for what historian Edward Cabbell has called Appalachia's, "black invisibility" problem.[33] Black invisibility has promoted the idea that Appalachia's black population is so small that its presence has been inconsequential. Cabbell argues that the exclusion of mountaineers of color was a calculated move in an attempt to mythologize Appalachia as a land of poor whites beset with "white problems" and not the racial problems that plagued the rest of America. The next two sections build on this argument by considering how mountaineers of triracial ancestry have contributed to and complicated the racial boundary making of the early twentieth century.

---

[30] Other notable tribes in the eastern U.S. include the Tuscarora, Shawnee, Catawba, Narragansett, Choctaw, and Seminole.

[31] Theda Purdue, "Red and Black in the Southern Appalachians," in *Blacks in Appalachia,* ed., William H. Turner and Edward J. Cabbell (Lexington: University of Tennessee Press, 1985), 23-24.

[32] Race, Ethnicity, and Identity," in *Encyclopedia of Appalachia*, Rudy Abramson and Jean Haskell ed. (Knoxville, University of Tennessee Press, 2011), 981.

[33] Edward J. Cabbell, "Black Invisibility and Racism in Appalachia: A Survey," in *Blacks in Appalachia,* William H. Turner and Edward J. Cabbell eds. (Lexington: University of Tennessee Press, 1985), 5.

Locating Triracial Appalachia

In addition to a long history of red and black inhabitants, Appalachia has a long history of triracial peoples. Scholars Darlene Wilson and Patricia Beaver have attributed this phenomenon to the social isolation that shielded residents from the same legal and social regulations against interracial coupling operating in other areas of the country.[34] In a historical sketch of life in Newman's Ridge, Tennessee one writer documents what she perceived as the gross immorality amongst the residents stating: "At this church I saw white women with negro babies at their breasts—Melungeons women with white or with black husbands and some, indeed, having the three separate races represented in their children."[35] Such encounters gave rise to several hundred triracial communities located in some of the most isolated and mountainous areas of the Appalachian region. In the first estimation of Appalachia's triracial population, sociologist William Harlen Gilbert speculated the population numbered well over 50,000.[36]

Appalachia's triracial communities came to regional attention in the years prior to the Civil War as part of news stories alerting readers to the strange racial origins of their nearby neighbors. One of the most well-known triracial groups of Appalachia, the Melungeons, are a triracial group of purported European, Native American, and African American ancestry, although they have claimed their ancestors were of Portuguese descent. Melungeon communities have been documented in western Virginia, eastern Tennessee, southern Kentucky, and northern

[34] Darlene Wilson and Patricia D. Beaver, "Transgressions in Race and Place: The Ubiquitous Native Grandmother in America's Cultural Memory," in *Neither Separate Nor Equal: Women, Race, and Class in the South*, Barbara Ellen Smith ed. (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1999), 38.

[35] Will Allen Dromgoole, "The Melungeons," *The Arena* 46 (March 1891): 475.

[36] William Harlan Gilbert, "Memorandum Concerning the Characteristics of the Large Mixed-Blood Racial Islands of the Eastern United States," *Social Forces 24* (May, 1946): 438.

Ohio.[37] They have also been the frequent subjects of novelists like John Fox Jr. who often features a Melungeons character in his tales of romance and violence in the mountains.[38] Other mixed-blood populations include the Black-Dutch of Pennsylvania, the Coe Colony of Kentucky, the Upper Cumberland River Cherokee of McCreary and Scott Kentucky, and the Vinton County Indians of Ohio. The size of these populations have shifted over time as economic and social forces have caused many members to shun their triracial identity in favor of membership in a primary racial group.[39]

In the twentieth century, these communities have been derogatorily labeled as "triracial isolates," "racial islands," "mestizo," and "little races."[40] These labels took on increased importance as investigators shifted their focus away from the racially anomalous origins of these communities to their distinctiveness as a caste group in a bi-racial society. Although the term "triracial isolate" was originally coined as an anthropological term meant to signal the genetic qualities of the community, it has been appropriated as a signifier of all mixed-race communities regardless their makeup.[41] Furthermore, the supposed isolation of these communities was never static. Thus, the term has performed a similar cultural function as the term "hillbilly," in that it indicates a stereotype of what it means to be triracial much like the image of the hillbilly represents a stereotype of what it means to be a rural white mountaineer.[42] Even as researchers

[37] Edward T. Price, "The Mixed-Blood Racial Strain of Carmel, Ohio, and Magoffin County, Kentucky," *Ohio Journal of Science 50* (November 1950): 281-290.

[38] Rachel Robin, "What Ain't Called Melungeon is Called Hillbillies," *Forum of Modern Language Studies* 40 (2004): 259-278.

[39] Brewton Berry, *Almost White* (New York: Macmillan, 1963), 60.

[40] Beale, "American Triracial Isolates: Their Status and Pertinence to Genetic Research," *Eugenics Quarterly 4* (December 1957): 188.

[41] Ibid.

[42] Harkins, *Hillbilly: A Cultural Icon*, 4

devoted increased attention to these communities as examples of genetic isolation, group out-migration was in full swing as residents relocated to other locales for greater political and economic opportunities.[43]

At the same time that researchers were becoming interested in triracial isolats, writers wishing to emphasize the distinctiveness of mountain life began to focus more on the nefarious aspects of mountain culture like moonshining, feuding, cousin-marriages, and pervasive poverty. These pejorative stereotypes of poor white mountaineers find their clearest expression in the image of the "hillbilly," perhaps one of the most enduring images to emerge from the local color writing. Investigators interested in the triracial communities of the eastern U.S. also furthered numerous damaging stereotypes about those groups. These investigations emphasized the racial "inbetweenness" of the triracial isolates as well as the anti-social behaviors: pauperism, inbreeding, moonshining, and licentiousness, bred by their social marginalization. Derogatory in nature, the terms "hillbilly" and "triracial isolate," represent dual stereotypes of inhabitants of Appalachia that are rarely, if ever, discussed together. Although both are examples of how race, class, and geography serve to define a region and its inhabitants.

Both white and tri-racially mixed mountaineers were the subjects of popular literary works designed to entertain the reading public with the strange and peculiar ways of the mountaineer. Comprising a variety of mediums from short stories, dialect tales, poems, and sketches, these writings gave rise to the local color movement, a literary phenomenon driving the discovery of Appalachia. Described as a blend between the realism of the 1830s and the

[43] For examples of this latter literature on the triracial isolates see: Thomas J. Harte, "Trends in the Mate Selection of a Tri-racial Isolate," *Social Forces* 37 (1954): 215-221; Edgar T. Thompson, "The Little Races," *American Anthropologist 74* (1972): 1295-1306; and William S. Pollitzer, "The Physical Anthropology and Genetics of Marginal People of the Southeastern United States," *American Anthropologist 74* (1972): 719-734.

romanticism of the 1890s, these works were created to draw attention to people and ways of being that greatly diverged from the lifestyle of both the author and the reading public.[44] Local color literature was aimed at a decidedly popular audience and ran almost exclusively in the new popular monthlies like *Lippincott's*, *Scribner's*, and *Harper's New Monthly Magazine.* As a whole, these works shaped the conventional view of Appalachia as a region of social isolation, family-centered violence, and extreme poverty.

One of the most well-known writers of the Appalachia region, Mary Noailles Murfree gained a popular following writing on the mountaineers of the Tennessee region. Murfree was born in Murfreesboro, Tennessee, a town named after her grandfather Hardy Murfree, a decorated officer in the American Revolution. Often writing under the pseudonym Charles Egbert Craddock, Murfree offered explanations of Appalachian otherness rooted in the distinctive origins of the mountaineer, namely his geographical and social isolation. Murfree's stories featured a people so isolated from the march of progress that it was as if they had been "forgotten by time." Murfree's mountaineers exhibited customs, traits, and characteristics of a primitive society of generations past.[45]

Will Allen Dromgoole, also of Murfreesboro, gained an equally wide following through her chronicles of life in the Cumberland. Whereas Murfree is best known for her tales of the pure Anglo-Saxon mountaineers of Kentucky and Tennessee, Dromgoole focused on their tri-racially mixed neighbors, particularly the Melungeons. Throughout the 1890s Dromgoole published a score of articles and at least one novel describing the "remnant[s] of a lost or forgotten race"

[44] Shapiro, *Appalachia On Our Mind*, 20-21.

[45] Mary Noailles Murphy, *In the Tennessee Mountains* (New York: Houghton Mifflin and Co, 1885), 9.

residing in "one of the most inaccessible quarter of Tennessee."[46] Like the white mountaineers, isolation also explained the distinct conditions of this racially mixed enclave. Through their respective subjects, Murfree and Dromgoole helped to establish the "otherness" of Appalachia as a region with discrete physical, social and cultural characteristics. Their writings inspired a host of scholars to also pursue investigations of the strange and peculiar ways of both white and triracial mountaineers.

Investigations of Appalachia commonly remarked upon the impoverished living conditions of both its white and non-white residents. Sketches of the region often focused on dilapidated "huts" or log cabins where one to three windowless rooms were the norm.[47] One writer of Appalachia life commented that he had "never before seen so dismal and desolate a haunt of human life."[48] The living conditions of mixed-blood mountaineers evoked parallel descriptions with one writer describing their "surroundings of dirt amidst their huts built of logs are of the rudest possible sort."[49] The poverty of the mountaineers took on added significance in the twentieth century as the eugenical philosophy of "fitness" gave members of the white elite the conceptual framework through which to link class position with genetic worth. Surveys of the living conditions found amongst both populations attributed their social problems to their degraded mental condition.[50]

---

[46] Will Allen Dromgoole, "Land of the Melungeons," *The Nashville American*, August 31, 1890. Accessed via, The Melungeon Indians < http://www.historical-melungeons.com/wad.html> (accessed October, 20, 2014).

[47] George E. Vincent, "A Retarded Frontier," *American Journal of Sociology* 4 (1898): 4; John C. *Campbell, The Southern Mountaineer and his Homeland*, 120.

[48] William Aspenwall Bradley, "Hobnobbing with Hillbillies," *Harper's Monthly Magazine* (May 1915): 102.

[49] Ada Carver, "Redbones," *Harper's Monthly Magazine* (Feb. 1925), 257; "The Jackson Whites: Strange People Living Between New York and New Jersey" *The Sunday Herald*, January 26, 1896, 21.

[50] Arthur Estabrook, "Blood Seeking Environment," *Eugenical News* (1926): 106-114; Roland Harper, "The Most Prolific People," *Eugenical News* (1938): 29-31.

Researchers also cited the practice of consanguineous parings, particularly those involving cousins, as a defining feature of both societies. Arthur Estabrook documented first cousin marriages among the mountaineers of Kentucky although it was "not as common as second or third cousin marriage.[51] Sociologist George Vincent noted the incidence of "intermarriage of three or four generations."[52] In a sketch of the living conditions of the "Jackson Whites" of the Ramapo, one writer suggested that the feelings of racial superiority had prevented the Ramapo people from marrying anyone besides their own kind.[53] It was not just racial pride that facilitated intermarriage amongst triracial isolates, biologist Arthur Estabrook pointed to prolonged social isolation as the major cause of intermarriage amongst a triracially mixed community in Virginia.[54] The passage of time did little to alter this image so that in 1957 demographer Calvin Beale found that the practice of intermarriage during centuries of geographic isolation had helped to produce "a distinctly new racial element in society."[55]

The work of sociologists' and anthropologists' did much to advance knowledge on the social conditions of both white and triracial mountaineers, particularly in regards to their moral quality. Investigators were particularly interested in the history of illegal distilleries and family based feuds.[56] Some writers found it not uncommon "to sit at a table with an affable host who is known to have committed three murders."[57] Studies also discussed the general laziness of both

---

[51] Ibid, 30.

[52] Ibid. 4.

[53] "The Jackson Whites: Strange People Living Between New York and New Jersey," *The Sunday Herald*, January 26, 1896, 21.

[54] Arthur Estabrook, "Triple Crosses in the South: Indian, White, Negro," *Eugenical News* 9 (1924): 58-59.

[55] Beale, "American Triracial Isolates," 187.

[56] William Brewer, "Moonshining in Georgia," *Cosmopolitan 23* (1897): 132.

[57] James Lane Allen, "Through Cumberland Gap on Horseback," *Harper's Magazine 73* (June 1886): 54.

groups, particularly in their aversion to work. James Lane Allen posited both mountaineer idleness and a propensity of violence in his study of the Cumberland mountaineer. He found that, "In the consequence of their abundant leisure…personal enmities soon serve to array entire families in an attitude of implacable hostility, and in the course of time relatives and friends take sides and a war of extermination ensures."[58] Separate reports on the "Melungeons," "Jackson Whites," and "Brass Ankles "of South Carolina attributed the majority of the communities' revenue to the illegal production and distribution of whiskey.[59] This information does much to underscore Francis Lynde's contention that, "all mountaineers are moonshiners."[60] It was not just criminal activities that set these communities apart but also their licentious conduct, shiftlessness, and a general lack of ethics and morals.[61]

The discussions of mountaineer morality naturally extended to questions of their sexual morals. Not only did mountaineers exhibit a "low standard of morality in their domestic relations," they were in the words of one author, "a most fecund race."[62] It was not uncommon for researchers to find families with an average of seven to ten children. Similarly, large families were considered the rule among triracial isolates.[63] In addition, to large families, writers found that both communities were surprisingly tolerant of illegitimacy. According to John C.

---

[58] Ibid. 56.

[59] William Harlan Gilbert, "Memorandum Concerning the Characteristics of the Larger Mixed-Blood Racial Islands of the Eastern United States," *Social Forces* 24 (May, 1946): 438.

[60] Francis Lynde, "The Moonshiner of Fact," *Lippincott's 57* (1896): 66.

[61] Horace Mann Bond, "Two Racial Islands in Alabama," *American Journal of Sociology* 36 (1931): 552-567; Swan M. Burnett, "A Note on the Melungeons" *American Anthropologist* 2 (1889): 347-350;

[62] Allen "Through Cumberland Gap on Horseback," 69.

[63] Horace Mann Bond, "Two Racial Islands in Alabama" *American Journal of Sociology* 36 (1931): 552-567; "The Jackson Whites: Strange People Living Between New York and New Jersey," *The Sunday Herald* (Jan. 26, 1896), 21.

Campbell, children born out of wedlock to white mountaineers were not at all ostracized.[64] Similar conditions were found among the "Jackson Whites" of New Jersey. Their illegitimacy was in large part due to "the licentious conduct [and] concubinage with both black and white men."[65] These depictions contributed to the social construction of white and triracial mountaineers as persons possessing the worst moral qualities in the nation. As eugenics gained inroads in the 1910s and 1920s as a palatable social movement aimed at biological improvement, the loose sexual morals of both societies made them the chief targets of compulsory sterilization programs.

In addition to similar depictions of their pathologies, both communities garnered the interest of researchers wishing to understand the consequences of social isolation. George Vincent was among the first to implore, "students of sociology [to] leave their books and at first hand in the Cumberland deal with the phenomena of a social order arrested at a relatively early state of evolution."[66] William Frost reached similar conclusions about the mountaineer believing that "Appalachia American may be useful as furnishing a fixed point which enables us to measure the progress of the moving world"[67] Both E. Franklin Frazier and Horace Mann Bond reached similar conclusions on triracial communities and encouraged social scientific investigation before modernization had destroyed the distinct social customs of this

[64] Campbell, *The Southern Highlander and His Homeland*, 132.

[65] "The Jackson Whites: Strange People Living Between New York and New Jersey" *The Sunday Herald* (Jan. 26, 1896), .21.

[66] Vincent, "A Retarded Frontier," 20.

[67] Frost, "Our Contemporary Ancestors," 31.

"intermediate type."[68] Interest in the social change and problems of both groups sparked multiple surveys of the Appalachian region by both private and public entities.

In the early twentieth century the "hillbilly" and the "triracial isolate," offered those concerned with racial purity the chance to situate their anxiety in a particular geographic location. On the one hand, locating these communities in a specific area made the threat they posed to white racial purity alarmingly real, on the other, because of the perceived distance of most Americans from these territories, the danger posed by white and triracial mountaineers seemed less immediate. Furthermore, the fact that important segments of the decision making public viewed poor white and triracially mixed people of the mountains in a similar manner carried profound implications for both populations, ultimately informing how these communities came to understand their own racial identity. For one, triracial communities laid claim to the hillbilly appellation as a badge of honor and testament to their pioneer stock. Outsiders also fashioned triracial communities as part of the same pioneer/hillbilly heritage as white Appalachians. E. Franklin Frazier attributed what he viewed as the well-developed religious and cultural institutions of the various racial islands of the U.S. to the Anglo-Saxon stock of their pioneer ancestors.[69] Likewise, white mountaineers used their relationships with their multi-racial neighbors to lay claim to a more diverse past. Darlene Wilson and Patricia Beaver have argued that the multi-racial heritage of their close neighbors, in particular the emphasis on their Native

[68] Bond, "Two Racial Islands in Alabama," 552-567; E. Franklin Frazier, *The Negro Family in the United States* (New York: Dryden Press, 1948), 164-189.

[69] Frazier, *The Negro Family in the U.S.*, 187.

American ancestry, allowed white mountaineers access a multiracial identity that still distanced them from the stigma attached to blackness.[70]

Eugenic Constructions of (Non)Whiteness

As mentioned above, rural white populations stood out because their social customs differed so strikingly from those of middle-class America. Endemic poverty, the lack of strong industrial centers, and the undereducated population of Appalachia greatly worried social reformers, not only those committed to eugenics. Whereas the uplift literature of the previous century located the mountaineer's distinctiveness in his social isolation and thus implicated environment, twentieth century eugenicists advanced biological arguments to explain the mountaineer's degraded condition. As a result, inbreeding, criminality, violence, pauperism, and sexual immorality were not only inherent but heritable conditions lumped under the umbrella of feeble-mindedness.

The work of eugenicists represents a major contribution to the construction of both poor whites and mixed-race people. Throughout the first three decades of the twentieth-century researchers, largely funded through the Eugenics Record Office, produced sixteen different family-based studies in order to scientifically prove that rural whites were "mental defectives." As one scholar put it: "the central image these studies created was the degenerate hillbilly family, dwelling in filthy shacks, and spawning endless generations of paupers, criminals and imbeciles."[71] Despite the fact that most studies centered on rural whites, at least two, the unpublished *Jackson Whites: A Study in Racial Degeneracy* (1911), authored by Elizabeth Kite and Arthur Estabrook and Ivan McDougle's *Mongrel Virginians* (1924), dealt explicitly with

[70] Darlene Wilson and Patricia D. Beaver, "Transgressions in Race and Place," 50.

[71] Wray and Newitz, *White Trash*, 2.

rural communities of triracial ancestry. Still, a majority of these family studies implicated a "mixed-blood" ancestor as the source of the family's feeble-mindedness. Even when a mixed-blood progenitor could not be located, researchers pointed to contemporary interracial coupling as another indication of defective germ plasm.

In effect, the eugenic family studies helped to draw a causal link between miscegenation and mental degeneracy. As a medical term meant to signify a broad range of mental defectiveness, feeble-mindedness served as a conceptual umbrella that allowed eugenicists to implicate both rural whites and "mixed-bloods" as threats to white racial purity.[72] The "feeble-minded" were considered a greater eugenical threat than "idiots" (those of a mental age of two years or younger) and "imbeciles" (those with a mental age of about seven years) for the same reasons that "mixed-bloods" were seen as more threatening to white racial purity than black Americans. While idiots and imbeciles were generally identifiable to the layperson, "high-grade morons" (those of a mental age between eight and twelve years) shared with the "mixed-blood" the ability to "pass" into unsuspecting white communities.[73]

As a biosocial movement "eugenics," which derived from the Greek term *eugenes*, meaning "of good birth," represents the utilization of hereditary theories to ensure the production of the "better" segments of society through selective mating.[74] In the American context,

---

[72] Southern and Eastern Europeans were also considered a serious threat to white racial purity, however their immigration was largely curtailed after 1924 in large part due to Henry Goddard's intelligence testing at Ellis Island. His 1915 testimony before the U.S. Public Health Service indicating that large segments of Eastern and Southern European immigrants were feeble-minded, greatly influenced legislators to take action to curb immigration from these regions. For more on eugenics and immigration see, Nancy Ordover, *American Eugenics: Race, Queer Anatomy, and the Science of Nationalism* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2003), 17-37.

[73] Nathaniel Deutsch, *Inventing America's Worst Family: Eugenics, Islam, and the Tribe of Ishmael* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2009, 107.

[74] "Better" was a common term used in eugenic parlance and was rhetorically linked to a raced, classed, and gendered ideal.

eugenics not only encouraged the better populations to reproduce (positive eugenics), proponents advocated intervention in the way of sterilization and segregation to prevent those deemed less fit from propagating their kind (negative eugenics).[75] Together, these efforts would ensure that eugenicists reached their chief aims, the prevention of white racial degeneracy. Declining birthrates among the eugenically "fit" as well as increased immigration by and high birth rates among those deem eugenically "unfit," convinced a large segment of the decision-making public that racial degeneracy was well underway. [76]

The Eugenics Record Office served as the basecamp for the American eugenics movement. In 1904 biologist Charles Davenport lobbied the Carnegie Foundation for a grant to establish a research center on Cold Spring Harbor, Long Island. Two years later Davenport lobbied the American Breeders' Association to fund a research center to investigate human heredity and "to emphasize the value of superior blood and the menace of society of inferior blood."[77] The result of these efforts was the Eugenics Record Office, which was founded in 1910 and funded by an endowment provided by Mary Harriman, widow to the railroad magnate R.E. Harriman.[78] The original function of the ERO was to serve as an archive of genealogical records on American genius. The initial pages of *The Eugenics Review*, the flagship journal of the movement, featured genealogical sketches that attempted to trace the hereditary origins of genius

[75] Daniel Kevles, *In the Name of Eugenics: Genetics and the Uses of Human Heredity* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1995), 3-7.

[76] Between 1907 and 1932 thirty states passed legislation permitting the involuntary sterilization of mental degenerates. See, Anna Stubbelfield, "'Beyond the Pale': Tainted Whiteness, Cognitive Disability, and Eugenic Sterilization," *Hypatia 22* (2007): 164-165

[77] Matthew Frye Jacobson, *Barbarian Virtues: The United States Encounters Foreign Peoples at Home and Abroad, 1876-1917* (New York: Hill and Wang, 2000), 162.

[78] Garland Allen, "The Eugenics Record Office at Cold Spring Harbor, 1910-1940: An Essay in Institutional History" *Osiris* 2 (1986):225-264.

in prominent Americans such as: Alexander Graham Bell, Madison Grant, and Theodore Roosevelt.[79]

Under the direction of Harry Laughlin, the ERO soon shifted its attention to documenting the lower strata of the population through intelligence testing and the publication of family studies. Family studies represented just one aspect of a multi-pronged approach to documenting mental defectiveness. In addition to the family studies, Davenport, along with psychologist Henry Goddard administered intelligence tests to southern and eastern European immigrants entering at Ellis Island. They also pioneered intelligence testing amongst army recruits during World War I.[80] According to Laughlin the job of eugenics was to seek out "the submerged tenth, the socially inadequate persons who must be prevented from reproducing…the insane, the feebleminded, the paupers, the epileptic, the criminals, and so on."[81]

Over the course of three decades the ERO released a total of sixteen family studies that used observation, genealogical mapping, and phenotypic variations to measure social degeneracy. The authors of the family studies came from a variety of backgrounds. At least one was a minster, two were sociologists, and the others were researchers employed by the ERO with training in various fields including biology, psychology, and linguistics. The studies also cover a variety of locales. For reasons most likely having to do with convenience, early studies centered on communities in close proximity to the ERO's Long Island headquarters. However, many of these communities still had ties to the Appalachia region. The Tribe of Ishmael, a community of

[79] Eugenicists believed that if a trait could be found in more than one generation then that trait was heritable. Later studies on "cacogenic" meaning unfit families also discussed the heritability of promiscuity, a trait they observed in successive generations of poor rural families. See Nicole Hahn Rafter, *White Trash: The Eugenic Family Studies 1877-1919* (Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1988), 6-9.

[80] Ordover, *American Eugenics*, 33-35.

[81] Harry Laughlin "Eugenics in America," *Eugenics Review* 17 (April 1925), 28.

purported multiracial origins, were residing in Indiana when they came to the eugenicists' attention but were believed to be the descendants of pioneer families living in Kentucky, North Carolina, and Tennessee. As the 1920s progressed and the ERO gained more funding researchers were able to expand their studies out into rural communities in central and southern Appalachia.[82] In addition to a variety of geographic locales, the family studies also presented varied opinions on the usefulness of social intervention. While some believed that social programs might improve the conditions of their subjects other researchers were steadfast in their commitment to sterilization in order to prevent the propagation of the unfit.[83] Authors of the Minnesota based *Dwellers in the Vale of Siddem* likened poor relief for mental defectives to, "trying to stamp out malaria or yellow fever in the neighborhood of a mosquito breeding swamp."[84] Researchers did however agree on the idea that social problems were rooted in biology and that the effective control of the mentally defective would be the only successful way to ameliorate these issues.[85]

Family studies typically began when a member of a group came to the attention of researchers either because they were institutionalized or they exhibited an exceptional degree of negative traits. From there researchers used public records, interviews with neighbors, and recollections by other family members to trace particular traits through time in order to prove

---

[82] For examples of this later work see Arthur Estabrook, "The Southern Highlands," *Eugenical News* (August 1925): 5-8; Arthur Estabrook, "Blood Seeking Environment, Presidential Address, Eugenics Research Association, 1926," *Eugenical News* (August 1926): 106-114; Nathaniel D.M. Hirsch, "An Experimental Study of the East Kentucky Mountaineers," *Genetic Psychology Monographs 3* (March 1928): 183-244.

[83] Henry H. Goddard, *The Kallikak Family: A Study in the Heredity of Feeble-mindedness* (New York: Macmillan, 1912), 102.

[84] A.C. Rogers in Maud Merrill, "Dwellers in the Vale of Siddem," published in *White Trash: The Eugenic Family Studies, 1877-1919,* Nichole Hahn Rafter ed. (Boston: Northeastern Press, 1988), 345.

[85]Karl Pearson, "Mendelianism and the Problem of Mental Defect," *Questions of the Day and Fray* 9 (London: Cambridge University Press, 1914), 8.

that the traits that characterized the group were in fact hereditary. The family studies followed those of the natural sciences in terms of being interested in the biological basis of human difference, however they embraced the new sociological principles in terms of a desire to translate their findings into social programs, most notably institutional segregation and the coerced sterilization of the feeble-minded. [86] The authors of the Sam Sixty study were explicitly clear on this point stating: "Society has the right and the duty to save such ever increasing expense from increasing numbers of dependents…by keeping the feeble-minded in custody while they are of child rearing and child be-getting ages."[87]

Eugenic studies capitalized on the marginality of interracial unions by positing miscegenation as a cause of feeble-mindedness. Authored in 1911 by Elizabeth Kite, a field worker with New Jersey's Vineland Training School, *The Jackson Whites: A Study in Racial Degeneracy* is the first eugenics study to explicit consider a mixed-race population and as such made the strongest argument for a biological link between miscegenation and mental defectiveness. In addition to her study on the "Jackson Whites," on which Kite is listed as the sole author, she also performed the fieldwork for Henry Goddard's study of the Kallikak family (1911) and published a separate genealogical history of one branch of the Kallikak clan in 1912. The following year she published a study of another rural poor community in upstate New York by the name of the Pineys.[88]

[86] Rafter, *White Trash*, 2.

[87] M.S. Kostir, *The Family of Sam Sixty,* (Cleveland: Ohio Board of Administration Press, 1916), 208.

[88] Elizabeth Kite, "Two Brothers," *The Survey* (May 2, 1912): 1861-1864; Elizabeth Kite, "The Pineys," *The Survey* (October 4, 1913): 7-13, 38-40.

Born in 1864, Elizabeth Kite attended elite secondary schools in the U.S. before leaving to pursue higher education abroad. While in Europe, Kite took up history as well as French language studies. After her return to the U.S. Kite trained under Henry Goddard, the director of research at the Vineland School, and served as a fieldworker there from 1909 until 1918. During this period, she also put her French skills to use by translating several key works on mental testing by Binet and Simon for use in Vineland's intelligence testing program. Kite was among the first wave of women professionals in the sciences. Like her counterparts, Kite gained access to a predominantly male field by performing jobs that were considered women's work. As field workers, Kite and the other 250 female alumni of the ERO's summer training school were valued by their male superiors for their keen sense of observation, which in their eyes, endowed them with the skills needed to perform the careful documentation of genealogical histories and social observation.[89]

The "Jackson Whites" first came to the attention of researchers at Vineland when they went in search for the relatives of one of their young female patients. Beginning in 1909, the study was the result of two years of research amongst the Ramapo community and drew on extensive interviews with neighbors of the Ramapo clan to determine their racial and moral quality. Like the other family studies that would come before and after, the Jackson White study made extensive use of genealogies to trace the inheritance of defective traits. Yet, unlike these other studies, the authors made no attempt to conceal the location or identity of their 2600 subjects. Coming so closely on the heels of the Kallikak study it is no surprise that Kite believed the studies were related, despite the fact that the Jackson Whites were of mixed heritage. Not only did the studies "belong logically to the same series," Kite argued that while both groups are

[89] Rafter, *White Trash*, 21.

in totally different environments, they were all "closely related by blood and are fundamentally of the same life."[90]

A triracially mixed community of Negro, Indian, and European ancestry, Kite documented the Jackson White ancestry as follows:

> These loose living descendants of slaves were gradually crowded back into the mountain districts where they lived from hand to mouth and where their numbers were from time to time recruited by whites whose tendencies were similar to their own…But how account for the Indian blood that shows itself so conspicuously among this race today? Undoubtedly a large part of it comes from Indians who were formerly held as slaves…[91]

The consequences of this deleterious racial mixture expressed itself in a number of ways, mainly in the "temperamental laziness" and "liquor heart" of the Jackson Whites.[92] Not all of the inherited racial characteristics were negative. Kite documented amongst many of her subjects a combination of the "Indian reserve" and the "Negro independence." These she considered responsible for the Jackson Whites' love of nature and physical freedom. Unfortunately, these qualities did not overcome the sexual immorality of the clan. Kite noted that "sex laxity [was] universal" among them.[93]

The danger of the Jackson Whites stemmed not only from their degraded racial status, but also from their close proximity to New Jersey's wealthy elite who not only refused to shun these social outcasts but also provided for their welfare. In her notes on the manuscript of the Vineland Study, Kite notes with alarm the fact that many Jackson Whites were no longer secluded in the

---

[90] Elizabeth Kite, *The Jackson Whites: A Study in Racial Degeneracy*, [Manuscript, 1911]. Elizabeth Sarah Kite Papers, 1864-1959. Box 1, Folder 1, Rutgers University and Special Collections and University Archives, New Brunswick.

[91] Ibid.

[92] Ibid

[93] Ibid.

isolation of the Ramapos but had migrated en masse to Hillburn, New Jersey, a small village located at the bottom of the Ramapo Mountains. In addition to the Jackson Whites, Hillburn was also the summer home to many of New Jersey and New York's elite families who had taken a "paternalistic stance against this defective race."[94]

Ultimately, the central danger of the Jackson Whites lay not in their mental deficiency but in their physical form. The argument as Kite put it, the "picturesque" and "attractive" qualities of the Jackson Whites could fool a casual observer as to the true nature of their racial and moral character[95]. As a precursor to *Mongrel Virginians* the Jackson Whites study laid the groundwork that linked physical appearance, sexuality, and place in the construction of the "mixed blood." When in 1932 scientists concluded that the "White-Indian-Negro" blood combination had bred "moron people," the racial construction of eastern remnants as breeders of mental deficiency had largely been finalized.[96]

Although Elizabeth Kite's *Jackson Whites: A Study in Racial Degeneracy* (1911) and Arthur Estabrook and Ivan McDougle's *Mongrel Virginians: The WIN Tribe* (1926) are often claimed as the only studies to explicitly deal with racial mixture, of the remaining fourteen studies, at least six make mention of "half-breed" relatives or the propensity of their subjects to engage in sex across the color line. Even when racial mixing was not marshaled as the direct cause of degeneracy researchers it was offered as proof.[97] Researchers made this point by tracing the defective germ plasm of their subjects back to an interracial liaison. In his description

[94] Kite, *The Jackson Whites*, n.p.

[95] Ibid.

[96] "Blood Combination Has Bred Moron People," *National Labor Tribune*, Thursday, Nov. 24, 1932, 5.

[97] Both the Jukes and the Kallikak families, the subjects of the two most popular eugenic studies, were believed to have engaged in interracial sex.

of a Kansas clan by the name of "Smoky Pilgrims," sociologist Frank Blackmar attributed the "moral defectiveness" as well as the "dusky and possibly the sickly yellow color" to "the Negro blood in the veins of part of the family."[98] Likewise, author Oscar McCulloch traced the "family history [of] murders, a large number of illegitimacies and prostitutes to the wandering blood from the half-breed mother …[and] the poison and passion that probably came with her."[99] He also noted their group's tendency to "gypsy," wandering across the mid-west by wagon when not occupying tree-houses or abandoned homes.[100] In his 1912 study of the Nam Family—an ominous appellation meant to denote the backwardness of the family—Estabrook argued that the "highly inbred community in New York State" sprang from a union involving a "roving" Dutch pioneer and an "Indian Princess."[101] Another cacogenic family in rural Ohio, the Happy Hickories, was the progeny of "an Indian squaw."[102] And finally, one of the families in Vale of Siddem was descended from "Nigger Ned." The daughter, "a mulatto," had several children and each of them shows their "Negro heritage. The oldest boy is an imbecile with very vicious tendencies. He will steal whenever the opportunity offers…"[103]

More than just elide concerns of racial purity and rural mental degradation, the eugenic family studies helped to blur the boundaries of whiteness. By rooting white racial degeneracy in

---

[98] Frank Blackmar, "The Smoky Pilgrims" *American Journal of Sociology* 2 (1877): 491.

[99] Oscar McCulloch, "The Tribe of Ishmael: A Study in Social Degradation" *Proceedings* Conference of Charities and Correction, 1888: 157.

[100] Scholar Nicole Hahn Rafter released a collection of the most notably and most hard to locate family studies in 1988. I will be using her book as the citation for most of these studies in this section. Nicole Hahn Rafter, White Trash: The Eugenics Family Studies, 1877-1919 (Holliston: Northeastern, 1988), 54.

[101] "Nam" was actually "Man" spelled backwards. Arthur Estabrook and Charles Davenport, *The Nam Family: A Study in Cacogenity* (Cold Spring Harbor, NY, Eugenics Record Office, 1912), 2.

[102] Mina Sessions, "The Feeble-Minded in a Rural County in Ohio" 1918 in Rafter ed. *White Trash*, 276.

[103] Rogers and Merrill, *Dwellers in the Vale of Siddem*, 368.

a mixed-blood ancestry, the eugenic studies served to position rural whites as racially impure in both a social and genetic sense. Even if rural white Appalachians were not reclassified as white, they were clearly conceptualized as approaching the specter of non-whiteness. If this is true, then the conception of the rural poor to white racial purity takes on new significance. By drawing genetic proximity between indigenous and black populations, the rural white mountaineer was transformed from off-white, the term used to describe their social degradation, to non-white, the language used to describe their genetic degradation.

Conclusion

In the years following their "discovery," The Thompsons received the "civilizing efforts" of both private and public aid institutions including the Nyack Women's Club, the Red Cross, and New Jersey's Vineland Training School for Feebleminded Boys and Girls. Although most of the family members were diagnosed as feeble-minded, the one bright spot was "Ella," the oldest Thompson daughter, who, despite her troubled beginnings was considered "bright and promising" and in 1923 was attending a "normal" school in the area.[104]Although both the Thompsons and the Jackson Whites were presumed to exist on the margins of society, the racial purity of family earned them reintegration into the mainstream.

Historian James Klotter has argued that efforts to distance mountain whites from blackness allowed them to access the benefits of white privilege by providing a population against which mountaineers could position themselves. What is also interesting to note is that for triracial communities like the Jackson Whites of New Jersey and the Narragansett of Delaware, their proximity to whiteness, however tainted, availed them to remedial efforts of social welfare

[104] Margery Rex, "Family Living Like Barbarians Found in New York Hills," *Evening Hills*, n.d. Eugenics Record Office Trait Files, Box. 36. American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia.

agencies. In the decade following the discovery of the Thompson family, the Jackson Whites received both a teacher and hygiene instructor, both of whom were employed by the ERO. Thus, both populations could capitalize on their proximity to degraded whiteness and it is this proximity that allowed them to make claims to citizenship and national belonging that are significant even if they are limited in nature. Finally, these populations trouble the scholarly supremacy assigned to the "one-drop rule" in regards to racial classification. That a number of rural whites participate in sex across the color line and still maintained the classification as white illustrates that racial boundaries were porous and like other mediated spaces, reflect the political, social, and economic interests of their gatekeepers.

The treatments of race mixing covered in this chapter have relied on conceptualization of race mixing as the route to or manifestation of psychological, social, cultural, and political degeneracy. In this vein, the had as much to do with the particular behaviors and conditions thought to befall these persons than with the ambiguity of their racial status. Although people biologically black could not aspire to whiteness, as the eugenic family studies in the last section reveal, whites could easily descend into "mulatoness"—creating what historian John Mencke calls "a new and curious kind of mulatto—a mulatto who was in fact genetically white but morally black.[105] By naming the conditions that befell these communities, each description and enumeration of a social disorder provides a condensed articulation of the identity story of the "mixed blood." Eventually, these characterizations served as the litmus for identity of eastern communities for both future investigators to ascribe that identity but also formed a set of characteristics by which eastern Indians could deny that identity by claiming not to fit them.

[105] Mencke, *Mulattoes and Race Mixture*, 105.

Chapter 3

'THIS INDIAN STUFF HAS GONE FAR ENOUGH': SCIENTIFIC EXPERTISE AND THE FIGHT FOR RACIAL INTEGRITY, 1920-1940

Unquestionably the people in the South arising from the mixture of the Indian, negro, and white races represent an ever increasing social problem."

Arthur Estabrook[1]

The epigraph above opens the introduction to the 1926 study*, Mongrel Virginians: The WIN Tribe*. Sponsored by the Eugenics Record Office (ERO) and the Carnegie Foundation, *Mongrel Virginians* investigated the moral and social character of the Amherst County Indians. Arthur Estabrook, alongside co-author and sociologist Ivan McDougle, used family pedigrees and sociological investigation to determine the genetic and moral make-up of the group they called the "WIN" tribe, a pseudonym meant to signify their "White-Indian-Negro" ancestry. Violating both legal and social restrictions against interracial mixing, the group—as the researchers saw it—embodied the moral and social degeneracy bred by miscegenation. For those Virginians committed to white supremacy, tri-racial populations posed a problem because they lacked a distinct physical type, and thus resisted neat racial classification, the cornerstone of Jim Crow's caste system. How could one maintain anti-miscegenation law if, for instance, a man could be married, "first as a negro, and later as a white man"?[2] To remedy this issue, Virginia legislators passed the Racial Integrity Act of 1924 (RIA), which enshrined into law a "no-trace" definition of white persons and established a strict bi-racial society of "white" and "colored" citizens.

[1] Arthur H. Estabrook and Ivan E. McDougle, *Mongrel Virginians: The Win Tribe* (Baltimore: The Williams & Wilkins Co., 1926), 1.

[2] Ibid., 3.

The Racial Integrity Act was largely the brainchild of Walter Plecker, Virginia's chief registrar of vital statistics and one of the RIA's most vocal proponents. A member of the nascent Anglo-Saxon Clubs of America (ASCOA), Plecker and his associates organized in support of strengthening "Anglo-Saxon instincts, traditions, and principles." The Anglo-Saxon Clubs listed amongst its principal goals, the promotion of "the intelligent selection and exclusion of immigrants" and a "final solution [to] our racial problems in general, most especially the Negro problem."[3] Frustrated by the limits of traditional Jim Crow legislation, the ASCOA ran an aggressive media campaign, using both state and national newspapers, to lobby for the RIA's goal of strict racial separation. In so doing, the ASCOA hoped to ensure white supremacy on a social and biological level by guarding against the inferior blood of the state's triracial population. In devising a law that married eugenicists' interest in better breeding with white southerners' commitment to racial supremacy, the members of the ASCOA helped to usher in a watershed moment in the history of Jim Crow legislation.

The passage of the Racial Integrity Act reveals the peculiar status of native peoples in the Jim Crow South. Historically, it has been difficult for southern Indians to have their identity claims regarded as legitimate. Lacking the physical appearance and cultural markers generally associated with tribal nations of the West, outsiders have dismissed identity claims of these communities. Instead, they have been accused of being racial transgressors wishing to use the "Native" category as an escape-hatch into whiteness. Even recognition as "white" has precluded some individuals from being recognized as "Indian." Thus, American Indian identity formation

[3] See, "Notes on the Anglo-Saxon Clubs of America" (A.S.C.O.A) n.d. Box 38, Folder 46, and John Powell to Stone Deavours, Mississippi. 20 April 1925. Box 39, Folder 52, Papers of John Powell, 1888-1978, n.d., Accession #7284, 7284-a, Special Collections, University of Virginia Library, Charlottesville, Va. (hereafter cited as John Powell Papers).

projects have been powerfully shaped by the dialectical relationship between blackness and whiteness. Yet, by establishing their own schools and churches, and also through distancing their relationships with both white and black relatives, Virginia Indians worked hard to enshrine their identity against efforts to class them as "Negroes."

Virginia Indians in the 1920s found themselves negotiating their racial identity amid concerns over white racial purity and the belief that black admixture negated all other ancestry. Historian David Hollinger, commenting on America's one-drop rule, accurately encapsulates the experience of Virginia Indians stating, "One has not been able to say, 'I'm one eighth African American' without giving up socially if not legally, the seven eighths of oneself that is not."[4] Indeed, while individuals need only possess a faint amount of black blood in order to be placed (even involuntarily) in the "black" category, American Indians are generally forced to establish proof of a high blood quanta in order for their identity claims to be regarded as legitimate.[5] For instance, in the 1928 study of the Lumbee Indians of North Carolina, another community of purported triracial ancestry, investigators determined that only those individuals with one-half or more Indian blood would be listed as "Indians" for the purpose of receiving agricultural resources administered through the Bureau of Indian Affairs.[6] As the Lumbee case illustrates, native identity carried real economic and political consequences. Virginia's citizen Indians reclassified under the RIA were not only subjected to segregation in public spaces, their racial

[4] David Hollinger, "Amalgamation and Hypodescent: The Question of Ethnoracial Mixture in the History of the United States," *The American Historical Review 108* (December 2003): 1368.

[5] Eva Marie Garroutte, "The Racial Formation of American Indians: Negotiating Legitimate Identities within Tribal and Federal Law," *American Indian Quarterly 25* (2001): 231.

[6] Malinda Maynor Lowery, *Lumbee Indians in the Jim Crow South: Race, Identity, and the Making of a Nation* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2010), 181-185.

reclassification threatened familial relationships, as many groups had a long history of marriage with both their white and black neighbors.

Despite the harm done by the RIA, Virginia's native descended people were not passive victims of the Anglo-Saxon Clubs' racial purity campaign, nor were they passive subjects of scientific scrutiny. On both fronts Virginia Indians took proactive measures to enshrine their self-identity against the accusations lodged against them. With the support of a different set of researchers, including anthropologists James Mooney and Frank Speck, many Indian groups pursued incorporation as a tribal community in order to preserve their "third" race status in the bi-racial state. Though Speck and Mooney viewed the Indians as a tri-racially mixed people, they did not subscribe to the orthodoxy of the one-drop rule. More interested in the groups' ability to maintain a distinct culture and identity apart from both black and whites, Mooney and Speck accepted them as Indians.

In what follows, I trace how Plecker and his associates used ideas about race rooted in eugenic thought to establish a new racial order. I argue that the Anglo-Saxon Clubs leveraged the scientific authority of eugenics to endow their pronouncements—which may have otherwise been dismissed as racist propaganda—with legitimacy and objectivity. So deep was their belief in the veracity of science that they looked to a eugenic study of Virginia's Amherst County Indians to provide the racial "truths" needed to buttress their identity claims. I contend that despite their best efforts to establish a new racial system, the ASCOA exposed the fissures of Jim Crow, namely the difficulty in drawing a permanent and distinguishable color line. Indeed, instead of excising racial categories, the members of the Anglo-Saxon Clubs helped to engender new ones, such as "near-whites," and "negroid Indians." Despite the fact that these were problem populations that were legal impossibilities according to Virginia law, Plecker and his

associates—by drawing attention to these groups for the purposes of enforcing the RIA—actually helped to imbue these categories with racial meaning. As the state's "negroid Indians" came under increased racial scrutiny, they responded by utilizing their own network of scientists and supporters who rejected the mono-racial thinking of Plecker and his associates. As a result, by 1930, when the Virginia legislature considered its final amendment to the Racial Integrity Act, the ASCOA's goal of enforcing racial reclassification on the state's Indians remained far from realized. Ultimately, competing ideas of what it meant to be black and Indian governed how each side viewed Virginia's citizen Indians. And each side called upon their own scientific experts in order to justify their racial outlook.

Jim Crow and the Anglo-Saxon Clubs of Virginia

Walter Plecker, joined by pianist John Powell and ethnographer Earnest S. Cox, were the three leading figures of the Anglo-Saxon Clubs. Together, they were part of a broad movement in the 1920s and 1930s to develop policy inspired by eugenics. Rooted in the Progressive Era ethos of reform, eugenic theories proved palatable to a large segment of the public—welfare workers, public health advocates, and white supremacists—committed to applying the principles of biology and medicine to what they perceived as the problems of modern society.[7] As the science of "race improvement," the eugenics movement focused on the identification and isolation of those considered biologically unfit. Because one's social position was often viewed as proof of biological fitness, eugenic programs disproportionately targeted racial minorities, immigrants and the poor. As Michael Dorr so aptly notes, "Eugenics reinforced the social hierarchy that elevated the elite, and extolled whites as fit," while denouncing groups including

[7] Alexandra Stern, "Improving Hoosiers: Indiana and the Wide Scope of American Eugenics," *Indian Magazine of History 106* (2010): 220.

non-assimilated European immigrants, poor whites, African Americans, Mexicans, and Native Americans as biologically inferior.[8] Eugenicists believed that, if the higher races were to be protected from these classes and not succumb to "race suicide," it was necessary to prohibit white Americans from breeding with these populations.

The members of the Anglo Saxon Clubs were aligned with racial thinkers who, by the 1920s, were increasingly concerned with the dysgenic effects of racial amalgamation. With the ascendancy of eugenics the menace of black admixture was purportedly no longer based in racial prejudice, "but [was] a biologically induced scientific fact."[9] Common were pronouncements like anthropologist's Reginald Ruggles Gates who opined that, "miscegenation commonly results in disharmony of physical, mental, and temperamental qualities often leading to disharmony with the environment, and consequent unhappiness."[10] Furthermore, eugenicists held that even one drop of inferior blood could cancel out or even retard the qualities of the higher race. In *The Passing of the Great Race* (1916), leading eugenicist Madison Grant summarized this belief succinctly: "The cross between a white man and an Indian, is an Indian; the cross between a white man and a negro is a negro….When it becomes thoroughly understood that the children of mixed marriages between contrasted races belong to the lower type, the importance of transmitting in unimpaired purity the blood inheritance of ages will be appreciated at its full value."[11] By the 1920s, miscegenation was no longer a social taboo; it a biological menace. As

[8] Gregory Michael Dorr, "Assuring America's Place in the Sun: Ivey Foreman Lewis and the Teaching of Eugenics at the University of Virginia, 1915-1953," *The Journal of Southern History* 66 (2000): 262.

[9] "Editorial," *Richmond Times-Dispatch*, February 18, 1924, 6.

[10] Reginald Ruggles Gates, "Heredity and Eugenics," *Eugenics Review 1* (1920): 10.

[11] Madison Grant, *The Passing of the Great Race or The Racial Basis for European History* (New York: Scribner's Sons, 1916), 14.

such, Plecker, Cox, and Powell pledged their full support to utilize their personal and professional networks in order to put an end to it.

A shared interest in America's racial problem and the place of the Negro in American culture shaped the professional careers of John Powell, Earnest Cox, and Walter Plecker. John Powell, a noted composer and concert pianist, was not only a founding member of the Anglo-Saxon Clubs, he was its chief spokesman. Born in 1882 into one of Virginia's most prominent families, Powell gained his musical training in Europe, where he studied piano and musical composition under such luminaries as Theodor Leschetizky and Karel Navrátil. Following his studies, Powell traveled extensively throughout the first decades of the twentieth century, determined to tease out the origins of a uniquely American musical tradition. During these years, he also toured widely, performing original compositions that promoted themes he deemed uniquely American. His 1917 composition *Rhapsodie Negre*, for example, drew upon Negro spirituals and folk music to tell the story of ante-bellum slave life. Upon his return to America, Powell embarked on a lengthy speaking tour through which he expounded his ideas on the superiority of Anglo-Saxon musical traditions and culture. Despite the fact that his compositions often drew upon both Native American and African American musical traditions, Powell remained convinced that neither group had contributed anything significant to America's musical culture. Rather, he argued that, as the most advanced and civilized culture, only Anglo-Saxon folksong formed the basis of identifiably American music. Powell later joined Annabelle Morris Buchanan and John Blakemore to create White Top Music Festival, a folk music festival that celebrated the creation and preservation of Appalachian folk music—a genre known for its unique Scotch-Irish origins.[12] By the time Powell returned to Virginia in the 1920s, he had come

[12] David Z. Kushner, "Powell's Racial and Cultural Ideologies," *Israeli Studies in Musicology* 5 (2006): 11.

to believe that the preservation of white civilization—like America's musical tradition—depended upon its protection from the blood, tradition, and culture of non-whites.

Powell met Ernest Sevier Cox at a dinner party in early 1922, and the two soon bonded over their shared racial outlook. Cox, a Tennessee native, was a Methodist preacher and self-described explorer focusing on the contact between the races. Born in 1880, Cox studied theology at both the Moody Bible Institute and Vanderbilt University, but left the former in 1909 after a dispute with the faculty. He later pursued graduate studies at the University of Chicago where he studied sociology under the eugenicist E.A. Ross. It was during his time at Chicago that Cox became interested in the so-called "Negro problem," and developed theories regarding the necessary separation of the races.[13] In a series of papers Cox argued that black Americans constituted an inferior race whose brutality must be held in check by white governance.[14] Cox left the university in 1910, embarking on a world expedition to study "how other people control their negroes." His travels took him to Cape Town, the colonies of Rhodesia, the Belgian Congo, German East Africa, and on to South America. Returning to America in 1914, Cox sold himself as an "ethnological expert" on the race question and became a highly sought after public speaker and lecturer.[15]

It was during his public lectures that Cox first began to expound upon his hereditarian conception of white supremacy. Influenced by eugenics' preoccupation with separating the fit

[13] Jason Ward, "'A Richmond Institution': Earnest Sevier Cox, Racial Propaganda, and White Resistance of the Civil Rights Movement," *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 16 (2008): 262-293.

[14] John P. Jackson and Andrew S Winston, "The Last Repatriationist: The Career of Earnest Sevier Cox," in *Race and Science: Scientific Challenges to Racism in Modern America*, ed. Paul Farber and Hamilton Cravens (Corvallis: Oregon State University Press, 2009), 60.

[15] John P. Jackson and Andrew S. Winton, "The Last Repatriationist," 58-108; Douglas Smith, "Earnest Sevier Cox, 1880-1966," *Encyclopedia of Virginia* http://www.encyclopediavirginia.org/Cox_Earnest_Sevier_1880-1966.

from the unfit, Cox began to push for the repatriation of black Americans to Africa, arguing that the only biologically sound nation was the one in which the races were geographically separate. Spearheaded by Cox, the campaign garnered the support of Marcus Garvey, leader of the United Negro Improvement Association. Garvey, Powell, and Cox corresponded frequently throughout the 1920s, the three men sharing a strong commitment to racial separatism. Cox expanded upon the theme of repatriation and the superiority of white civilization in his anti-miscegenation treatise *White America.* This 1923 publication offered an overview of civilizations Cox believed to have perished because of miscegenation. In writing *White America,* Cox aimed chiefly to advocate for a strong eugenics program that would preserve the biological fitness of native-born white Americans. The "ideal of eugenics," according to Cox, was the absolute maintenance of white purity.[16] The book received the endorsement of many notable eugenicists, including Madison Grant and Harry Laughlin, and even became part of the University of Virginia's biology curriculum.[17]

The third leading figure of the Anglo Saxon Clubs, Walter A. Plecker, also fashioned himself a lay-ethnologist. Plecker was born in 1861 in Augusta County, Virginia. He attended the University of Virginia for his undergraduate degree before earning a degree in obstetrics from the University of Maryland in 1885. Whereas Powell and Plecker developed their theories on America's race problem while traveling abroad, Plecker gained his insights as an obstetrician working in rural areas across the South. His posts included Birmingham, Alabama and Hampton, Virginia, as well as Rockbridge County, Virginia, an area heavily populated by the mixed-blood Indians that would become the targets of the ASCOA's racial integrity campaign. Plecker

[16] Earnest Sevier Cox, *White America* (Richmond: White American Society, 1923), 23.

[17] Jackson and Winston, "The Last Repatriationist," 62.

became a county health officer in 1904 and made a name for himself with his investigations into the high fatality rate of the county's black residents. He was named State Registrar of Vital Statistics in 1912, a position in the newly established State Health Department. Plecker used his authority as state registrar to enforce and promote the racial integrity campaign of the Anglo-Saxon Clubs even before the passage of the RIA. From the time of his appointment in 1912, he ensured that a midwife confirmed that all children born in Virginia received birth certificates with their racial designation. Plecker also used his position to enjoin county clerks to register as "colored" anyone they suspected of having Negro blood.[18]

In one of his first articles on the subject of miscegenation, "Is White America to Become a Negroid Nation?," published in the *Richmond Times-Dispatch* in 1923, Powell accused white Virginians of being concerned with "the more obvious and superficial aspects of white supremacy," i.e., limiting black political and social rights while ignoring "the more insidious, less apparent problem of integrity." Powell looked at the state of Jim Crow Virginia in the 1920s and found it seriously wanting in its laxness. Whites in the state had erected a litany of racial separation laws but these fell short, in his view, of adequately protecting white supremacy. Powell railed, "it [was] not enough to segregate the Negro on railway trains and street cars, in schools and theaters; it [was] not enough to restrict the exercise of [the] franchise, so long as the possibility remains of the absorption of Negro blood into our white population."[19] He offered instead a legal regime designed to preserve the biological separation of the races, which he saw as the best guarantee of white supremacy's future. The irony was that the efforts of Powell and

[18] Plecker's correspondence contains letters between the commissioner of revenue as well as an Amherst County registrar concerning their reluctance to list as "colored," for fear they may upset the families. See Walter Plecker to Commissioner of Revenue, 22, June 1922. Box 41, Folder 1; and. Local Registrar to Walter Plecker, 28, July 1923. Box, 41, Folder 2, John Powell Papers.

[19] John Powell, "Is White America to Become a Negroid Nation?" *Richmond Times-Dispatch,* July 22, 1923, 52.

his associates, while designed to patch Jim Crow's many fissures, only seemed to expose the fundamental impossibility of the system—and the maintenance of a strict color line.

Racial Integrity Act of 1924

In the summer of 1923 Powell and Cox launched a print campaign designed to introduce Virginians to the Anglo-Saxon Clubs and garner support for their first initiative: a bill for the "preservation of the white race."[20] Both Powell and Cox published articles in the *Richmond Times-Dispatch*, voicing their concern for the rampant "mongrelization" afoot in Virginia. Citing both Mendel's law of heredity and eugenic science, Powell warned readers that mixing with a primitive race degraded the qualities of the higher race. In short, Negro blood, even one drop, could erase all of the Caucasian's superior qualities. The preservation of white civilization therefore depended upon preventing intermixture with the Negro. According to Powell, "no race even slightly mixed with negro blood had failed to experience cultural decay." Thus, new laws were needed to establish racial purity: "Only an iron-clad law which prevented intermarriage with the lightest of the mulattoes could prevent ultimate amalgamation."[21]

For Powell and his associates only an "absolute" color line based on the most restrictive definition of whiteness could preserve racial purity in Virginia. To achieve this the ASCOA proposed four major legislative planks. The first would institute "a system of registration and birth certificates showing the racial composition (white, black, brown, yellow, red) of every resident in the state." Second, they sought to prohibit the issuance of marriage licenses "save upon presentation and attestation under oath by both parties of said registration or birth certificate." Third, they wanted to make marriages illegal between whites and non-whites. And,

[20] Powell, "White America," *Richmond Times-Dispatch,* July 22, 1923, 52.

[21] Ibid.; "Virginia to Decide if Needs Racial Law," *Omaha World Herald*, March 2, 1924, 10.

finally, they sought to define as "white" only those persons who had no trace whatsoever of any blood other than Caucasian.[22] While acknowledging previous legislation aimed at preventing intermarriage between blacks and whites, Powell warned that such laws did not necessarily prevent "intermixture." According to Powell, "numerous individuals of Negro blood [who] are legally white and may not marry Negroes" were residing in the state. Legal whites were a class of Virginians who were Negro in the biological sense of possessing black blood, but were legally white because of a 1910 statute defining as "Negro" any person having one-sixteenth or more Negro blood. The great danger to white racial integrity emerged not from crossings with full-blooded Negroes: Powell recognized that such unions had sharply decreased since the end of slavery. Rather, he worried about unions involving "near-white mulattoes,"—persons with less than one-sixteenth black blood—with unsuspecting whites. "The real negro is giving us no trouble," he wrote. "The near whites, the mongrels and the would-be whites are the trouble makers. There are about 10,000 of these in Virginia, who might step over the line with little difficulty but for the racial purity restrictions."[23] For Powell, racial amalgamation was nothing less than a fundamental threat to the future of the nation.

Powell, Plecker, and Cox set about alerting white Virginians to the racial menace of "near-white" Negroes, who they believed had their sights set on crossing the color line first by "passing" as white, and later by marrying into Virginia's white families. Plecker, like Powell, refused to see the "true negro" as a danger to racial integrity. He felt that this type was "indifferent to the subject [of race mixing], [lacking] the foresight enough to see clearly the significance of it." For Plecker, "near whites who are striving in every way to pass over into the

[22] "Anglo-Saxon Club," *Richmond News-Leader,* June 1923, 5.

[23] "Anglo-Saxon Club May Take Appeal in Sorrels Case," *Richmond Times-Dispatch*, December 10, 1924, 1-2.

white class" represented the crux of Virginia's race problem.[24] Despite an onslaught of early twentieth-century legislation meant to curb such practices miscegenation continued. Anti-miscegenation laws also engendered the racial ambiguity of the 1920s by drawing color lines that defined some mixtures as white and others as "mulatto."[25] As a result, "the effect of statutes defining a mulatto as someone with a certain proportion of Negro or Indian blood was to make 'white' into a mixed-race category."[26]

The existence of legally white, but in fact "mixed" persons testified to the weakening of racial boundaries in 1920s Virginia, at the very height of segregation. To underline the point, Powell set out to perform a "social experiment:" After standing for forty-five minutes at the corner of Richmond's Second and Broad streets Powell reported that he "counted among passers-by over 200 Negroes, of whom only five were black." He also noted the presence of an additional thirty persons so racially ambiguous that he could not state whether they were "white" or "colored."[27] It was this group, Virginia's "near-white" population, that the ASCOA viewed as the clear targets of its racial integrity campaign. Only later would this emphasis shift to the state's American Indian population. That the ASCOA did not initially view Indians as the primary racial threat is best evidenced by Cox's willingness to "classify an individual of one-eighth or less of the blood of the red or yellow race as "'white,'" as he believed, "our chief danger is not from this source."[28]

---

[24] Walter Plecker to John Gailey, 21 May 1925. Box 41, Folder 43, John Powell Papers

[25] A. Leon Higginbotham and Barbara K. Kopytoff, "Racial Purity and Interracial Sex in Law of Colonial and Antebellum Virginia," *Georgetown Law Review* 77 (1989): 1980.

[26] Ibid., 1984

[27]Powell, "White America," *Richmond Times-Dispatch,* July 22, 1923, 52.

[28] Walter Cox, "Is White American to Become a Negroid Nation?," *Richmond Times-Dispatch*, July 22, 1923, 52.

The members of the Anglo-Saxon Clubs launched a three-pronged attack to battle the issue of amalgamation in Virginia. First, they wanted to awaken the sensitivities of Virginians through an aggressive media campaign that highlighted the presence and expansiveness of amalgamative practices in the state. Next, the leaders set out to gather facts through a scientific study of the state's race problem. Finally, they sought to reorient the racial climate in the state by securing legislation that would establish racial boundaries in more absolute terms.

When the General Assembly convened in February of 1924 several members of both houses proved willing to lend their support to the racial integrity measure, thus leading to its introduction in the Senate as Bill No. 219 on February 1, and in the House as Bill No. 311 on February 15. The bills that appeared before the House and Senate differed in several key ways from the measure outlined by the ASCOA. Not only did the new bills make providing false testimony regarding one's racial identity a felony punishable by up to one year of imprisonment; it also expanded the definition of "white" to include "persons who have less than one sixty-fourth of the blood of an American Indian and have no other non-Caucasic blood." The proposed legislation also sought to make racial registration compulsory in the state of Virginia.[29] Compulsory registration represented the only way to "determine once and for all who is a Caucasian and who is not in order that further intermingling of the races might be prevented."[30] The exception for persons with less than one sixty-fourth native blood represented a compromise intended to appease prominent Virginian families who traced their ancestry to the union of John Rolfe to Pocahontas. The "Pocahontas Exception" outlined the only acceptable formulation of

[29] Commonwealth of Virginia, *Acts of Assembly 1924*, 535

[30] "Emasculating a Good Bill," *Richmond Times-Dispatch*, February 29, 1924, 8.

non-white ancestry and functioned as an early example of the political power of white Virginians who were more implicated in Virginia's multiracial society than they generally understood.

Powell called the proposed integrity measure "the most perfect expression of the white ideal, and the most important eugenical effort that has been made in 4,000 years."[31] Testifying in support of the bill, Powell referenced such notable eugenicists as Charles Davenport, Lothrop Stoddard, and Madison Grant, all of whom supported the theory that racial mixture was destroying white civilization. Letters from Grant and Stoddard in support of the racial integrity measure were also read before the assembly. The Racial Integrity bill also received the unfettered support of the *Richmond-Times Dispatch*. The paper ran numerous articles and editorials promoting the legislation throughout 1924. Powell, Cox, and Plecker used this space to position themselves as experts on the racial problems of Virginia. In explaining why Powell, a composer, would be invited to speak before the General Assembly on the biological dangers of race mixture the *Times-Dispatch* cited his "knowledge of ethnographic problems and conditions in various parts of the world, and his wide acquaintance among European authorities and statesmen."[32] Indeed, the relationships the three shared with other scientific experts and their ability to draw on the language and rhetoric of science buttressed their professional authority more than anything. It was not uncommon to read declarations stating that, "America is headed toward mongrelism: only a realization of the seriousness of the fact, and resultant measures can retain racial integrity…Every recognized ethnologist is as certain of that as he is that the sun rose this morning."[33] Although these experts were rarely identified by name, the simple practice of

[31] John Powell to Address House on Race Question," *Richmond Times-Dispatch*, February 9, 1924, 12.

[32] "Walter A. Plecker, "Virginia's Attempt to Adjust the Color Problem," *American Journal of Public Health* 15 (1925): 114.

[33] Ibid.

appealing to scientific authority gave the ASCOA's inflammatory pronouncements on racial mixing the gloss of scientific objectivity.

Opposition to the bill was not particularly widespread. Some lawmakers did resent the need to compel all Virginians to register their racial identity just to verify "the one or two percent of the population so indefinitely blooded and pigmented as to need registration."[34] The compulsory feature was stricken from the final version of the bill ending much of the vocal opposition to the measure. Even if some lawmakers resented the need for compulsory registration, they remained supportive of the need for establishing strict racial boundaries.

Neither was opposition particularly strong among Virginia's black population, who largely recognized that the Racial Integrity bill primarily targeted the state's mulatto population. The absence of vocal black opposition to the Racial Integrity Act should not be taken to mean that black Americans supported the bill; rather, this testifies to the precarious state of race relations in 1920s America. White supremacists often took any push for social equality on the part of black Americans as a tacit endorsement of miscegenation. Thus, African Americans across the country found it difficult to speak out against racial discrimination without drawing the critique that what they really wanted was to engage in sex across the color line. Such a precarious position prompted the *Richmond Planet*, Virginia's black newspaper, to characterize racial separatism as the ideal of "every well-thinking colored person."[35]

Black publications outside of Virginia were much more critical of the Racial Integrity Act. The *Crisis* and *The Pittsburg Currier* ran articles lambasting the legislation as the most

[34] "Racial Integrity," *Richmond Times-Dispatch,* February 18, 1924, 2.

[35] "Race Amalgamation Bill Passed in Va. Legislature," *Richmond Planet*, March 1, 1924, 4.

incendiary form of scientific racism. For them, the RIA was nothing more than anti-negro propaganda spouted by "biased whites who suppressed evidence which did not support their prejudices."[36] These same periodicals expressed special resentment at the idea that black Americans were believed to have desired miscegenation. W.E.B. DuBois, a vociferous critic of the RIA, wrote: "We have not asked for amalgamation, we have resisted it. It has been forced on us by brute strength, ignorance, poverty, degradation and fraud. It is the white race, roaming the world that has left its trail of bastards and outraged women." In calling out white men as the sexual aggressors, DuBois challenged one of the most enduring aspects of the segregationist narrative of miscegenation—the sexual violence allegedly perpetrated by black men against respectable white women.[37] Neither did DuBois subscribe to the scientific theories underpinning the bill. He dismissed such theories about the biological danger of race mixing as "lies agreed upon." DuBois summed up his opposition to intermarriage stating, "It is not because we are unworthy of intermarriage-either physically or mentally or morally….It is because no real man can accept any alliance except on terms of absolute equal regard and because we are abundantly satisfied with our race and our blood."[38]

Governor Elbert Lee Trinkle signed the Racial Integrity Act into law on March 20, 1924; however, the final version did not include the compulsory feature.[39] Powell and his associates

---

[36] "Virginia to Enforce New Segregation Act: Registrars Instructed to Be Sure There Is No Trace of Colored Blood," *The Pittsburgh Courier*, July 5, 1925, 9; Carol M. Taylor, "W.E. B. Du Bois' Challenge to Scientific Racism," *Journal of Black Studies* (June 1981): 458-59.

[37] Alex Lubin, *Romance and Rights: The Politics of Interracial Intimacy, 1945-1954* (Oxford: University of Mississippi Press, 2004), 68.

[38] W.E.B Du Bois, "Lies Agreed Upon," *Crisis* (Feb. 1916): 187; "Amalgamation," *Crisis* (December 1921): 55-56.

[39] Commonwealth of Virginia, *Journal of the Senate 1924*, 374; *Journal of the House of Delegates 1924*, 722; *Acts of the General Assembly 1924*, 394, 569-71. This same Assembly also passed a bill legalizing the sterilization of metal defectives in state institutions.

expressed vocal disappointment at this development, calling the approved legislation "scarcely a half-step" in the direction of maintaining white racial purity.[40] The bill did succeed in making the submission of false testimony in regard to one's race a felony offense punishable by up to a year in prison. Furthermore, the bill endorsed the "no trace" definition of a white person, while raising the allowable amount of Indian blood to one-sixteenth. The final bill is also noteworthy because it specifically barred marriages between whites and any non-Caucasian strains including "Mongolians, American Indians, Malayans, or any mixtures thereof."[41] In short, the RIA had as its intent two races: "white" and "colored." This last amendment attests to the legislature's commitment to establishing a truly bi-racial order.

In the months following the passage of the RIA, Plecker worked tirelessly to enforce Virginia's new color line.[42] Plecker not only pledged his own attention to racial integrity, but he also utilized the full bureaucratic structure of the state in establishing a new absolute color line. Within days of the bill's passage Plecker circulated letters to county and city school officials, health professionals, and county registrars instructing them on how to enforce the new law. He instructed registrars to refrain from issuing vital records to any person whose racial composition was in doubt. Additionally, he supplied them with definitions of the terms "mulatto," "quadroon," "octaroon," and "issue,"—terms often used on the state's vital records that typically signified black admixture. Plecker used old marriage and birth records, principally between the years of 1853 to 1896, to verify the racial backgrounds of applicants. If vital records were found

[40] "Emasculating a Good Bill," *Richmond Times-Dispatch,* February 29, 1924, 8.

[41] These groups were free however to intermarry amongst each other. That lawmakers had no intention of protecting the racial integrity of non-whites as it made clear by the title of the Senate Bill, "To preserve the integrity of the white race"

[42] "To Further Aims of Racial Law," *Richmond Times-Dispatch*, March 19, 1924, 2.

to be in error, Plecker authorized registrars to withhold the certificate; registrars also stamped the back of all "corrected" certificates noting a change in the applicant's racial classification.[43]

The enforcement of the RIA depended upon the surveillance of Virginia's mixed-race population, surveillance that, in turn, relied upon speculation. Entire towns and families could be implicated in a racial scandal through just the mere supposition of blackness. It was not uncommon for Plecker to field inquiries into the racial composition of various citizens. Plecker once had to reassure the superintendent of the Russell County School Board that he had not indicated that fifty of the most influential white families in that county possessed black ancestry, although he did not discount that such a situation could arise. Plecker assured the superintendent that his office would prove capable of policing such matters, writing, "We are now beginning to get in touch with similar conditions throughout the State and are trying to establish a list of all doubtful families."[44] Indeed, Plecker circulated lists throughout the state containing the names of persons and family groups believed to be of mixed-racial ancestry. These lists carried profound implications for anyone they identified, as these persons often underwent racial reclassification—generally without their consent. Plecker's directives soon resulted in the first legal suits being brought against the bureau.

"This Indian Stuff Has Gone Far Enough"

Although the early efforts of the Anglo-Saxon Clubs focused on managing the threat posed by "near-white" mulattoes, Plecker and his associates soon turned their attention to the state's native population. Spurred by the belief that "there [were] no native-born Virginians

[43] Warren Fiske, "The Black and White World of Walter Plecker, Part 2," *The Virginia Pilot Online*, August 18, 2004, http://hamptonroads.com/2004/08/blackandwhite-world-walter-ashby-plecker.

[44] Walter A. Plecker to R.N. Anderson, 31 July 1924. Box 41 Folder 13, John Powell Papers.

unmixed with Negro blood," Plecker spearheaded a new phase of the ASCOA's racial integrity campaign, which now aimed at policing the "negroid-Indians" they feared were using the "Indian" label as a way-station to whiteness.[45] Virginia's Indian population provided a readily identifiable population toward which Powell and his associates could spew their vitriol. The ASCOA framed the hardships that befell these communities as proof of the biological dangers of racial mixing, thereby justifying the racial integrity legislation. Ironically, attempts to bring these communities in line with the Clubs' ideals of racial purity served to highlight the various shortcomings of the racial integrity campaign, as well as the overall difficulty of establishing an absolute color line.

Most white Virginians believed their state lacked any recognizable Indians, save for the two groups of reservation Indians residing in the eastern part of the state and a few other pockets of people claiming Indian descent scattered across the state. Those communities that did remain were believed to be so assimilated that they were scarcely recognizable as Indians—in other words they lacked the original languages and modes of life of pre-contact native peoples. Beyond the widespread assimilation believed to have taken place, was the notion that both black and white racial admixture had eroded these communities' racial purity, negating any claims they had to being Indian.

Despite the widespread belief that native peoples were on the verge of extinction, Virginia's Native American population seemed to be on the rise during the early twentieth-century, a trend that greatly worried Plecker and his associates, as they suspected these newly minted Indians had ulterior motives of crossing the color line. According to census data,

[45]"Native-born" here refers to Native Americans. See, Earnest S. Cox, "Voice of the People: Major Cox Writes on Legal Color Line," *Richmond Times-Dispatch*, February 2, 1928, 6; Walter Plecker to Ethel Magner, 20 July 1940. Box 41, Folder 84, John Powell Papers.

Virginia's native population grew from 0.018 to 0.032 percent of the total population between 1870 and 1920. The most worrisome data came from Amherst County Virginia, where enumerators failed to register any Indians in 1870, yet managed to register 304 Indians in 1920.[46] Similar numbers were reported for neighboring Rockbridge County, where residents were believed to share the same ancestors as the Amherst Indians. In addition to the two groups that had their own reservations—the Pamunkey and the Mattaponi Indians---there were pockets of self-identifying Indians in Amherst and Rockbridge counties (present-day Monacans), in Charles City County (Chickahominy), and as well as in King and Queen County (Rappahannock). At least another ten smaller, unaffiliated groups of native-descended people resided throughout the Tidewater and Blue-Ridge regions of the state. In total, between 1900 and 1925, researchers estimated that Virginia's Indian population grew from 500 to at least 2000 people.[47]

The state's Indian population eked out an existence on some of the poorest land in the state, yet they still managed to participate in a variety of economic sectors and attain varying degrees of economic and social development. As reservation Indians, the Pamunkey held what was perhaps the highest socioeconomic status amongst the Virginia Indians. Not only did they farm a portion of the reservation, but they also opened their reservation to game hunters. Additionally, the Pamunkey operated a store that sold the tribe's goods throughout the state. Their ingenuity proved remarkable to researchers studying the tribe in the early part of the century. Scientists discussed the tribe in generally positive terms, noting their achievement of a

[46] *U.S. Census Estimate of Indians in Virginia, 1900-1920,* n.d. Box 38, Folder 3, John Powell Papers. These years also saw a steady decline in the Negro population that further exacerbated fears that Virginia's racial purity was in danger. Historian J. Douglass Smith has attributed this demographic trend to the mass migration patterns of African Americans to urban centers for employment. J. Douglass Smith, *Managing White Supremacy: Race, Politics, and Citizenship in Jim Crow Virginia* (Chapel Hill: UNC Press, 2002), 96.

[47] James Mooney, "The Powhatan Confederacy, Past and Present" *American Anthropologist 9* (1907): 6; Frank Speck, "The Rappahannock Indians of Virginia" *Indians Notes and Monographs 5* (1925): vii.

level of civilization worthy of emulation by other native groups. James Mooney, an ethnologist with the Smithsonian Institute, described the Pamunkey as "self-supporting, industrious, law-abiding, and hospitable, with no paupers or criminals, and [they] constitute in every way a worthy factor in the community."[48]

Other communities that lived in less advantageous economic conditions were described as "backwards." The Amherst County Indians—a small cluster of unaffiliated Indians from the state's Blue Ridge region—were tenant farmers, who raised primarily tobacco and corn. Seeing less stable economic prospects for this community, outsiders viewed them as less developed and socially degraded. In their pronouncements against miscegenation, Powell, Cox, and Plecker focused on the poorest and most obviously struggling native communities. The trio also used this as evidence of the group's moral and biological unfitness when arguing for the necessity of the racial integrity measure. Plecker identified the illegitimacy rate amongst the Amherst Indians, a number he placed as high as twenty-one percent, as evidence of the group's preoccupation with "constantly securing a new infusion of white blood." As a result, "they are growing whiter and whiter all the time."[49]

Walter Plecker expressed special skepticism in regards to the identity of the state's various Indian-descended people. Numerous historical and anthropological reports seemed to confirm the belief that the Indians had married into white and black families. Although, in Plecker's view, their white ancestry did not preclude them being considered Indian, his belief that one drop of black blood made one a Negro, prohibited their classification as "Indian." "One of the most troublesome problems," according to Plecker, "is that the first steps of groups of

[48] Mooney, "The Powhatan Confederacy, Past and Present," 146.

[49] "Controversy Rages Further in Racial Integrity Law," *Richmond Times-Dispatch*, November 11, 1924, 8.

mulattoes is to declare themselves as Indians and after shouting for a generation or two that 'We are Indians' the white population becomes indifferent to the truth."[50]

In reality, while many of the state's native peoples were content to exist outside the purview of their white and black neighbors, the ascendancy of Jim Crow statutes necessitated that they be able to differentiate themselves from their black neighbors. As a people who were neither black nor white, Virginia's Indian population needed to protect themselves against white elites' attempts to lump them into the black underclass. Hence, when the Virginia legislature had passed a law in 1900 establishing segregated streetcars, members of the Pamunkey tribe began carrying identification cards affirming their native identity. Furthermore, that some white Virginians suspected the states' Indian population of having black ancestry further necessitated that they take strong measures to guard themselves against the presumption of blackness by guarding their own racial purity. When visiting the Pamunkey in 1907 ethnologist James Mooney noted, "Their one great dread is that their wasted numbers would lose their identity by absorption in the black race, and against this they have struggled for a full century."[51] This fear prompted the Pamunkey council to add their own anti-miscegenation measure to their tribal code.[52] Sensing the shift in racial feelings regarding the state's native peoples, both the

[50] Walter Plecker to Ethel Magner 20 July 1940. Box 41, Folder 84, John Powell Papers.

[51] Mooney, "Powhatan Confederacy Past and Present," 145; So strong was the Pamunkey's fear of being classed as black that they retained this anti-miscegenation measure as part of their tribal code well into the twenty-first century. Although the tribe has since repealed the code, in 2014 several members of the Congressional Black Caucus opposed the Pamunkey's petition for federal acknowledgement on the grounds that they had a history of discriminating against black Americans. The Pamunkey's were finally approved for recognition in August of 2015 despite the CBC's objections. See, Noah Bierman, "Pocahontas' Tribe, the Pamunkey of Virginia Finally Recognized," *Los Angeles Times*, August 2, 2015, http://www.latimes.com/nation/la-na-pamunkey-20150802-story.html. For more how the Pamunkey deployed anti-black prejudice to buttress their identity claims see, Arica Coleman, *That the Blood Stay Pure: Native Americans and the Predicament of Race in Virginia* (Indianapolis: Indian University Press, 2003).

[52] The Chickahominy of New Kent even disbanded their school after black children started to enroll. See, "He's an Indian and Can Marry White Woman," *Broad Ax,* November 26, 1925, 5.

Rappahannock (1921) and Nansemond Indians (1923) became incorporated tribal entities in an effort to protect their claims to the "Indian" category.[53] Race thus emerged as a cornerstone of Native American identity in Virginia at precisely the same time as concerns grew about the survival of native peoples and cultures.

It was not uncommon for Plecker to cite someone like Mooney, who, when studying the Virginia Indians in 1907 concluded, "In all of these bands the blood of the three races is comingled….Thus, many would pass among strangers as ordinary negroes; a few show no trace of any but white blood; while a few families and individuals might pass as full-blood Indians in any western tribe."[54] In his pamphlet "Eugenics and Racial Integrity," Plecker cited the *Encyclopedia Britannica* and John H. Russell's *The Free Negro in Virginia* (1913) as independent sources confirming his belief that Virginia's Indians would have a difficult time asserting that they are unmixed with any blood other than "white" and "Indian."

Nevertheless, Plecker was concerned by the work being done by Frank Speck and James Mooney among the Virginia Indians. Plecker accused Speck of aiding some Virginia groups, notably the Rappahannock and Nansemond in their efforts to incorporate as official tribal communities. Speck, a vocal advocate on behalf of the Virginian Indians, had indeed helped these populations pursue incorporation. He had spent a great deal of time living amongst the Indians as he conducted his fieldwork and provided his public support in their battle against Virginia's racial system. For instance, in 1925 when Plecker tried to have the Pamunkey and other Indian groups classed as "Negroes" on the federal census, Speck wrote letters census

[53] Walter Plecker, "Racial Improvement," *State Department of Health, Bureau of Vital Statistics* (1925): 29.

[54] Mooney, "Powhatan Confederacy, Past and Present," 145.

officials testifying to the Indian's racial authenticity.[55] Speck used his published ethnographical accounts to affirm their freedom from Negro admixture and to draw attention to the harm being forced upon them by their forced racial reclassification. Speck's ethnographic investigations focused on the self-imposed endogamy practiced amongst the two tribes, an effort he described as an attempt to preserve their racial purity. Plecker dismissed this work, calling such endeavors "pseudo-scientific efforts, the chief purpose which seems to be to force the State to recognize as Indians various groups of triple mixture though Indian blood may be absent from some." As Plecker soon realized, the racial integrity campaign was actually bringing more attention to the question of the Indians' racial identity. What many saw as the callous nature in which Plecker enforced the RIA against the state's Indian population actually helped to garner sympathy for their plight.[56]

Plecker's alarm about mixed-race Indians passing themselves off as white was not limited to Virginia. For instance, he wrote letters to the Governor of Tennessee, warning him that the state's Melungeons—a group claiming Portuguese, Indian, and white ancestry—were actually mulattoes. Powell also worked hard to publicize the problem of "negroid Indians" throughout the country. He mailed copies of the RIA to multiple senators in the hopes that the ASCOA's brand of racial integrity would become a nation-wide standard. As a result, in 1925 Arkansas, Texas, Oklahoma, North Carolina, and Massachusetts all introduced their own racial integrity measures.[57] Moreover, Powell was invited to speak before Georgia lawmakers in support of the state's racial integrity legislation. Legislators in California, Missouri, Oregon, and Mississippi

[55] Helen C. Rountree, "The Indians of Virginia: A Third Race in a Biracial State" in Walter L. Williams ed. *Southeastern Indians Since the Removal Era* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2009), 42.

[56] Walter Plecker, "Racial Improvement," *State Department of Health, Bureau of Vital Statistics* (1925): 29.

[57] "Launch Racial Integrity Campaign," *Richmond Times-Dispatch,* April 9, 1924, 1; **"**Racial Integrity Law for Georgia," *Richmond Times-Dispatch,* July 2, 1925, 15.

wrote letters in support of racial integrity. The amount of such correspondence suggests the extent to which Powell and Plecker understood that racial purity worked only to the extent that other states also adopted the same racial bar as Virginia. If, for instance, a mixed-blood Indian from North Carolina wanted to relocate to Virginia and pass himself off as a white man, Plecker and Powell understood that the racial line was protected only in so far as North Carolina classified their residents according to the same standards as Virginia. Anxiety that mixed-race people were relocating to new places in order to distance themselves from their dubious ancestry served as a primary motivation for the draconian nature of Virginia's racial classification system. Any resident who refused to accept the racial designation assigned by the county clerk could be denied a marriage or birth certificate. As a result, Indians across Virginia began to file lawsuits in the hopes of forcing the state to recognize their self-classification.

Dorothy Johns, a resident of Rockbridge County— an area known for having a large population of mixed-race Indians—was the first to bring a suit against the newly instituted racial integrity act. A.T. Shields, the Rockbridge County clerk, refused a marriage license to Johns on the grounds that she was "colored" and her fiancé was "white." For her part, Johns denied having any black ancestry and was emphatic that her ancestors were mainly Indian with some white admixture. As Johns's lawyer pointed out, the case carried profound implications for the residents of Rockbridge: "it means that they can no longer attend the only school in the Irish Creek neighborhood, as well as the white churches, and the numerous of them who have married into absolutely white families under white marriage licenses will have their offspring classified as negroes."[58] Plecker called multiple witnesses, who testified that the Johns family had

[58] Walter Plecker to Arthur Estabrook, 20 August 1924, Box 1 Folder 3. Arthur Estabrook Papers,1908-1962, M.E. Grenander Department of Special Collections & Archives, University of Albany Libraries, Albany.

significant black admixture. He also submitted old marriage records that listed the Johns' ancestors as "colored." Plecker proved victorious in this first challenge of Virginia's Racial Integrity Act, although his success would prove short lived.

Atha Sorrells, a close relative of Dorothy Johns, provided the next significant test for the Racial Integrity Act. Like Johns, Atha Sorrells was accused of having black ancestry. Unlike Johns, however, Sorrells won her fight with the county clerks. Sorrells's lawyers successfully argued that records listing her ancestors as "colored" denoted Indian rather than black ancestry. Furthermore, Henry Holt, the presiding judge took issue with the uncertainty surrounding the term "Caucasian" noting that a literal interpretation of the statute would prohibit a marriage between a white person and a Hungarian while allowing that same white person to marry an Arab, North African, or a Todas of India.[59]

The conundrum that Holt set forth highlights the state of ethnography in the 1920s. At the time, human kind was conventionally divided into five races: Caucasian, Ethiopian, Mongolian, American, and Malay. While Hungarians were considered Mongolian in origin, Arabs and North Africans were considered Caucasian. Even Powell acknowledged that there was no such thing as an Anglo-Saxon race, but argued for "Anglo-Saxon civilization" as the foundational principal of white purity. Despite challenging the definition of Caucasian, Judge Holt was generally supportive of the statute stating, "Whether it is based upon pride, prejudice, or instinct, we look upon ourselves as a separate race and stand for its preservation in all its integrity." Nevertheless, he found the task of proving the absolute absence of "alien blood" an impossible task. Holt concluded that "common-sense should rule" the process of racial classification stating, "The

[59] Atha Sorrells v. A.T. Shields, Clerk. Rockbridge County Petition for Mandamus, 1925. Box 39, Folder 70, John Powell Papers.

Negro alone in Virginia presents a racial problem and it is only necessary to prescribe that there shall be no intermarriage with them within degrees of consanguinity, ascertainable, and sufficiently remote to provide as a practical proposition against reversion of type…"[60]

The impact of the Holt ruling appeared clearest to Walter Plecker, who estimated that 300 Rockbridge and 500 Amherst residents could now be classified as "white." With the legitimacy of the early vital records in doubt, the ASCOA looked to reinforce their position by having leading eugenicists study Virginia's racial problems. They also set out "to clarify the terminology of the law and amend the section permitting individuals of one-sixteenth Indian blood to intermarry with whites so as to preclude whites from marrying "negroid Indians."[61]

The Anglo-Saxon Club's racial campaign took on a new bitterness after the Sorrell's verdict. Powell and Plecker, especially, devoted their subsequent discourse to assailing the moral character of Virginia's mixed-race population. While the presumed low moral status of mixed-race people was part of the national conversation regarding race mixture, Powell and Plecker's protestations against Virginia's Indians took on a more epidemiological quality. By framing the supposedly poor moral and mental qualities of these communities as heritable conditions Powell and Plecker lent these populations the status of biological menace. Only stricter racial classification measures could protect white Virginian's from the "infection" of "mongrel" blood.

Eugenics Locates the Mongrels

The researchers with the Eugenics Record Office began their fieldwork among the Amherst Indians in February 1923. Although records suggest exactly why Amherst was chosen

[60] "Editorial," Ric*hmond News-Leader*, November 19, 1924, 4.

[61] Ibid.

as the research site, one can speculate that it might have had something to do with their status as a one of the less economically prosperous Indian communities—the majority of residents subsisted as tenant farmers and the group reported a high incidence of illegitimacy—they were believed to best exemplify the deleterious effects of racial mixture. One might also speculate that the Amherst lacked the same patronage network of the other major Indians enclaves who counted amongst their supporters the Indian Rights Association, various state representatives, and notable anthropologist Frank Speck. Additionally, they were they only group with major numbers that had not yet attempted to incorporate. Charles Davenport, head of the Eugenics Record Office, appointed Arthur Estabrook lead researcher on the project. A zoologist by training, Estabrook made a name for himself through his investigations into the traits of mixed-race groups and the rural poor. Just prior to beginning work on the Amherst group Estabrook had completed a study of another racially mixed group, the Ishmaelites of Indiana.[62] He was also the author of the updated eugenic family studies, *The Jukes in 1915*, and *The Nam Family: A Study in Cacogenic*s (1912). Estabrook's research emphasized the role of genetic susceptibility over environment in the creation of degenerate populations. As a result, his studies framed the degenerate behavior of his subjects as justification for stringent reproductive controls including institutional segregation and sterilization.[63]

To understand the sociological dimensions of the study, Estabrook asked Ivan E. McDougle, a sociologist and fellow classmate from Clark University, to join the study. McDougle, a faculty member at Sweet Briar College located just outside of Amherst, not only

[62] Arthur Estabrook, "The Tribe of Ishmael" in *Eugenics, Genetics, and the Family Vo. 1* (Eugenics Record Office: Carnegie Institute of Washington, 1923), 24

[63] While conducting fieldwork for the Amherst study Estabrook lent his professional services to another matter, the sterilization trial of Carrie Buck. Between 1924 and 1926 he also conducted fieldwork in Virginia researching Buck's living conditions and family history.

enjoyed a physical proximity to the community, he also used his position in the women's college to recruit a number of young researchers willing to venture into the community to conduct the detailed interviews necessary for a study of this kind. McDougle's affiliation with Sweet Briar likely helped him win the Indians' confidence as a supporter of their identity claims given that Sweet Briar had provided financial support for the Indians' mission school since 1910, an endeavor that which was also partly funded by the southwestern diocese of Virginia.[64]

The Amherst study provided the ERO with their first chance to study a mixed-race population since the publication of Elizabeth Kite's 1912 work on the Jackson Whites of New York and New Jersey. Since that time the ERO had become extremely interested in trait inheritance, having made headlines in 1915 when Dr. Woods Hutchings published his theory disproving the popular notion that a child born of a "near-white" mulatto and a pure white would be negro. Instead, Hutchings argued that pairing would most certainly produce a white child. [65] This conclusion alarmed many who believed they could readily discern Negro blood regardless of its proportions. Thus, Estabrook and McDougle's reflected the ERO's increasing interest in racial mixture.

While it is unclear if Estabrook and McDougle began the Amherst study at the behest of Walter Plecker, it is evident that Plecker hoped to use Estabrook and McDougle's research in his fight against the Virginia Indians. Alluding to the Amherst study Plecker confided to a close confidant that he soon hoped "to be in possession of facts which we can take into court if

[64] Peter W. Houck and Mintcy D. Maxham, *Indian Island in Amherst County* (Lynchburg: Warwick House Publishing, 1993), 104.

[65] "Trait Files" n.d. Box 61, Eugenics Record Office, American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia.

necessary."[66] Plecker wrote to both Estabrook and McDougle throughout the course of their fieldwork to inquire about the racial backgrounds of Amherst residents who came before his office. He even invited Estabrook to testify on the state's behalf in the Sorrell's case. Although the researchers would occasionally supply Plecker with information, they appeared reticent to provide Plecker with ammunition to use against the Indians. Plecker wrote to Estabrook asking for help in the Johns' case as well, but Estabrook informed him that he would not be able to send him any data for at least two weeks, by which time the trial would have already concluded.[67]

Although they tried not to share too much information with him, both Estabrook and McDougle took issue with how Plecker deployed the information that they did share. McDougle in particular complained that Plecker was using all their good "dope," i.e. information, in his racial campaign against the Indians. Specifically, McDougle alleged that Plecker used material they had provided him in a 1924 article on Virginia's racial measures that was published in the *Washington Post*. McDougle was angered by the fact that Plecker had shared parts of their research before their study was even published. To add insult to injury, Plecker gave no attribution of Estabrook or McDougle for their findings. The issue of Plecker's unattributed borrowing aside, McDougle did not seem to mind exploiting Plecker's knowledge on the Indians, particularly the marriage and death records in his possession. McDougle's opinion of the working relationship he and Estabrook hoped to share with Plecker is best summarized in an early letter between the two detailing how they might utilize Plecker:

[66] Walter Plecker to W.H. Clark, July 29, 1924. Box 4, Folder 7, John Powell Papers.

[67] W.A. Plecker to A. Estabrook, August 29, 1924 Box 4, Folder 6. John Powell Papers.

> This man has unwittingly put me on track of some great stuff but I don't intend to let him know anything of the material we have discovered. All the same he can help us a lot and we can let him think we are helping him because he has a lawsuit on his hands where one of these Indians in Rockbridge claims that his newly born child is entitled to a white card because the father and mother were married in Amherst County as "white" which the clerk's marriage record shows.[68]

Estabrook and McDougle's hesitancy to supply Plecker with information appears to have stemmed as much from their desire for notoriety as it did from any ethical concerns about how their work might be utilized by the Anglo-Saxon Clubs. Estabrook raised concerns about the ethics of sharing information in an early letter to Charles Davenport explaining why he had ignored a letter from Plecker seeking information on the racial background of an Amherst resident.[69] Estabrook felt it wrong to allow information taken in confidence to be utilized against the Indians in their legal battles with the county clerks over their racial registration.

McDougle was particularly concerned that the number of new tracts on the Virginia Indians emerging by 1925 might somehow undercut the novelty of their Amherst research. The Anglo-Saxon Clubs released two-pamphlets in the month of July alone and McDougle knew that two more were on their way. Meanwhile, Frank Speck of the Museum of the American Indian had just published "The Rappahannock Indians of Virginia," an ethnological study of the "awakened self-consciousness" of the tribe.[70] While many scholars focused on the tri-racial admixture of the Virginia Indians, Speck concentrated on the measures taken in the recent past to preserve their racial integrity and cultural identity as Indians. He concluded that, "Probably none of the numerous persons of Powhatan Indian classification in the state could not boast of

[68] I. McDougle to A. Estabrook, September 20, 1923 (Estabrook Papers)

[69] Arthur Estabrook to Charles Davenport August 19, 1924 (Davenport Papers, American Philosophical Society)

[70] Speck also located seven other groups besides the Rappahannock and the well-known Pamunkey and Mattaponi tribes. See Frank Speck, "The Rappahannock Indians of Virginia" *Indians Notes and Monographs 5*, no.3 (1925): vii-viii

absolutely pure Indian blood…. They have nevertheless, neither indulged in nor permitted intermarriage with representatives of the other peoples surrounding them for almost a century—drastic homogamy to compensate for earlier laxity." Speck argued that a century of inbreeding had produced a "predominance of Indian blood" that would not be dismissed "unless beheld through the eyes of those bound to the deadly routine of race and class prejudice."[71] McDougle lambasted Speck's research to Estabrook, writing, "He has entirely disregarded all vital statistics since 1853 and all county records on these people. He has contented himself to living among these people and taking their own word for their history etc. He discussed their mating with whites but entirely disregards every single case of Indian-Negro-White or Negro-White [admixture]"[72] Whereas Plecker was quick to dismiss the Virginia Indians as "Negroes in feathers," Speck essentially defended their right to be classed as Indians. Both treatments drew ridicule from McDougle, who described them as follows: "These [studies] are issued in the form to make them appear the results of pure scientific research whereas they are pure BUNK." McDougle believed that he and Estabrook had somehow worked out a middle ground with regards to the racial composition of Virginia's native population and he hoped they could take advantage of the publicity garnered by Speck's study by publishing their own. Writing to Estabrook in July of 1924 McDougle encouraged him to publish everything they had on the Amherst Indians.[73]

Although Estabrook and McDougle concluded their fieldwork by July 1925, in time to publish their findings, Davenport expressed serious concerns over the characterizations of the

[71] Speck, "The Rappahannocks of Virginia", viii

[72] I. McDougle, to A. Estabrook, July 5, 1924. Box 1, Folder 3. Arthur Estabrook Papers.

[73] Ibid.

community contained in the study. These and other internal issues relating to salary and expense disputes between Estabrook and the ERO threw the study's publication into doubt. During this time, Estabrook also began other research and his employment with the ERO ended.[74] Eventually the study was published in 1926 as *Mongrel Virginians: The WIN Tribe*.[75] By this time the publicity for the book had largely fallen to McDougle who took primary responsibility for dispensing copies to the Anglo-Saxon Clubs and other interested parties.

Mongrel Virginians confirmed many of the primary theories advanced by the Anglo-Saxon Clubs regarding the immorality and mental deficiency that they believed resulted from racial mixing. In discussing the public perception of the group's racial mixture Estabrook and McDougle offered the following: "They are described variously as 'low down' yellow negroes as Indians, as 'mixed,' No one however speaks of them as white." Writing about the consanguinity practiced within the group, Estabrook and McDougle attributed it to social barriers established between the "WIN" and whites and blacks residing outside of "Ab" county.[76]

Having hoped that the study would provide him new ammunition in his racial integrity fight against the state's Indians, Plecker was disappointed to learn that not only had the names of the community been changed, Estabrook and McDougle changed individual family names, thereby obscuring any information that might have been helpful in identifying Amherst residents. A discouraged Plecker wrote to McDougle complaining that he "couldn't find practical value in

[74] A. Estabrook to C. Davenport, November 10, 1925; C. Davenport to A. Estabrook, November 16, 1925. Charles Davenport Papers, American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia.

[75] Here "WIN" is used to refer to the "White-Indian-Negro," racial composition of the group. The acronym also provided a useful pseudonym to disguise the identity of the community who were known colloquially as the "Free Issues."

[76] "WIN" was the pseudonym given to obscure the identity of the tribe with "Ab" the pseudonym used for "Amherst County." A. Estabrook and I. McDougle, *Mongrel Virginians: The WIN Tribe* (Baltimore: Wilkins & Co.: 1926), 3-4, 75.

the book."[77] However, that Plecker lacked a key to the Amherst study did not stop him from leveraging that information when making claims regarding an applicant's racial composition. Responding to a July 1924 letter from a Rockbridge resident wishing to register as "white" Plecker wrote, "I do not know you personally and have no positive assurance as to your racial standing but I do know that an investigation made some time ago by the Carnegie Foundation of the people of mixed descent in Amherst County found the ____ family to be one of those known to be mixed."[78]

Although the Amherst study did not bring Arthur Estabrook the prominence that he might have hoped for, his scholarship certainly benefitted from his time in Virginia as evidenced by his later work among other triracial populations. Eventually, this inspired him to develop a new thesis about the relationship between blood, heredity and the environment. While in the course of his fieldwork on the Amherst County Indians, Estabrook branched out to study the social conditions and status of other isolated tri-racial communities including the Melungeons of Eastern Tennessee, the "brass-ankles" and "sand-hillers" of South Carolina, and the "Croatan" Indians of Robeson County, North Carolina. Using his network of friends involved in social welfare endeavors throughout the Eastern U.S. Estabrook set out to determine the number, location, intellectual and social status of these tri-racial populations.[79]

Clark Wissler of the American Museum of Natural History was a major supporter of Estabrook's research into the triracial peoples of the eastern United States. Knowing that most ethnological work had focused on reservation Indians in the West, Wissler encouraged Estabrook

[77] I. McDougle to A. Estabrook, April 22, 1926. Box 1, Folder 6, Arthur Estabrook Papers.

[78] W. A Plecker to W.H. Clark, July 29, 1924. Box 41, Folder 5, John Powell Papers.

[79] Ibid.

to study the eastern populations. In the 1920s, many Americans were not even aware that such triple mixtures existed. In addition to producing new and novel research, Wissler believed that investigations into the physical and mental status of the tri-racial groups might give the communities valuable insights into their own culture:

> This data should be acquired not only for the sake of science but also that the Indians themselves may know their history, genealogy, origin, and physical and mental traits. These things if properly studied now by competent worker would furnish the information to the Indians to assist them in keeping their race pure, and to aid them in the promotion of legislation to this end.[80]

The theme of racial purity was present in Wissler's letter reflects the broader anthropological concern about the racial destiny of American Indians. Private and public institutions like the American Museum of National History as well as the Bureau of American Ethnology endeavored throughout the late nineteenth and early twentieth century to document the cultural practices of people who seemed on the verge of extinction as the result of both their biological and cultural assimilation into American society. Thus, not only was Estabrook's research promising for what it might reveal about the effects of racial mixture on cultural survival. If assimilation was indeed eroding the biological and cultural distinctiveness of native peoples residing in the eastern U.S., then Estabrook's research presented the fortuitous opportunity to preserve those cultural practices that did exist before they disappeared completely.

Estabrook stressed the need for racial purity to A.F. Corbin, a trustee of the Croatan Normal School at Pembroke, a post-secondary school established for North Carolina's Indian residents. Calling racial purity the desire of "all real thinking Indians" Estabrook hoped that the

[80] Emphasis in the original. A. Estabrook to A.F. Corbin, June 23, 1924. Box 1, Folder 3; A. Estabrook, "Memorandum Regarding Clark Wissler," July 1, 1924. Box 1, Folder 3. Arthur Estabrook Papers.

school's trustees would allow him to perform mental and physical tests on the students.[81] Thus, Estabrook hoped to establish new standards upon which the "Croatans" could base their decisions regarding the racial purity of their students as native students throughout the U.S. were routinely tasked with establishing their Indian blood within a certain fraction in order to be eligible to attend Indian schools. Unfortunately for Estabrook, the trustees of the Pembroke School proved perhaps a little too concerned with racial purity. They put an early stop to his investigations citing concerns that he might select less-than- "typical" individuals as a representative of Pembroke students. Nevertheless, the reports he gathered on the triple mixtures made Estabrook the first to study tri-racial mixtures as a unique phenomenon of the Eastern United States. Additionally, Estabrook's descriptions of rampant drunkenness, immorality, and inbreeding within these communities helped construct how future researchers viewed tri-racial peoples.

The Last Stand: Attempts to Adjust the RIA

After the release of *Mongrel Virginians* Powell, Plecker and Cox kicked their racial integrity campaign into high gear. To bring attention to the rampant miscegenation believed to have taken place in the state Powell published a series of articles under the heading, "The Last Stand." Released between February 16 and March 2, 1926, the articles were largely inspired by the premise of Estabrook' and McDougle's study, as Powell wished to bring attention to the geographic location of the state's "mixed-breeds." Powell harkened his fellow Virginians to

[81] Estabrook was clearly trying to appeal to Corbin's racial sentiments, as he knew North Carolina had its own racial integrity measures meant to preserve the purity of the "Croatans" by prohibiting them from marrying blacks.

"awaken from [their] lethargy of pleasure and prosperity!" and to heed the call for "a last stand," or else white civilization would "be swallowed in the quagmire of mongrelization."[82]

Powell intended the "Last Stand" series to garner support for a new amendment to curb the shortcomings of the first RIA. Notably the 1926 amendment redefined as "white" any person, "whose blood is entirely white, having no known, demonstrable or ascertainable admixture of the blood of another race." This particular amendment drew heated opposition from Virginia's leading families. While the bill allowed those unions occurring before 1619 to be exempted the fear was that many of Virginia's most prominent residents, those whose ancestors were Indians or married Indians after 1619, would be reclassified as "colored."[83] The *Richmond News-Leader*, generally an enthusiastic proponent of the ASCOA's goals characterized this new amendment as "the most cruel sort of injustice."[84] In its final form, the 1926 bill extended the timeline for acceptable marriages to any that were officiated before June, 17, 1924 between parties "whose blood admixture does not include other than white and North American Indian blood, and their legal descendants."[85]

If it was Powell's goal to spark discussion on the practice of miscegenation and the extent of mongrelization in Virginia, he succeeded and perhaps too well. As coverage of *Mongrel Virginians* grew, many leading Virginians came to resent the state's newfound notoriety as the home of transgressors of the South's color line. Although there was some support for the bill, many Virginians had grown intolerant of the Anglo-Saxon Clubs' particular brand of vitriolic

[82] John Powell, "The Last Stand," *Richmond-Times Dispatch*, February 16, 1926.

[83] **"**Bill Characterizes F.F.V. as 'Colored'" *Chicago Broad Ax*, February 20, 1926.

[84] "Race Segregation Bill is Opposed," *Richmond News Leader,* February 9, 1926, 1.

[85] Commonwealth of Virginia, *Hose of the General Assembly 1926.*

racism. Powell's "last stand" alienated many Virginia law-makers, including Senator Harry Wickman who voiced his embarrassment over the media's characterization of Virginia "as a state fast becoming mongrelized."[86] Amidst the controversy the Senate voted to postpone the 1926 measure indefinitely.[87] The 1926 measure was the beginning of an uphill battle for Powell and the Anglo-Saxon Clubs. As the state's native and black residents launched more vocal opposition it became harder for Powell and his associates to find supporters willing to abide by the strict color line they wished to establish.

The 1928 meeting of the General Assembly once again brought racial integrity to the fore as the ASCOA proposed yet another new amendment to the RIA. This new bill sought to redefine as "colored" any person with "any ascertainable degree of negro blood."[88] The 1924 Act's definition of "white person" along with a 1910 statute defining "colored" and "Indian" citizens left certain compositions unaccounted for. In particular, the 1924 law created a legal anomaly whereby "certain individuals—notably three-way racial mixed breeds with one-thirty second or less Negro blood, less than one-eighth Indian blood and the rest white"—had no defined racial status in the law.[89] Virginia's tribal communities, who had worked to convince leading Virginians of the merits of their position since the passage of the first integrity measure, organized a strong faction to lobby against the measure. Hill Montague, who testified before the legislature on behalf of the Pamunkey Indians worried that the new law would negatively impact many citizens who would otherwise be considered white. For his part, Plecker accused the

[86] *Ibid.*

[87] "Racial Integrity Bill Reported Out," *Richmond Times-Dispatch*, February 12, 1926, 5.

[88] Commonwealth of Virginia, *Journal of the House of Delegates 1928*, 44,11. While the 1928 law proposed a new definition of the term "colored" it allowed the definition of "Indian" to remain the same as the 1910 bill.
[89] Thomson, "Racism and Racial Classification," 237.

Indians' supporters of engaging in the most dangerous kind of racial betrayal: "Fifty thousand near-white mixed breed are pressing down on the color line and if we let down the bars our civilization is doomed."[90] That some whites had offered the Indians admission to their churches and social circles were signs that white civilization was in danger.

It would be a mistake to see the acceptance of the Indians as a sort of new chapter in the racial egalitarianism of the state. The unions these tribes were able to establish with their white supporters were often buttressed by a mutual animosity toward black Americans. In testimony before the legislature to discuss the impact of the racial integrity measures a member of the Pamunkey tribe referred to black Americans as "dirty negroes," while a Mattaponi man passionately declared that "rather than submit to a negroid classification we would prefer to be banished in the wilds of the forest and there let the wild fowls of the air and the animals of the forest devour our bodies and leave our bones to bleach white in the sun of the Great Spirit."[91] By 1928 lawmakers seemed to be much more sensitive to the negative impact of this law on Virginia's native descended citizens. As a result, the bill stalled. The reticence on the part of the legislature to pass this bill suggests that many white Virginians viewed the racial composition of the state's native population in more positive terms. Their reticence to amend the bills also speaks to the possibility that white Virginians understood that their state's unique history would allow for such sharp racial divisions as could not be made as sharply as the members of the Anglo-Saxon Clubs hoped to enact.

[90] "Racial Integrity Bill Beaten in Senate by Vote 26-13," *Richmond-Times Dispatch*, February 14, 1926, 1-2.

[91] "Editorial," *Richmond Times-Dispatch,* January 31, 1928; "Mattaponi Indian Chief Says Tribe Not Negroid," *Richmond Times-Dispatch*, July 14, 1925, 3.

In 1930, the ASCOA proposed yet another amendment to the RIA. They hoped that with the passage of time, the legislature was now more receptive to establishing a stricter color line. The *Richmond News-Leader* provided a very apt description of the two sides: "In essence the fight was between a small group of poverty ridden people, who honestly believe themselves to be Indians and still a smaller group of part-time ethnologists, who passionately are trying to stem the growing tide of miscegenation in Virginia and the South"[92] The 1930 bill did gain the approval of the legislature, but it was amended so to leave the status of the Mattaponi and Pamunkey Indians unchanged. While Walter Plecker and the members of the Anglo-Saxon Clubs advocated for a biracial society in the end they were forced to settle in some small measure for a tri-partite system.

Conclusion

Although the Powell, Plecker, and Cox were generally successful in reclassifying Virginia's native population, they were not successful in their ultimate goal of establishing a bi-racial system in the state. Despite Virginia's classification, native peoples continued to enter into marriages, raise families, and live identities in direct opposition to the law. It is also important to mention that the ASCOA's reclassification only went as far as Virginia, when Virginia Indians registered for the draft during WWII they were overwhelmingly accepted into the armed forces classed as Native Americans and placed in white or American Indian regiments.

The willingness of Virginia's Indians to formally organize highlights a path taken by many mixed-race natives who used formal incorporation as a means of legitimizing their otherwise marginal identity. Not only did formal incorporation gain tri-racial native peoples the

[92] "Race Integrity Bill Is Passed by Delegates," *Richmond News-Leader*, February 11, 1930, 1.

recognition of ethnologists willing to study their conditions, it allowed the communities a means to formally police their own racial boundaries. It was through their identity as a tribal community and not as individual citizens that racially mixed Indians have been able to advance their own identity claims. This process has not been without its hardships. As the testimony of the various chiefs speaking before Virginia's assembly attest, one's proximity to blackness served as a critical factor in how Native Americans have fashioned their identities.

Chapter 4

MAKING INDIANS, RECOVERING HISTORY: SALVAGE ANTHROPOLOGY AMONG EASTERN INDIAN REMNANTS, 1900-1950

This may be the result of the work of our friend, Speck, of the University of Pennsylvania, who created the Rappahannock 'Tribe' and threated to do the same for about a half dozen other groups.

Walter A. Plecker[1]

In the first decades of the twentieth century the Ramapo Indians voiced for the first time a public claim that they were neither white nor black, but Native American. The Ramapo, along with numerous Indian communities including the Nanticoke, "Wesorts," and "Amherst—many of which had previously existed in relative isolation—sought cultural as well as legal recognition as distinct populations each with its own specific culture, heritage, and importantly, its own racial identity. The dominant U.S. understanding of race as a binary, however, circumscribed American Indian projects of racial formation. Because black Americans had long been relegated to the bottom of America's racial caste system, American Indians had to create a new vision of identity that was not only recognizably "Indian," but also noticeably *not* black. Thus, the history of Native American identity projects has been deeply intertwined with the history of blackness in the United States.

Avowing a distinct racial identity was one of several strategies deployed by American Indians living in the eastern and southern U.S. who wished to establish a separate racial status. Communities also sought to enshrine their identity by creating separate religious and educational institutions, establishing land bases, and by securing public recognition as Indians. Some

[1] Walter Plecker to John Powell, June 7, 1933. Box 41, Folder 55, John Powell Papers, Special Collections, University of Virginia Library, Charlottesville.

scholars have described these efforts as ethnogenesis or even as ethnoregenesis. The former refers to the historical emergence of people who defined themselves by their sociocultural and linguistic heritage while the latter refers to efforts to revive a previously dormant ethnic identity.[2] Although eastern Indians' various identity projects could be described as acts of ethnogenesis or ethnoregenesis, the terms themselves have often been used to cast aspersions on the "genuineness" of their efforts and the "authenticity" of their identity. The terminology one uses to describe the collective actions taken by native-descended people to establish a separate identity is not merely a matter of semantics. Terms like ethnogenesis and ethnoregenesis, each of which presumes some yardstick by which to measure, even adjudicate, Indian identity, call up particular notions of the "authentic" and "inauthentic. Alternatively, one could refer to Native American identity projects as "strategies of survival," a term which better reflects the continuity of collective identity that has been documented among the eastern remnant Indians.[3] Yet, each of the aforementioned terms—ethnogenesis, ethnoregenesis, and strategies of survival—highlights a crucial dimension of American Indian identity projects. Here I employ all three terms to showcase the ways in which identity formation for the Ramapo, Nanticoke, "Wesorts," and

[2] Jonathan D. Hill, "Introduction: Ethnogenesis in the Americas, 1942-1992," in *History, Power, Identity: Ethnogenesis in the Americas, 1492-1992*, ed. Jonathan D. Hill (Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 1996), 1; Lester Singer was the first to introduce the term enthogenesis in his study of African American ethnic development. Lester Singer, "Ethnogenesis and Negro Americans Today," *Social Research* 29, no.4 (1962): 419-432. In 1971, William Sturtevant introduced the concept to the anthropological study of Native Americans in his treatment of the Seminole Indian's cultural development. William Sturtevant, "Creek into Seminole," in *North American Indians in Historical Context*, ed. Eleanor Burke Leacock and Nancy Oestreich Lurie (New York: Random House, 1971), 91-128. For a definition of ethnoregenesis see, Jan Åke Alversson, "The Process of Ethno(re)genesis among the Weehayak of the Gran Chaco" *Revista del CESLA* 10 (2007): 139-156. For an example of scholarship that explores the process of ethnoregenesis among a eastern remnant tribe See, Helen C. Rountree, The Ethnoregenesis of a Virginia Indian Tribe: The Nansemond Indians Tribal Association (Norfolk: Helen C. Rountree, 1987).

[3] The phrase strategies of survival drawn from Frank W. Porter's path-breaking work on the survival strategies of eastern Indians. See, Frank W. Porter, Strategies for Survival: American Indians in the Eastern United States (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1986).

Amherst, among others, was a historically situated process that depended simultaneously on cultural development [genesis], and renewal [regenesis], and survival [strategy].

Whatever terminology one uses to describe the processes of identity formation, Native American identity projects cannot be understood outside of processes of racialization. Michael Omi and Howard Winant describe racialization as a historically situated process whereby individuals and groups are assigned racial identities for the purposes of social differentiation and stratification.[4] In America, as in other parts of the West, racialization has served to enforce white hegemonic power by rooting political, social, and economic privileges in race. Through the process of racialization Native Americans' various cultural identities were recast in racial terms and placed within a stratified and largely binary system in which social position and identity were dependent upon their distance from blackness.[5] Many native-descended peoples, however, had a history of marital unions with black Americans. To forge a public identity as a people free from black admixture while simultaneously navigating life within communities in which their neighbors and relatives were visibly black was, as we will see, was an exceedingly difficult task.

If the history of American Indian identity projects was intertwined with the history of blackness and racialization in the U.S., it must also be understood in relation to the history of social science. Anthropologists in particular, including Frank Speck and James Mooney among others, played a crucial role in American Indians' efforts to be recognized as a distinct racial group. Anthropologists' various methods to decipher, represent, and advocate for Native American racial identity, as we will see, had tremendous consequences for communities like the

[4] Michael Omi and Howard Winant, *Racial Formation in the United States* (New York: Routledge, 2015), 7.

[5] Laura Kathryn Ferguson, "Indian Blood or Life Blood: An Analysis of the Racialization of Native North American Peoples," (M.A. thesis, Montana State University, 2005), 24. Accessed May 7, 2016, ProQuest Dissertation and Theses.

Nanticoke. Indeed, present-day critics of anthropologists like Speck and his contemporaries have gone so far as to claim that social scientists did not merely represent Indian identity—they *created* it.[6] Anthropologists and other influential white outsiders were an important source of legitimization for the identity claims of native-descended people residing in the eastern and southern U.S.

This chapter explores the various strategies of survival and ethnic renewal undertaken by the Ramapo, "Wesort," Amherst, and Nanticoke Indians during the first half of the twentieth century. It examines too, the role that social scientists and white outsiders played in the formation of Native American identities. Indian identity claims, of course, existed long before white anthropologists interest in them. Cooperating with, even capitalizing on, anthropologists like Frank Speck can in this way be seen as one of several strategies deployed by the Indians in order to buttress their identity claims. Native communities like the Nanticoke deployed history, land claims, cultural heritage, and relationships with anthropologist allies as strategies through which to assert their own vision of Native American identity. Enlisting anthropologists as allies was for some Indians a strategy in and of itself.

This chapter demonstrates that groups like the Nanticoke used anthropologists to further their own ends and were, in this way, vital participants in their own identity formation. Beginning with an examination of the earliest efforts of eastern groups to establish their own church and school institutions during the early twentieth century, the chapter goes on to trace the different strategies of survival deployed by the Ramapo, Amherst, "Wesorts," and Nanticoke Indians in order to preserve their separate racial status as a people who were neither black nor

[6] Lee Baker, *Anthropology and the Racial Politics of Culture* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2010), 15.

white. Although some Indian identity projects were more successful than others, examining the survival strategies each employed and the challenges posed to them tells us much about the ways Indian racial identity was constructed, contested, negotiated, and sometimes even created.

Early Efforts at Identity Maintenance

Gaining public acceptance as racially "Indian," was a challenging task for those remnant populations residing in the eastern and southern U.S. The task proved especially difficult for those communities without a history of formal land treaties with the federal government or a centralized land base. Some tribes had lost many of their cultural practice and indigenous languages, which added to the tenuousness—at least in the eyes of white officials—of their identity claims. White elites tasked with judging the cultural authenticity of these Indian communities often held notions of Indianess that were based on old stereotypes of the "noble savage." Despite the racial and cultural diversity of Native America, white conceptions of "the Indian," as historian Richard Berkhofer Jr. has shown, recognized Indians only as a single entity.[7] For American Indians, especially those whose racial ancestry had been called into question, a community's public performance of Indianess had to contend not only with America's caste system, but also white expectations. Indian identity projects, in other words, were forced to contend with what it meant to be black in American in the early twentieth century, as well as with what it meant to be Indian.

The creation of separate educational and religious institutions, was and continues to be, an important aspect of identity development for native-descended peoples in the eastern U.S. For a people whose racial identity was constantly open to question, separate institutions provided

[7] Robert F. Berkhofer Jr. *The White Man's Indian: Images of the American Indian from Columbus to the Present* (New York: Vintage Books, 1978), 3.

native communities a respite from the racial interrogations and negotiations that characterized many of their encounters outside their communities. As compulsory education grew in the United States during the twentieth century schools became an important site of racial negotiations. One's attendance as at an all-white school functioned as defacto verification of one's whiteness. Enrollment in a school designated specifically for black Americans similarly served as prima facie evidence of one's blackness. For native-descended people with multiracial ancestry, separate educational institutions helped to facilitate group consciousness and promote pride in one's native ancestry, but also created cleavages within these multiracial communities.[8]

Religion also served as an important source of group cohesion for eastern native communities, particularly when an Indian community's religious denomination diverged sharply from that of their black and white neighbors. For instance, conversion to Mormonism helped to distance the Catawba Indians of North Carolina from surrounding black and white families. After the first Catawba converts were baptized in the 1880s, most of the group followed suit. That the Mormons considered the Catawba, indeed all Native Americans, to be among God's chosen peoples also likely helped attract Catawba converts who saw religion as a way to affirm their native identity.[9] The history of Mormonism among the Catawba thus highlights the important role that missionaries and church institutions played in facilitating the identity formation of eastern Indians. Not only did missionaries and church leaders take seriously their congregants' Indian identity, they also provided a public endorsement of that identity. For the eastern indian

[8] Theda Purdue and Michael Green have argued that separate education facilities were so important to the group consciousness of southeastern Indians that after these schools were desegregated in the 1960s, students turned to Pan-Indian activism and other forms of collective organizing in order to fill the gap left after the school closures. Theda Purdue and Michael Green eds., *The Columbia Guide to American Indians in the Southeast* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2001), 140.

[9] James H. Merrell, "The Racial Education of the Catawba Indians," *The Journal of Southern History* 50 (1984): 383.

remnants, the majority whom joined Protestant denominations, Christian missionaries similarly performed the important work of helping to facilitate group cohesion and racial pride.

The establishment of an Episcopal mission among the Indians in Amherst County greatly aided in the development of their group consciousness. Although they established their own church in the mid-nineteenth century, the Amherst Indians did not have a separate school facility prior to the founding of the Episcopal mission. The community largely relied on traveling preachers for whatever formal education and religious instruction they received. Denied access to white schools, and unwilling to send Amherst children to the county-supported schools for blacks, the Amherst had few educational prospects prior to the twentieth century. In 1908, the church dispatched Rev. Arthur Gray II to Bear Mountain with instructions to build a school to educate Indian children. Gray, a Virginia blue-blood, used his connections to procure a tract of land and donations totaling fifteen hundred dollars for the building of a two-room school and a new church facility. Gray also secured funds from the southwestern diocese of the Episcopal Church for the employment of a teacher and a deaconess.[10] The Amherst Indians welcomed the new mission and collected three hundred and fifty dollars to go towards the building fund.[11] Although Gray left the mission in 1910, both the school and church continued thanks to funding provided by the county, the southwestern Episcopal diocese, and Sweet Briar College.[12]

The presence of the mission legitimized the Amherst Indians' existence and helped to establish a better public perception of their community. Surrounding white outsiders viewed the

[10] Arthur P. Gray II, "Mission Work Among Some Cherokee Remnants in Virginia," *Diocesan Journal*, (Sept.-Oct. 1908), St. Paul's Mission Folder, Monacan Tribal Museum, Bear Mountain.

[11] "50th Anniversary of St. Paul's Mission," *Amherst New Era Progress*, October 16, 1958.

[12] Peter W. Houck and Mintcy D. Maxham, *Indian Island in Amherst County* (Lynchburg: Warwick House Publishing, 1993), 104. Sweet Briar donated the funds in 1916 for the building of a log cabin that would house the deaconesses on assignment at the mission.

multiracial Amherst as an embodiment of the harmful consequences brought on by racial mixture. Given the Amherst Indians' new access to formal religious and scholastic education, however, Gray and other mission workers held higher regard for the Amherst Indians' moral and intellectual capacities. Whereas Estabrook and McDougle characterized the Amherst people as inferior "mongrels," Gray described his charges as "intelligent and anxious to learn."[13] The mission also provided the Amherst Indians access to goods and services that would have otherwise been out of reach to the isolated people. Missionaries established a thrift shop, which allowed community members to purchase clothing and other goods at an affordable price. The diocese even paid for one the deaconesses to receive training as a nurse so she could provide medical care to the Amherst people.[14] There are no letters that explain why the deaconess decided to pursue medical training. It is likely, however, that the Amherst lacked access to medical care due to their geographic isolation, and that the deaconess hoped to remedy that problem. In addition to issues of geography, the Amherst Indians were also likely denied admittance into nearby white-only health facilities on account of their status as mixed-race. Given that hospitals were segregated, the Indians likely welcomed the deaconess' medical aid because it provided them not only with improved access to healthcare, but also an alternative to seeking treatment at black hospitals.

Yet, for all the good that the Episcopal mission brought to the Amherst Indians, the mission's presence may have also circumscribed their identity formation and survival strategies in important ways. For instance, how did the presence of an Indian mission influence the community belonging of persons who looked less demonstrably "Indian"? And what role, if any,

[13] Arthur H. Estabrook and Ivan E. McDougle, *Mongrel Virginians: The Win Tribe* (Baltimore: The Williams & Wilkins Co., 1926), 1; Arthur P Gray II, "A Virginia Tribe of Indians," *The Southern Churchman*, (1908): 6-7.

[14] Houck and Maxham, *Indian Island*, 112.

did the Episcopal Church take in maintaining racial boundaries? Observations from Rev. Gray's first year at the mission suggests tht tensions between darker and lighter skinned residents were present prior to the mission's founding: "Those who have the most Negro blood and least Indian," he claimed, "are not in the same social standing as others."[15] The racial stratification that Gray observed only seemed to worsen after the passage of the Racial Integrity Act and the publication of *Mongrel Virginians* in 1926. Racial tensions within the community reached such a boiling point that in the 1940s the Presbyterian Church established a separate school for the Indians "with more Negroid appearances" in the adjacent town of Pedlar Mills.[16] Many Amherst residents found the racial strife too much to bear and chose to leave the state rather than continue living under Virginia's racial regime. Between 1917 and 1945 twenty-four families left the Bear Mountain area of Amherst County; by 1946 only 570 people remained.[17] By 1948 that number shrank further to 326 people. The majority of the families who relocated moved to other eastern states like Maryland, New Jersey, and Tennessee.[18]

Very close to the time that the Amherst Indians established their mission, the Ramapo Indians of New York also established a church and school of their own with the help of the Presbyterian Church. Rev. Francis Wheaton started a mission school to serve the mountain Indians in 1901. Unlike the Amherst Indians, who were and continue to remain situated around Bear Mountain, the Ramapo people had already began to move out of the Stag Hill area of the

[15] Gray, "Mission Work Among Some Cherokee Remnants," 1.

[16] Houck and Maxham, *Indian Island*, 85-86.

[17] Melanie Hamies-Bartlof, "Policies and Attitudes: Public Education and the Monacan Indian Community in Amherst County Virginia, from 1908 to 1965," (Ph.D. diss, Virginia Commonwealth University, 2004), 97. Accessed April 15, 2016 ProQuest Theses and Dissertations

[18] Karenne Woods and Diane Shields, *The Monacan Indians: Our Story* (Amherst: Monacan Indian Nation Office of Historical Research, 1999), 30.

community into the surrounding towns of Suffren and Hillburn, New York. Mobility as well as changes in the tribe's demography greatly hindered the development of group solidarity and organization among the Ramapo. As families relocated to towns like Suffren, they were integrated into other church and school communities. Although some families remained at the mission, many Ramapo families attended the local Episcopal Churches, including the African Methodist Episcopal Church.[19] Changing church and social alliances created cleavages within the Ramapo community that undermined their ability to collectively organize or to gain public acceptance as Indians. More culturally and geographically dispersed than communities like the Amherst, the Ramapo started to revive aspects of their aboriginal culture decades later than many other Indian communities. The Ramapo illustrate how important a centralized land base was to the development of group cohesion and the maintenance of social barriers. Not until the 1980s did the Ramapo begin to collectively organize in the hopes of gaining public acceptance as Indians.

Securing separate religious and educational institutions, however, was not the only means of developing community cohesion. The Wesorts of Maryland lacked separate schools and churches. They nevertheless insisted on holding themselves apart as a separate racial group. Members of the Catholic Church, the Wesorts had historically attended St. Ignatius Church located in Charles County, Maryland. St. Ignatius, although open to all races, partitioned the space of the church in order to accommodate the three racial groups that comprised its congregation: whites, blacks, and Indians. Whites sat in main body at the front of the church while the Indians sat behind them. Meanwhile, the pews aligning the sides of church were

[19] David Cohen, *The Ramapo Mountain People* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1986), 165.

reserved for St. Ignatius' black congregants. Whites and Indians also used a separate entrance that was at the front of the church.[20]

The state of Maryland neither established nor funded separate educational facilities for its Indian citizens. "Wesort" children therefore had to attend segregated schools reserved for black children, or attend no school at all. With the exception of Turkey Tayac, a noted Indian activist and leader among the Wesorts who attended the Carlisle Indian School in Pennsylvania, most Wesorts attended schools designated for blacks.[21] Even without the benefit of formal institutions, however, the Wesorts' still negotiated their racial status in relation to their black neighbors. An anthropologist investigating the social caste of the Wesorts during the 1940s reported the following: "They will not eat with them at the same table, or sleep at their homes, or permit Negroes to attend their dances. Yet, they seem to regard it as proper to appear at Negro recreational affairs such as picnics and outings, participating in a kind of standoffish way."[22] Wesorts appeared willing to coexist and engage with black neighbors when necessary, according to this anthropologist, but only under particular – and noticeably unequal – circumstances. Whereas some communities, like the Amherst, attempted to affirm their native identity by disassociating with black Americans, the Wesorts used their association with blacks to establish a separate caste for themselves. While it is not clear whether their white or black neighbors recognized them as Indians, the Wesorts did achieve at least nominal recognition as a distinct class within Maryland's racial caste system.

---

[20] William Harlan Gilbert "The Wesorts of Maryland: An Outcasted Group," *Journal of the Washington Academy of Sciences* 35 No. 8 (1945): 245.

[21] Gabrielle Tayac, "'To Speak With One Voice': Supra-tribal American Indian Collective Identity Incorporation Among the Piscataway, 1500-1998," (Ph.D. diss, Harvard University, 1999). Accessed May 22, 2016 ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global 9935915.

[22] Gilbert, "The Wesorts of Maryland," 245.

Together, these early efforts to form and maintain an Indian racial identity showcase the range of resources utilized by eastern remnant populations in their quest to gain public acceptance as Indians. The experiences of these multiracial communities in both the North and the South illustrate that America's racial system – even if lacking formal categories by which to recognize multiracial individuals – was capable of incorporating multiracial Indians into the existing racial hierarchy. Despite living in a social system that formally recognized only two races, multiracial Indians created a racial identity that was neither white nor black. In so doing, they continually challenged – and often disproved – the legitimacy of an imagined racial binary. And yet, some Indian communities' efforts to establish a racial identity between whiteness and blackness often relied on, and indeed reinforced, deeply racist conceptions of an inferior black other. Ultimately, American Indians' ability to gain recognition from whites relied on the degree to which they could be incorporated into the existing system of racial hierarchy *without* challenging its underlying logic or structures of power.

Salvage Anthropology Among Eastern Indians

American Indians residing in the eastern U.S. in the first decades of the twentieth century worked both individually and collectively to elicit the approval and acceptance of their white neighbors. Some Indian communities even enlisted the aid of white outsiders, namely anthropologists, in their efforts to create and legitimize their racial identity. Frank Speck, an anthropologist and faculty member at the University of Pennsylvania, for example, served as an important source of legitimization for the identity claims of native-descended people.[23] Speck

[23] Speck received his Master's degree from Columbia University in 1905 where he worked under the direction of Franz Boas. Although Speck would retain his advisor he went out to complete his Ph.D. at the University of Pennsylvania where he finished in 1908. Speck gained his training as a linguist and conducted his dissertation fieldwork in Oklahoma where he recorded the languages of the Yuchi Creek, Chickasaw, and Osage tribes. William H. Fenton, "Frank G. Speck's Anthropology," in *The Life and Times of Frank G. Speck, 1881-1950*, Roy Blankenship ed. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Department of Anthropology, 1991), 9.

was a major supporter of ethnogenesis among the eastern Indians. In contrast to the many whites who believed that Indians no longer resided in the eastern U.S., Speck held firm to the belief that these groups not only persisted, but that they had also retained aspects of their aboriginal culture.

Frank Speck devoted his career to studying as well as facilitating the ethnogenesis and cultural survival of his subjects. During his fieldwork among the Powhatan-descended Indians of Virginia, which he began in 1919, Speck became very involved in their efforts to develop a cultural identity as Indians. Speck increased his support of their ethnic renewal especially after the passage of Virginia's Racial Integrity Act (RIA) in 1924. He encouraged various communities to organize as tribal entities, and helped them collect affidavits from white neighbors attesting to their public acceptance as Indians. He personally provided dance and language instruction to his research subjects, and also routinely invited reservation Indians residing in the West to travel to eastern communities to teach the members traditional crafts. Through language, dance, and arts, Speck's efforts to rebuild Indian culture in Virginia were inspired by traditional ideas of what it meant to be "Indian."

A vocal advocate for Virginian Indian communities, Speck and his version of ethnogensis had critics. Walter Plecker, who abhorred Virginia's Indian population for their supposed racial transgressions, namely racial admixture, reserved some of his harshest criticisms for Speck. Plecker considered Speck an outsider (a non-Southerner and non-Virginian) whose commitment to highlighting the Indians' cultural persistence sat counter to Plecker's own claims that Virginia lacked both an ethnically and racially recognizable Indian population. Walter Plecker also condemned Speck's interventionist approach to anthropology and accused Speck of manufacturing the very cultural persistence he claimed to document. Indeed, Plecker accused

Speck of participating in "pseudo-science," designed to manufacture Indians by fabricating their history and culture.[24]

Plecker was not the only voice critical of Frank Speck and the ethics of his advocacy anthropology. Numerous anthropologists and historians of anthropology have maligned Speck's decision to privilege cultural persistence while ignoring the process of acculturation in the historical development of eastern Indian populations.[25] In a related critique, historian Arica Coleman has accused Speck of obfuscating the black admixture of his subjects in order to render an image of American Indian identity palatable to white elites.[26] Furthermore, Coleman has attributed the Virginia Indians' anti-black animus to Speck's encouragement that they establish a critical distance between themselves and all associations with blackness.[27] On the other hand, there remains a vocal contingent of scholars who have posited Speck's advocacy on behalf of the Virginia Indians and other groups as proof that "anthropology has also sometimes benefitted the people we work with."[28]

---

[24] Plecker had such strong feelings about the threat posed by Speck's "bad" science that he attempted to have his 1925 study on the Rappahannock Indians banned in the state of Virginia. W. A. Plecker to John Powell, April 27, 1925. Box, 41, Folder, 41, John Powell Papers.

[25] George L. Hicks and Frank Speck, "Cultural Persistence versus Local Adaptation: Frank G. Speck's Catawba Indians," *Ethnohistory* 12 (1965): 343-354.

[26] Arica Coleman, *That the Blood Stay Pure: African Americans, Native Americans, and the Predicament of Race and Identity in Virginia* (Bloomington: Indian University Press, 2013), 131.

[27] Ibid., 124-125.

[28] Frederic Gleach, "Anthropological Professionalization and the Virginia Indians at the Turn of the Century" *American Anthropologist* 104(Jun 2002): 500. For other examples of authors championing Speck's advocacy among the Virginia Indians see also, Samuel R. Cook, "Anthropological Advocacy in Historical Perspective: The Case of Anthropologists and Virginia Indians," *Human Organization* 62 (2003): 191-20; Helen C. Rountree, *Pocahontas' People: The Powhatan Indians of Virginia through Four Centuries* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1990), 215. Although Rountree acknowledged that, "[Speck] came to Virginia with the intention already formed of organizing into tribes any 'Indian" groups he found, rather than observing them at length and collecting documents about them before acting," she nevertheless celebrates Speck as important champion of the Powhatan's cause.

Although treatments of Speck have explored important questions about the ethical implications of interventionist anthropology, they have not fully acknowledged the role that the presumed subjects of research – in this case American Indians - played in their own ethnic renewal and identity formation. Focusing on the researcher rather than the researched, in other words, existing literature has failed to appreciate the ways in which anthropological studies required the cooperation and investment of both parties. Additionally, focusing too narrowly on Speck risks ignoring the revitalization efforts and survival practices of communities with which he was not affiliated. Speck chose not to work on behalf of the Amherst Indians of Virginia or the Ramapo Indians of New York, despite publishing a study on the latter group. Speck's advocacy was a key factor in the success of Indian identity projects but, as we will see, not one that all communities could enjoy.

Additionally, by placing Native Americans' anti-black animus squarely at the feet of advising anthropologists, we risk treating racist ideology as a tactic thrust upon these communities from the outside, rather than a position chosen, adopted, and mobilized from within. Apologist explanations for Indians' anti-black animus both under acknowledge the proliferation of racist attitudes that have cast black Americans as inferior, which existed among Indians as well as whites. By the time Speck began his ethnographic fieldwork in 1919, eastern remnant populations had decades of experience negotiating their racial position vis-à-vis their black and white neighbors. Apologist explanations, moreover, minimize the agency of Indian research subjects as individuals and communities capable of forming (and therefore answering for) their own racial ideologies.[29]

[29] And yet, those scholars who have considered the impact of Speck's research have not fully reckoned with Speck's role in the Indian identity formation beyond his role in reinforcing their social and biological distance from

Frank Speck was known for his work among eastern native communities but was particularly interested in the descendants of the Eastern Woodland Indians. Speck published 247 papers on the subject of cultural persistence among the Eastern Woodland Indians, a significant portion of which address his research among communities with presumed tri-racial identity.[30] Speck is still today considered a pioneering anthropologist because of the attention he brought to the lived experiences of native-descended peoples in the eastern U.S. at a time when most scholars had turned their gaze to the study of indigenous populations abroad. Speck's fieldwork demonstrated the presence of Indian descendants in the eastern and southern U.S., as well as the fact that the rapid social change taking place among these communities called for prompt action on the part "of field-working ethnologists who know the living groups better than those who wrote their pre-mortem obituaries!"[31] In addition to his work among the Powhatan Indians, which was treated in the previous chapter, Speck also performed ethnographic studies on the Catawba and Lumbee Indians of North Carolina, the Nanticoke Indians of Delaware, the Ramapo Indians of New Jersey, the Houma Indians of Louisiana, the Poarch Band of Creek Indians in Alabama, and the Piscataway Indians of Maryland.[32] Although the term did not appear in Speck's writing until much later in his career, his methodological approach might best be

---

blackness. In Arica's Coleman's examination of Speck's advocacy on behalf of the Virginia Indians she has rightly charged him crafting an image of Virginia Indians that defined by the absence of blackness. Coleman provides an important frame of analysis for anthropological work and as such this section seeks to build upon her argument by considering how Speck advanced ideas about racial *and* cultural authenticity through is research and advocacy among eastern Indian communities. Coleman, *That the Blood Stay Pure*, 45.

[30] Ralph W. Dexter "Contributions of Frank G. Speck (1881-1950) to Ethnobiology," *Journal of Ethnobiology* 4 (1984): 171.

[31] Frank Speck, "Reflections Upon the Past and Present of the Massachusetts Indians," *Bulletin of the Massachusetts Archaeological Society* 4 (1943): 33.

[32] For some representative texts see, Frank G. Speck, "Remnants of the Machapunga Indians," *American Anthropologist* 18 (1916): 271-276; "The Ethnic Position of the Southeastern Algonquian," *American Anthropologist* 26 (1924): 184-200; "The Catawba Nation and Its Neighbors," *The North Carolina Historical Review* 16 (1939): 404-417; and "The Road to Disappearance: Creek Indians Surviving in Alabama, A Mixed Culture Community," *American Anthropologist* 51 (1949): 681-682.

described as ethnohistory.[33] Speck's methodological approach considered the historical record alongside first hand observations, and also privileged detailed observations of American Indian culture based on long intimate residence among his informants. In his work among eastern Indian groups, Speck was particularly interested in charting the course of cultural change over time. Through first-hand observation he sought to understand which aboriginal traits survived, which had changed, and which were lost.

Through his careful preservation of Indian culture and artifacts Speck became one of the most well-known practitioners of salvage anthropology. Salvage anthropology as far, as it pertained to eastern remnant populations, was virtually non-existent before Speck and his predecessor James Mooney began their research among some Algonquian-speaking groups in the early twentieth century. Most of the salvaging efforts prior to that point were concerned primarily on tribes that resided on federally recognized lands in the western United Sates. Developed under the direction of John Wesley Powell of the Bureau of American Ethnology, salvage anthropology involved the preservation of rituals, language, and artifacts of cultures facing extinction as a result of modernization or dislocation.[34] Initially salvage anthropology was little more than the collection of data and artifacts to be stored in the repositories of American museums. Eventually, however, researchers began to produce studies on the social condition of various Indian tribes; their goal was to determine how social change had affected the preservation of indigenous identity. Unfortunately, researchers showed little interest in trying to

[33] A. Irving Hallowell, "Frank Gouldsmith Speck, 1881-1950," *American Anthropologist* 53 (1951): 68.

[34]Originally salvage anthropology was a method to preserve archaeology artifacts in the face of geological change. Eventually historians of anthropology began consider the ways in which early anthropological studies of Native Americans flowed from a similar philosophical tradition. See James J. Hester, "Pioneer Methods in Salvage Anthropology," A*nthropological Quarterly,* 41 (July 1968): 132; Frederic Gleach, "Anthropological Professionalization and the Virginia Indians at the Turn of the Century" *American Anthropologist* 104 (Jun. 2002): 500.

understand Indian communities on their own terms as persons attempting to grapple with the effects of industrial capitalism and urbanization. Instead their work privileged the romanticized vision of the "noble savage" as the baseline by which to judge present-day conditions. The overall result was a depiction of Indian communities that spoke more closely to an imagined past than to the contemporary moment.[35]

Frank Speck's Search for "Real" Indians

Speck was one of the first anthropologists studying eastern and southern American Indians to play an active role in the processes of cultural change among his research subjects. Speck's advocacy anthropology, also sometimes called participant intervention, marked a sharp departure from traditional anthropology, which insisted on maintaining professional distance. Allan Holmberg describes participant intervention as the process in which the investigator's very presence influences the process he is studying. More specifically, participant intervention requires that the investigator assist the community in developing itself while at the same time studying the process of development as it takes place.[36] According to Anthony Wallace, one of Speck's graduate students who often accompanied him on research trips, Speck's research "contributed indirectly to the goal of re-creating an Indian ethnic identity, by recapturing information about aboriginal culture from the observation of contemporary practice."[37] Participant observation suggested that strict professional distance was not only unnecessary; it was also impossible.

---

[35] Sherry Smith, *Reimagining Indians: Native Americans Through Anglo Eyes, 1880-1940* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 8.

[36] Allan R. Holmberg, "Participant Intervention in the Field," *Human Organization* 14 (1955): 23-26.

[37] Anthony F.C. Wallace "A Field Trip to Indian River" in "Unforgettable Frank Speck" in *The Life and Times of Frank G. Speck, 1881-1950*, Roy Blankenship ed. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Department of Anthropology, 1991), 86.

As an anthropologist interested in locating moments of cultural persistence, and as someone who admittedly helped to nurture that persistence, Frank Speck provides a window into how scientific authority functions in the determination of what is "authentic." Through his attention to salvaging languages and cultural practices, as well as through his focus on racial purity, Speck used the perceived objectivity of science to give credence to the idea that genuine Indian identity could only be constituted through language, culture, and race. This meant that those who fell inside the bounds of Speck's conception of Indianess gained an influential advocate who could validate scientifically their identity claims. Those who fell outside the boundaries of Indianess as Speck defined it were, by contrast, determined not "real" Indians.

Two studies authored by Speck in particular, one on the Ramapo and one on the Nanticoke, shed light on how ideas about race, culture, and authenticity influenced his research on Indian remnants. The first study examined the Jackson Whites of the Ramapo Mountains, which Speck detailed in a 1911 article for the *Southern Workman*. Speck suggested that the Ramapo were descendants of eastern Algonquians and Tuscarora Indians who probably traveled through the Ramapo Mountains on their way to the Carolinas during the eighteenth century. In terms of physical appearances, Speck reported to have found "representatives…of all three elements, ranging from apparent full-blooded Indians through all possible degrees of intermixture."[38] However, "as regards the vestiges of native culture," Speck concluded that the Jackson-Whites were, aside from the few members who made and sold baskets and wooden utensils, culturally "quite barren."[39] Unable to find any evidence of traditional folklore or to locate anyone able to speak an indigenous language, Speck surmised that the "Jackson Whites

[38] Frank Speck, "The Jackson-Whites," *The Southern Workman* (1911): 105.

[39] Ibid.

[had] lost the cultural traits of their ancestors" and as such had been reduced to a mere "imitation of that of white country folk."[40] Ironically, while Speck denied having found any evidence of the Ramapo's cultural persistence, he nevertheless donated several baskets made by the mountain people to the American Museum of Natural History in New York to be showcased as examples of traditional Tuscarora basketry.

Ultimately, however, the Ramapo's lack of a group identity was a stronger factor in Speck's determination of their cultural persistence than their maintenance of any cultural practices. Speck even attributed the "unfruitfulness" of his research to the group's failure to recognize themselves as a collective beyond their direct kinship ties.[41] According to Speck, the "Jackson Whites" only possessed group consciousness in a negative sense. The Jackson Whites, as he observed, "appear to be conscious only that they are looked down upon by their white neighbors."[42] Although group consciousness weighed heavily in Speck's assessment of the Ramapo's Indian identity, his focus on their supposedly criminal nature also suggests that social class and respectability influenced his assessment. Not only did Speck judge the Jackson Whites as having low moral character, he found that: "On the whole one can conclude, unfortunately, that the worst of white social influences which surround them have tended to develop the poorest of the traits inherited from their predecessors." [43] Interestingly, Speck attributed the Ramapo's low social standing to the fact that "schools and churches are practically unknown in their

[40] Speck, "The Jackson Whites," 106.

[41] Ibid.

[42] Ibid, 107.

[43] Ibid., 106.

settlements."[44] Surprisingly, Speck's account contrasted sharply with various other newspaper accounts that praised Rev. Wheaton for his "civilizing" work among the mountain people.[45]

Speck's study had a long lasting affect on the Ramapo people. His claims that the Ramapo people had neither group consciousness nor any surviving culture or language undermined the group's identity claims. In so doing, Speck's assessment placed the Ramapo outside the bounds of supposed authentic Indianness. As a result, they were left to forge their identity without the benefit of his scientific endorsement. Speck's assessment of the Jackson Whites remained unchallenged until the 1980s. Only then did anthropologists begin to seriously reconsider the possibility that the Ramapo people were an Indian remnant and began to facilitate the ethnic-renewal that Speck encouraged among other eastern communities some forty years earlier. Despite these efforts, Speck's early dismissal of the Ramapo's indigenous identity had lasting consequences for the group's formation throughout the twentieth century. In his 1993 decision to deny federal tribal recognition to the present-day Ramapough-Lenape Indians, the Bureau of Indian Affairs cited Speck's study as evidence that the Rampough-Lenape Indians did not meet the principal criteria of federal acknowledgement—continuous existence as a tribal entity.[46]

After completing his fieldwork in the Ramapo Mountains, Speck was inspired to pursue an ethnography of another group of "mixed-blood" Indians, the Nanticoke of Indian River

---

[44] Ibid., 107.

[45] James T. Carter, "Mountain Folk Are Mourning Their Shepherd of the Hills," *Sacramento Bee*, June 25, 1942, 24; "Artist is Divorced at 91; Reclaimed 'Jackson Whites,'" *Omaha World Herald*, August 1, 1939, 5.

[46] Bureau of Indian Affairs, *Index: Part 83 Procedures for establishing that an American Indian Group exists as an Indian Tribe*, http://www.doi.gov/bia/acknowl.html (accessed May 11, 2016); Bureau of Indian Affairs, *Final Determination Against Federal Acknowledgment of the Ramapough Mountain Indians, Inc.,* 61 FR 4476, February 6, 1996.

Hundred, Delaware. Speck began his fieldwork among the Nanticoke in 1912. He developed such a strong bond with his informants that he continued to travel back to Indian River Hundred every winter and spring for well over ten years. During this time Speck published two book-length monographs on the Nanticoke as well as numerous articles detailing their medicinal practices and hunting techniques, as well as aspects of their folklore. His first publication, *The Nanticoke Community of Delaware,* was published in 1915 and introduced the reading public to the Nanticoke people for the first time. The Nanticoke study is especially instructive because it established the cultural criteria Speck would continue to privilege in his authentication of Native American identity.

Although Speck found the Nanticoke to exhibit the same tripartite mixture as the Jackson Whites, he reported to have found among the Nanticoke people more "surviving native characteristics," especially in terms of physical appearance.[47] While noting that the Nanticoke possessed "the physiognomy, color, and hair ranging from the European, the mulatto, and the Indian…" he still found that "even the most negroid of these people is quite different from that of the common Southern Negro type. [The Nanticoke] are much more refined in appearance, with thinned lips and narrower noses."[48] Speck traced these features to probable Moorish ancestors as well as to a small amount of African admixture that likely ceased by the mid-eighteenth century. Perhaps Speck's insistence that the Indians had not experienced recent black admixture accounts for why the photos accompanying his study included mostly light colored people who he described as exhibiting the Nanticoke "type." Besides their physical resemblance

[47] Frank G. Speck, *The Nanticoke Community of Delaware* (New York: Heye Foundation The Museum of the American Indian, 1915), 10; See also Speck, "The Nanticoke Conoy Indians," *Papers of the Historical Society of Delaware* (1927).

[48] Speck, *The Nanticoke Community of Delaware*, 2.

to Indians, Speck noted few surviving cultural traits among the Nanticoke, although he reported hunting practices that were likely inspired by the group's Indian forbearers. Like the Jackson Whites, none of the Nanticoke spoke a native language. Speck was informed that the language had been spoken in the recent past but had died the late nineteenth century along with the oldest member of the community.[49] The strongest factor influencing Speck's depiction of the Nanticoke as "real" Indians, however, was their collective group identity as Indians. Speck described the Nanticoke as a "self-recognized" community with their own schools and churches in addition to "a decidedly endogamous tendency that refuses particularly to recognize marriage with negroes."[50]

Like the groups discussed in the previous section, the Nanticoke were among a contingent of native-descended people who established their own schools and churches in response to the outside threat of being lumped into the black underclass. When the state of Delaware passed "An Act To Tax Colored Persons For the Support of Their Own School," in 1875, the Nanticoke sought to avoid being taxed as "Negroes" by filing for incorporation.[51] After gaining approval in 1881, the group calling themselves the "Incorporated Body" set out to build two schools for the students of Indian River Hundred, both on lands donated by wealthier members of the community.[52] The Warwick and Hollyville schools, built on separate sides of the county, were open to all members of the Nanticoke Community and funded by an assessment placed on each family to provide for building maintenance and the teacher's salary.[53] Yet,

[49] Ibid., 7

[50] Ibid.

[51] Weslager, Delaware's Forgotten Folk, 112.

[52] State Laws of Delaware XVI Part 1 Chapter 369 p. 378

[53] Weslager, Delaware's Forgotten Folk, 117-118.

despite their incorporation and the establishment of a tripartite school system, the state of Delaware did not recognize the Nanticoke as Indians until the twentieth century.[54] Not until 1903 did the Delaware legislature approve a measure proposed by the Nanticoke people called "An Act to Better Establish the Identity of Race of People Known as the Offspring of the Nanticoke Indians," in which the state legally recognized the existence of Indian descended people within its borders.[55] Thus, when Frank Speck made his way to Indian River Hundred, the Nanticoke, like many of the other eastern remnants, had already taken formal steps to gain public recognition as Indians.

Nevertheless, Speck's arrival in Indian River Hundred proved particularly fortuitous for the Nanticoke, who were at the time facing new challenges to their collective identity. Despite the 1881 law that established a tripartite school system, a black teacher was hired to teach at the Warwick School in the 1910s and several black children were enrolled soon after.[56] A group of Nanticoke responded unfavorably to these events and after withdrawing their children from the Warwick school set up a third school in Indian River Hundred that they called the Indian Mission School. Eventually white neighbors started to exert pressure on the Nanticoke to accept classification as "Negroes." Under the direction of William Russell Clark, the de facto leader of the Nanticoke, the group sought Speck's advice for how to protect their racial integrity. Unaware of the formation of the Incorporated Body in the late nineteenth century, Speck advised the Nanticoke to obtain a lawyer and pursue incorporation as an Indian community. In a move to

[54] Prior to the twentieth century, the state only recognized the Nanticoke as "a certain class of colored people" who were not black.

[55] The law reads: "The descendants of the Nanticoke Indians shall hereafter be recognized as such within the State of Delaware." Act of 1903 State Laws of Delaware XXII Chapter 470 p.986

[56] In the intervening years between the 1881 and the beginning of the twentieth century the state of Delaware had taken over the administration of both schools located in Indian River Hundred.

solidify their race consciousness the community applied for incorporation as the Nanticoke Indian Association in February 1922. Unlike the Incorporated Body, the Nanticoke Indian Association was specifically chartered as an Indian tribal group. The association became the sole administrators of the Indian Mission School and used membership fees to support the school and pay the teacher.[57] Although several Nanticoke parents withdrew their children from Warwick, not every parent wanted to assume the fiscal responsibilities that came along with placing their children in the new school. Thus, many families continued to send their children to Warwick, which caused a great divide among members of the Nanticoke community. Speck accused those families who continued to allow their children to attend the now integrated Warwick school of being less proud of their Indian heritage.[58]

The creation of the Nanticoke Indian Association complicated the already delicate state of family and community relations among the Nanticoke people. Attendance in churches and schools became not only a way for the community to establish differences between themselves and outsiders, they also served to differentiate factions within the community, a process that was all the more complicated because the entire community was related by either blood or marital ties. Racial tensions cut across the Nanticoke community when, for example, an elder member of the Indian Association – as the encounter was described by one of Speck's graduate students – who was "violently anti-Negro… had trouble explaining the Negro character of his wife."[59] Individuals who shared these "anti-Negro" sentiments attended separate schools and churches from those who were more open to the idea of associating with blacks. The Indian Association

[57] "Nanticoke Indians, Maryland Tribe, Start Association," *Sun*), December 18, 1921, 6.

[58] Speck, *The Nanticoke Conoy Indians*, 15.

[59] Wallace also described Stewarts son Johnny, who served as the Nanticoke's chief during the 1940s as exhibiting a "Negroid character from his mother, a mulatto." Wallace, "A Field Trip to Indian River," 89.

also established strict criteria for membership in the association in order to more sharply differentiate itself from the more welcoming faction they called the "Harmony people".[60] Whereas early members of the association needed to only proved proof of good moral character, by the 1930s, members applying for admission into the association needed to also provide proof that they possessed "at least two-thirds Indian blood."[61]

Speck, greatly impressed by the fervor with which the Nanticoke defended their racial integrity, spent the 1920s helping the Nanticoke learn more about their history and culture. When the newly formed Indian Association held its first meeting in November of 1922, members invited Speck to give a lecture on Nanticoke history from 1740 to the present.[62] Described as "strongly pro-Indian and against the Negroizing tendency of part of the community," the newly formed association dedicated itself to the promotion of a group consciousness and interest in aboriginal traditions.[63] To facilitate this last initiative the Nanticoke instituted an annual powwow to be celebrated every Thanksgiving. Speck assisted by teaching the Nanticoke dances and songs and helped them in making regionally accurate ceremonial costumes. "There was no intent to hold up these things as direct survivals," according to C.A. Weslager, a Speck confidant and lay-ethnologist who also studied the Nanticoke. Rather, "the purpose was patently to revive the Indian individuality by attaching some aboriginal practices to their once denuded cultural framework."[64]

---

[60] Speck, *The Nanticoke Community*, 9.

[61] Clinton A. Weslager, *Delaware's Forgotten Folk: The Story of the Moors and the Nanticoke* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1943), 101.

[62] Weslager, *Delaware's Forgotten Folk*, 91-92.

[63] Wallace, "A Field Trip to Indian River," 89;

[64] Weslager, Delaware's *Forgotten Folk*, 94.

The powwow became a source of legitimation for the Nanticoke as well as for other eastern communities who were also negotiating a tenuous claim to Indianess. Speck's strategy was not just to revitalize the cultural practices of his research subjects; he also helped to promote Pan-Indian alliances that would reinforce the Indians' shared identity. Speck encouraged the triracial groups to attend one another's events so that they might engage in the exchange of cultural ideas and practices. Nanticoke chief William Russell Clark attended the Chickahominy powwow in1928. The Chickahominy then returned the favor in 1937 when they attended the Nanticoke's powwow along with members of the North Carolina Cherokee, both of whom were groups that Speck was assisting in their ethnic revival.[65] That same year the Nanticoke's chief, Charles Clark, banned those Nanticoke with more visible black ancestry from participating in the powwow. As an act of public presentation intended to affirm the group's Indian identity, powwows, from Clark's point of view, had to be carefully controlled in terms of who could participate and what images would be presented to the public.[66] Although Speck discontinued his work among the Nanticoke Indians in the late 1920s, the Nanticoke continued to hold the annual powwow throughout the 1930s.

The juxtaposition of Speck's Jackson White study with his research and advocacy on behalf of the Nanticoke Indians reveals that race and cultural persistence were not the only factors influencing Speck's assessment of the community identity. Unlike the Ramapo, who Speck accused of lacking a conscious self-identity, the Delaware Nanticoke maintained a strong collective consciousness. The exclusivity maintained by restricting intermarriage with either their white or black neighbors was just one of many barriers set up to protect the group from

[65] "Hundred Indians Expected at 'Pow Wow' in Delaware," May 4, 1937. Box 3, Folder 1, Speck Papers, APS.

[66] Barring Red-Haired Indians from the Pow Wow," *Philadelphia Inquirer* 1937. Box 10, Folder 2, Speck Papers, APS.

outside influence. Thus, social standing, group consciousness, and most importantly a willingness to preserve this group consciousness also powerfully influenced Speck's willingness to advocate on a community's behalf. Speck's research is also instructive for what it reveals about his promotion of "authentic" versus "inauthentic" Indian identity. Although he did not use the terms, Speck's anthropological research established criteria by which social scientists as well as government agencies could determine who qualified as a "real" Indian. Speck determined which cultures were worthy of study and which were not. In so doing, he established the measures by which to bound the parameters of American Indian identity.

Back to Indian River: Clinton A. Weslager Finds Delaware's Forgotten Folk

In the 1940s Speck returned to Indian River Hundred at the invitation of Clinton A. Weslager, a DuPont executive who also dabbled in ethnology and the study of Indian cultural survival, to resume his research on the Nanticoke. Although twenty years had passed since his last visit, Speck found several people who knew of him and his work, as well as the service he had provided for the community. Speck used his return visit to document Nanticoke folk remedies and children's games, neither of which had been previously studied by ethnologists.[67] Speck and Weslager first became acquainted in 1938 when Weslager wrote Speck requesting his assistance in translating Algonquian personal names.[68] Although Weslager began his research, "Purely for personal satisfaction and as a hobby to occupy [his] leisure hour[s]" his interest in

[67] C. A. Weslager's "The Unforgettable Frank Speck," in *The Life and Times of Frank G. Speck, 1881-1950*, Roy Blankenship ed. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Department of Anthropology, 1991), 52-53.

[68] Ibid.

anthropology deepened. Weslager was eventually appointed as president of the Archaeological Society of Delaware.[69]

Weslager invited Speck to accompany him on a research trip to Indian River Hundred and nearby Cheswold County, which was the home of a closely related group of Indians called the Moors. Under Speck's guidance, Weslager undertook a two-year study of the Nanticoke and Moor communities where he documented their social evolution, folk traditions, and plant culture. In 1943, Speck published a book-length study of the Nanticoke and Moor communities entitled *Delaware's Forgotten Folk: The Story of the Moors & Nanticokes*. Speck was greatly influential in getting Weslager's book published. Speck not only instructed the novice ethnologist on how to perform a detailed field study, he also reviewed every chapter of the book. Additionally, Speck introduced Weslager to Phelps Soule, who was then serving as the editor of the University of Pennsylvania Press. As Weslager acknowledged in his book, which he dedicated to Speck in 1943, "It would have been difficult, if not impossible, for a layman to break into print in 1943 under a University of Pennsylvania Press imprint, without the endorsement Speck gave to my manuscript."[70]

Although Weslager was greatly influenced by his mentor, his depiction of the Nanticoke departed from Speck's in several important respects, including the attention Weslager gave to his informants' tri-racial identity. A defining feature of Speck's work among the eastern remnants was his focus on their cultural continuity to the exclusion of any sustained treatment of their racial mixture. When Speck did discuss the racial ancestry of subjects, he did so only briefly before returning to what was for him the more important question of their cultural survival.

---

[69] Weslager, *Delaware's Forgotten Folk*, xi.

[70] Weslager, "The Unforgettable Frank Speck," 63.

Weslager, by contrast, provided a sustained treatment of what he described as the Nanticoke's "struggle to keep their Indian characters intact in the face of the oppositions of whites, blacks, and neighbors."[71] Weslager saw the creation of the Nanticoke Indian Association as a positive step toward changing the group's status as social outcasts. The formation of the Nanticoke Indian Association, he argued, provided the Nanticoke the ability to lay claim to a respectable identity. Although he acknowledged that the Nanticoke had black mixture he, like Speck, insisted that black admixture among the Nanticoke had long ceased. Weslager also addressed the efforts taken by members of the Indian Association to distinguish themselves from their black neighbors. Even still Weslager, who spent the first several pages of the book condemning the racial oppression of black Americans, refused to attribute the Nanticoke's actions to any racial prejudice on their part. Rather he argued that their efforts to separate themselves from their black neighbors was an expression of their pride in their identity, as well as a "natural" response to their fear of being relegated to the Negro's lower social position.[72] Although Speck's field notes confirmed roiling racial tensions within the Nanticoke community, Weslager's study largely ignored the community's internal racial politics. Weslager chose instead to focus on the racial negotiations he witnessed between the Nanticoke and black outsiders. Weslager's disregard for internal racial tension might have been tied to his insistence on downplaying the black ancestry of his research population. The explaining away the Nanticoke's racial prejudice as a "natural" response also set the tone for future anthropological scholarship, which has continued to explain away, indeed apologize for, strong and undeniable anti-black animus among American Indians more generally.

[71] Weslager worked with L.T. Alexander another member of the Archaeological Society to help the Nanticoke's revitalization efforts in the 1940s. Weslager, *Delaware's Forgotten Folk,* 105.

[72] Weslager, *Delaware's Forgotten Folk*, 5-6, 113.

The publication of *Delaware's Forgotten Folk* coincided with growing interest in tri-racial populations. At the same time that Speck and Weslager were describing eastern communities as Indian remnants, a new set of scholars emerged to study tri-racial communities as "racial islands." Those interested in racial islands argued that mixed-blood communities could provide valuable insights into the development of social caste in America. William Harlen Gilbert, who published a memorandum in 1946 on several "mixed-blood racial islands," typified the new line of inquiry emerging in the 1940s. Gilbert was not interested in studying cultural survival among remnants Indians. Instead, he was interested in investigating tribes like the Nanticoke as a mixed-race people whose identity sat somewhere in between blackness and whiteness. Convinced that these racial islands deserved more attention than sociologists and anthropologists had previously given, Gilbert published his 1946 memorandum "in the hope of enlisting the interest of scientific bodies and foundations in the research on these mixed groups."[73]

Perhaps sensing that the tides were turning in terms of the public perception of the remnants, Weslager encouraged the influential Speck to intervene in support of the eastern remnants, as well as to protect their own positions as authorities on the matter. Weslager encouraged his friend to write a detailed study of all the remnant communities stating:

> Write it for the layman. Tell him that Indians are still living in the East. Tell him that you know from experience and observation. Then take him by the hand for a tour of Virginia, the Carolinas, Delaware, Connecticut, Massachusetts, etc., etc. Man! What a job you could do. I urge—yes implore—that you begin this task without delay. You are the only man in the world who can do it, and if you don't, it will never be done. It will be the greatest 'lift' that has ever been given to these remnant groups.

[73] William Harlan Gilbert Jr. "Memorandum Concerning the Characteristics of the Larger Mixed-Blood Racial Islands of the Eastern United States," *Social Forces* 24 (1946): 438-447; 438.

> Call it "The Indian Lives" or something similar, and devote a chapter to each community, using real names and places—and let yourself loose from the inelastic bonds of scientific precision. Write for the man on the street."[74]

Although Speck never followed through on Weslager's suggestion that he pursue a comprehensive study of the eastern Indian remnants, Speck did much to demonstrate that the descendants of American Indians continued to live in the U.S. Unfortunately for Speck and Weslager, however, new interpretations that emphasized their social marginalization as a people without a race had by the late 1940s supplanted the framing of eastern remnants as cultural survivals. Emerging scholars like Gilbert were by the 1940s pushing for a new examination of eastern communities that revealed, even privileged, the racial mixture that the communities had worked so long to conceal.

By 1943, even Weslager was interested in moving beyond a strict focus on cultural survival. Weslager pushed, for example, for a genetic study of microthalmia among the Nanticoke. Understanding the genetics of tri-racial populations – or in Weslager's pejorative terms the "little eye people" – could, he argued, be perhaps "the most important source of data among the group."[75] Despite his earlier objections to the racial island framework, and his explicit encouragement that Speck should counter it, Weslager was by 1945 corresponding with Gilbert to discuss the possibility of planning a symposium that would bring together scholars working on the various "mixed-bloods."[76] Gilbert's interest in eastern Indian communities as laboratories in which to examine racial mixture had succeeded in converting even Weslager, once one of

[74] C.A. Weslager to Frank Speck May 4, 1943. Box 9, Folder 1, Speck Papers, APS.

[75] Ibid.

[76] C.A. Weslager to William H. Gilbert July 21, 1945, Weslager Papers, unprocessed Hockessin Public Library, Delaware.

Gilbert's harshest critics. Gilbert's and Weslager's symposium never came to fruition. Nevertheless, Gilbert's work on racial islands, and to some extent Weslager's, laid the analytical groundwork and established the driving research questions that would continue to be at the center of scholarship on eastern groups throughout the twentieth century.

Anthropologists and Other Friends

Eastern remnant groups, as we have seen, played a central role in forming their own racial and community identities. But many of the most successful Indian identity projects were those in which the community cooperated with anthropologists and other white supporters. Anthropologists and community members often collaborated, for example, in regard to education. Because most of the separate Indian schools did not extend beyond the primary level, Indian children were rarely educated past the seventh or eighth grade. Although states and local counties supported the primary schools, these same bodies proved either unable or unwilling to provide separate Indian high schools. With Speck and Weslager's help, several Nanticoke children were able to attend high school classes at Haskell Institute, an Indian boarding school in Lawrence, Kansas. In order to gain admission to the Haskell Institute an Indian student typically needed to obtain the signature of the Superintendent of the Indian Agency, a field agent, and a social worker. However, because the Nanticoke were not a federally recognized tribal nation, there were no administrators to fulfill such requirements. And yet, because Speck had invited Willard Beatty of the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs to visit Indian River Hundred in the early 1910s, Beatty was aware of the Nanticoke's condition and personally approved the enrollment of several students. Beatty "realize[d] that they are not an organized tribe in our sense of the word," and therefore had no Indian Agency officials. Beatty expressed to Weslager that "in this particular instance" an application singed by the schoolteacher, Beatty,

and Weslager should, he hoped, "be considered adequate." Before he would support any student's application, however, Beatty wanted Weslager's assurance that each student recommend for Haskell "is basically a Indian" and a student who would "profit from enrollment in a Federal Indian vocational school."[77] Outsiders like Weslager and Speck used their position as authorities on Indian identity and enlisted the aid of influential white allies to help Indian students gain educational opportunities that would have otherwise been denied to them.

Particularly in light of the Racial Integrity Act, gaining access to separate educational institutions in Virginia was an especially challenging battle. In 1942, Plecker circulated a racial "hit list" of the names of those persons he suspected of having black ancestry. White Virginians sympathetic to their Indian neighbors shared the list with state's native population who quickly understand what was at stake. With the help of Speck and James Coates, an influential white Virginian, Indians including the Pamunkey began collecting tribal rolls and affidavits from their white neighbors. Coates even convinced the head of Virginia's Medical College to provide a public statement indicating that the school recognized Pamunkey and Mattaponi students as white and admitted them as such.[78]

The racial classification of Indian's had consequences beyond access to education, however. During WWII, for example, numerous communities had to grapple with the effects of racial misclassification in the draft. When the Selective Service began registering men for the draft during WWII, agency officials had the responsibility of assigning each recruit a racial classification. Military classifications, however, only allowed for two racial categories:

[77] Willard W. Beatty to C.A. Weslager July 15, 1949. Weslager also stressed the small matriculation from the Indian Mission School as reason to let the students attend. Basically he argued that the number of kids too small to cause a serious problem.

[78] Rountree, *Pocahontas' People*, 235.

"Negroes" and "Whites." As such, black Americans were the only racial group subject to formal segregation in the military. Anyone who could prove that they were not "Negro" were placed in white units.[79]

The Selective Service left the task of making racial determinations to local draft boards, which in turn adhered to the categories of racial classifications established by the state. State officials and local boards did have some flexibility to determine the criteria by which to determine a man's race. For example, some states defined as black any person with one-sixteenth or more Negro blood; other states set the bar as low as one thirty-second Negro ancestry.[80] In Virginia, under the Racial Integrity Act, a man was classed as "Negro" if he had "any ascertainable amount of Negro blood." One could be classed as "Indian," however, if he had at-least one-fourth Indian blood and "no ascertainable trace" of black ancestry.[81] The State of Virginia also recognized the category of "tribal Indian"—a classification created by a 1930 amendment to the RIA—which applied only to the state's two reservated populations, the Mattaponi and Pamunkey, who were thought to have less than one-sixteenth Negro blood."[82]

Walter Plecker, who was adamant that Virginia Indians be classed as "Negroes," took the draft as an opportunity to expand and enforce his views on Indian racial identity. Plecker informed Selective Service officials that his office had made rigorous efforts to verify – and decidedly reject – Virginia Indians' identity claims, writing:

---

[79] Paul T. Murray, "Who is Indian? Who Is Negro? Virginia Indians in the World War II Draft," *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 95 (1987): 230.

[80] Peggy Pascoe, *What Comes Naturally: Miscegenation Law and the Making of Race in America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010), 148.

[81] Commonwealth of Virginia, *Acts of the General Assembly 1924*, 394, 569-71.

[82] [82] "Race Integrity Bill Is Passed by Delegates," *Richmond News-Leader*, February 11, 1930, 1

> After years of exhaustive research and study we fail to find that there is a native born Indian in the State who is unmixed with Negro blood. Under the Virginia Law we designate anyone as a negro or colored person with any ascertainable degree of negro blood. We classify all native people in Virginia claiming to be Indian as negro.[83]

Soon after the start of the draft, Virginia Indians and their allies began a letter writing campaign to overturn their racial classification. Oliver Adkins, the chief of the Chickahominy tribe, wrote letters to the Selective Service, the War Department, and the White House in which he warned:

> My people are American Indians of the State of Virginia. The youth is called to serve the country, but I am sure they will not go as the Negro race in the United States Army and fight for those who misrepresent our government and take away our rights as American Indian people of this state.[84]

Speck, who sent numerous letters on behalf of draftees from the Chickahominy, Pamunkey, Mattaponi, and Rappahannock tribes, added scientific weight to Adkin's claims by assuring army officials that, according to his research, these Indian men had two-fifths to three-fifths Indian blood. The rest of their ancestry, Speck claimed, "came from past mixing with whites.[85]

With the aid of researchers like Speck and other white allies, the Nanticoke and Virginia Indians appealed their Selective Service classification as black. These appeals moved though state and federal channels and thus provide an abundance of archival materials detailing the Nanticoke and Virginia Indians' efforts to gain official recognition as Indian. There were two cases of Rappahannock Indians, for example, who after refusing to be enlisted as Negroes, were jailed for providing false evidence in a military court case involving racial classification. The court determined that because one man had been classed as a "Negro" in county records and the other man had attended "colored schools and churches," both men's claims that they were not

[83] Walter Plecker to Mills Neal, Feb. 25, 1941. Record Group 147, NARA-Washington, D.C

[84] O Oliver Adkins to the War Department, Aug. 28, 1942.

[85] Frank Speck to Dr. John Collier, Department of Indian Affairs, Feb 13, 1942.

black constituted false evidence. These men were only two of many Nanticoke and Virginia Indians jailed for refusing to be classed as "Negroes." The two men were perhaps luckier than most; with Speck's help they were later released and transferred to a work detail for conscientious objectors.[86]

Yet not every group had the benefit of Speck's scientific "authentication." Although he was invited to visit the Amherst Indians in 1934 Speck took no interest in the group, despite the fact that their plight was nearly identical to that of other Virginia Indians.[87] The Amherst County Indians were the only group in Virginia that did not receive the benefit of Speck's advocacy anthropology. Although without Speck's endorsement, the Amherst were able to rely on another group of powerful white advocates who fiercely defended the Amherst's' right to be classed as Indians. In 1942, seven Amherst Indians hired attorney William Allen to challenge their racial classification by the Selective Service. For his part, Allen conceded that some mixing with blacks had occurred but urged military officials to allow those without "negro contamination" to be registered as Indians.[88] "The people I represent," Allen continued, "have lived apart for over a quarter of a century among themselves, associating with neither the white nor negro race so far as they could control the situation."[89] Despite these efforts the Amherst men remained classified

[86] Helen Rountree, "The Indians of Virginia: A Third Race in a Biracial State" in *Southeastern Indians Since the Removal Era* Walter L. Williams ed. (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1970), 44.

[87] Johns, Samuel 1934 Letter to Frank G. Speck, September 4.1934, Monacan Ancestral Museum, Bear Mountain.

[88] William Allen to Mills Neal, Jan 22, 1942, Records of the Selective Service, RG 147, NARA

[89] William Allen to Lewis Hershey, Feb. 16, 1942, Records of the Selective Service RG, 147, NARA

as Negroes until they successfully brought suit against the Selective Service in June 1943 in the United States District Court of Western Virginia.[90]

Although located in the northern U.S., Delaware military officials also experienced difficulty classifying racially ambiguous Indian enlistees. In 1942 two Nanticoke men were classified as "colored" by their local draft boards. Because Weslager had befriended several Nanticoke families, he was asked to intervene on the men's behalf. He wrote to the National Headquarters of the Selective Service to inquire about having the men transferred to another all-white unit. The Selective Service assured Weslager that they would "list the registrant as being the color which the registrant claims." The following year, however, local draft boards misclassified another man from Indian River Hundred, but this time he was quickly transferred to an all-white regiment.

Although Weslager imagined himself an advocate for his informants, his research could also carry negative consequences. When one Nanticoke resident decided to share Weslager's book with the members of his squadron he was alarmed to find that they fixated on Weslager's brief discussion of the Nanticoke's black ancestry. Perhaps the gentleman had did no idea Weslager's book included such information. Either way, after discovering the Nanticoke man's purported black ancestry, members of his unit immediately – and successfully – called for his ouster. The Nanticoke man was transferred to a black regiment. He expressed his frustrations in a letter to Frank Speck that was eventually forwarded along to Weslager:

> The Book I got from you some time ago, of Delaware Forgotten Folks of Nanticoke and Moor it really has given me trouble now, I cannot change my Commanding Officer's mind about the book, he believe every word of

[90] Virginia Indians not the only ones to file suit, in 1943 six members of the Waccamaw Indians of North Carolina refused induction as Negroes. In this case the judge decided the men had not been given a fair hearing and dismissed the charges against them. Paul Murray, "Who Is Indian/ Who Is Negro?, 227, n48.

> it, of which not every word not truly, of which you state…after they read the Book, they then wanted to court marshal me for this and they, my (sqdn) went around telling everybody about this.____ the Nanticoke Indian is half blood negger, that what the book said, so everybody know about it all over Columbus Ohio.[91]

Weslager responded to the man's note with disbelief at such a turn of events. "I cannot understand how this book can do you any possible harm," he wrote. The book "presents a case very favorable to the Nanticoke Indian Tribe, and was not written in a way to bring disfavor to any members of the tribe." He continued, "My book points out strongly that Nanticokes are not Negroes and if offered evidence that (?) should be in your favor instead of against you."[92] Troubled by the harm his book caused this Nanticoke man, Weslager worked diligently to rectify the situation and to have him sent to another white squadron.

Conclusion

During the first half of the twentieth century, American Indians residing in the eastern and southern U.S. forged their identities in response to external pressures from whites to conform to conventional ideas of Indianess. White elites' investment in a system of racial hierarchy that recognized only two races—white and black—meant that native peoples had to negotiate their identity vis-à-vis their proximity to blackness. This task was especially challenging for those native descended people with black ancestry. Mixed race tribes like the Ramapo and Nanticoke often lacked the cultural practices and physical appearance that outsiders generally associated with Indians. In the absence of what white elite's considered the obvious markers of Indianess, these communities established their own institutions and tribal organizations, revived old cultural practices, and created new ones in the hopes of legitimizing their claim to Indian racial identity.

[91] Earnest Harmon to Frank G. Speck, November 27, 1942. Weslager MSS.

[92] C.A. Weslager to Earnest Harmon November 29, 1944. Weslager MSS.

Eastern and southern Indians designed their own identity formation projects, and also enlisted the aid of anthropologists and other white supporters. Frank Speck's salvage anthropology, for instance, brought attention to the continued existence of these native populations. And when white elites challenged the Indians' identity, Speck proved a tireless advocate who not only publicly corroborated the Indians' cultural persistence, but in some cases even helped the Indians manufacture the cultural elements necessary to convince white elites of their racial identity.

Native communities experienced some success in their quest to gain public acceptance as Indians. Nevertheless, such projects could also create new cleavages within the very communities they were meant to unify. As native communities worked to define themselves in opposition to black Americans, they also ostracized many community members who were more visibly black. Pressure to live up to the expectations of white outsiders ultimately fractured Native communities as some members rejected their more visibly black neighbors, and even family members, in order to present a public image as a people free of black admixture. The embrace of anti-black animus was a deliberate choice made by individuals and communities who understood that their public identification as Indian depended upon not being seen as black. Some have read native communities' adoption of racial prejudice as an automatic or even negotiated response of a people who desperately wanted to affirm their own identity, an expression of their own racial pride. We must also acknowledge that American Indians – indeed all Americans – were socialized into a system saturated by overt and covert expressions of anti-black animus. As such, their adoption of racial prejudice should be viewed as both a strategy to preserve their racial status and as a reflection of the pervasiveness of ideas concerning black inferiority.

Frank Speck helped various communities of native descended people navigate the racial politics of culture and identity. Not every community, as we have seen, was able to benefit from his scientific endorsement. Speck chose not to assist the Amherst people in their identity project projects not because he was unaware of them, but because he had judged their culture as beyond rescue. In this way Speck, and later Clinton Weslager, were not merely engaged in ethnographic observation, they were, in a sense, makers of Indians. In the case of the Amherst, by contrast, anthropologists could also unmake Indian tribes by denying their claims to Indian identity. Speck's and Weslager's scientific endorsement had the power to determine which Indians communities were "worthy" of being seen as "authentic" Indians, and which existed outside the bounds of authenticity due to a supposed lack cultural integrity.

Speck, Weslager, and other white allies who advocated on behalf of these native communities should be celebrated for their achievements as well as their contributions to the history of Indian racial identity. By affirming Indian identity in the face of dogged racism, Speck and Weslager no doubt empowered many groups to more proudly assert their Native heritage. This pride would prove particularly useful in the latter half of the twentieth century as researchers came to these populations interested in them not as Native Americans but as triracial isolates, as isolated, inbred communities of presumed white, Indian, and black ancestry. Although the next decade of research would serve to undermine the identity claims that the Indians had worked so hard to develop, because of the cultural development that had taken place through Speck's advocacy anthropology they had become much more adept at negotiating the expectations placed on the performance of their identity.

Chapter 5

IT'S IN THE BLOOD: PHYSICAL ANTHROPOLOGY, GENETICS, AND THE MAKING OF AMERICA'S TRIRACIAL ISOLATES, 1950-1960

In 1957 the *Eugenics Quarterly* published an article by demographer Calvin Beale entitled, "American Triracial Isolates: Their Status and Pertinence to Genetic Research." Beale's article represents a watershed moment in the history of research on persons of White, Indian, and African American ancestry, as it set off an avalanche off studies devoted to their social and biological conditions. Yet, the article is perhaps most noteworthy for coining the term "triracial isolate" to describe the populations' unique racial mixture as well as their social, geographic, and reproductive isolation in the eastern and southern United States. While Beale is not the first to offer a collective name for triracial peoples, his term gained the widest purchase amongst researchers of all sorts, particularly during the 1960s and 1970s, and is still used today.

Beale's main objective in writing the article was to encourage geneticists to study the many genetic diseases that were prevalent among triracial groups due to inbreeding. Beale attributed the consanguinity of triracial isolates to their geographic isolation and marginal social position as a "third" race in a bi-racial society. Thus, Beale encouraged geneticists to study the "Jackson Whites" of New York and New Jersey in order to learn more about the transmission of albinism and polydactylism, while the "Moors" of Delaware provided an opportunity to investigate the disease transmission of microphthalmia, a genetic disorder that produces carriers with unusually small eyes.[93].

[93] Calvin Beale, "American Triracial Isolates: Their Status and Pertinence to Genetic Research," *Eugenics Quarterly* 4 (1957): 189.

Beale's focus on triracial isolates reflects a broader shift in racial thinking that emerged out of the1950 Symposia on Quantitative Biology, which brought together for the first time, evolutionary biologists, geneticists, and anthropologists to rethink the meaning of race.[94] Seeking to distance themselves from the racial atrocities perpetrated in the name of eugenics, attendees worked towards a new definition of race that was both less politically charged and more analytically precise than the older definition of race as fixed racial types. So too were attendees interested in studying human variation, and as such, sought a new definition of race that more accurately reflected human variation. Thus, race gave way to populations as race was redefined as the relative difference in the gene frequencies between populations.[95]

A new attention to genetic isolates, defined as populations exhibiting "the existence of multigenerational and well-recorded pedigrees, environmental and phenotypic homogeneity, restricted geographical distribution, and inbreeding as a norm" was another major outcome of the symposium that likely inspired Beale's article.[96] Isolates were desirable subjects of genetic research during the 1950s and after because their small size greatly simplified the mathematical computations necessary to calculate gene frequencies. Additionally, scientists found it easier to study genetic adaptations to the environment on this smaller scale. And finally, the reproductive isolation within these communities eliminated such variables as gene flow, the movement of new genes into a population from outside individuals, which greatly complicated genetic analysis.

---

[94] The Cold Spring Harbor Symposiums were all arranged around topics in molecular biology. For more information, see http://library.cshl.edu/symposia

[95] Marks, Human Biodiversity, 126-127; Theodosius Dobzhansky, "Introduction: Biological Aspects of Race in Man," in *Science and the Race Concept*, ed. Margaret Meade, Theodosius Dobzhansky, Ethel Tobach, and Robert Light (New York: University of Columbia Press, 1968), 78.

[96] M. Burgos-Arcos, and M. Muenke, "Genetics of Population Isolates," *Clinical Genetics* 61 (2002): 233.

Although triracial isolates possessed all the qualities of a genetic isolate, the presence of triracial ancestry made the triracial isolates unique. Beale's interest in triracial isolates was driven by his belief that the groups' social conditions had precipitated their genetic condition. Unlike the eugenicists who blamed the social conditions of triracial people on their biology, Beale attributed the triracial isolates' biological conditions to their social status. Furthermore, Beale imputed that the genetic diseases found among triracial communities were the result of outside pressures that promoted consanguinity as strategy of preserving their unique racial status.[97] Beale's treatment of consanguinity as a strategy of identity harkens back to Speck's discussion of inbreeding practices among the Virginia Indians. Yet, where inbreeding was one of many survival strategies that Speck documented among the Virginians, it was for Beale the triracial isolates' chief strategy of survival.[98]

Beale's article represents an important moment in the history of people of presumed white, Indian, and black ancestry as his work marked the first time these groups became legibly as triracial people. Although racial mixture clearly played a role in how eugenicists, sociologists, and anthropologists framed the previous fifty years of research on triracial communities," Beale's article marked the first time that their tripartite mixture was explicitly marshaled as the analytical frame orienting the research on these populations. By promoting sociological and genetic research on the isolates, Beale provided researchers, especially those anthropologists who remained committed to racial studies, an opportunity to investigate a controversial topic under the politically neutral umbrella of genetics.

[97] Beale, "American Triracial Isolates," 189.

[98] Frank Speck, "The Rappahannock Indians of Virginia" *Indians Notes and Monographs 5* (1925): vii

In popularizing the isolates as a scientifically valuable population, Beale's 1957 article set the course for mid-century research on these populations. Between 1957 and 1976 geneticists, physical anthropologists, and sociologists published over three-dozen studies on the triracial isolates.[99] While almost all of these works cited Beale's 1957 article, even those that did not cite Beale either directly or indirectly engaged with his conceptualization of a triracial isolate. For instance, in his 1959 article investigating mate selection amongst the Maryland "Wesorts," sociologist Thomas J. Harte borrowed both the term and description of a triracial isolate.[100] In similar fashion, geneticist Carl Witkop adapted part of Beale's map listing the names and locations of triracial communities in his 1966 study on the same group.[101] When sociologist Brewton Berry published his 1963 book *Almost White*, he framed his decision to refer to persons of white, Indian, and black descent as "mestizos," as a deliberate rejection of the term "triracial" which he dismissed as inflammatory.[102] Finally, in 1972, the *American Anthropologist* devoted an entire issue to triracial communities in which they tried to work out the conditions that defined them and as well as determine a suitable name. Thus, Beale's article introduced triracial communities as an important phenomenon worthy of sociological and biological study.

---

[99] For representative studies see, Thomas J. Harte, "Trends in the Mate Selection in a Triracial Isolate," *Social Forces* 37, no.3 (March 1959): 215-221; Carl Witkop et. al., Medical and Dental Findings in the Brandywine Isolate," *Alabama Journal of Medical Sciences* (1966): 382; Carl J. Witkop, "A Study of Some Triracial Isolates in the Eastern United States," *Acta Genetica et Statistica Medica* 6 (1956/1957): 410-412; William Pollitzer, "Catawba Indians: Morphology, Genetics, and History" *American Journal of Physical Anthropology* 26 (1967): 5.Lynwood Martell, "The Coe Ridge Colony: A Racial Island Disappears, *American Anthropologist* 74, no.3 (1972): 710-719; J. Anthony Paredes, "The Need for Cohesion and American Isolates," *American Anthropologist* 78, no.2 (1976).

[100] Thomas J. Harte, "Trends in the Mate Selection in a Triracial Isolate," *Social Forces* 37, no.3 (March 1959): 215-221.

[101] Carl Witkop et. al., Medical and Dental Findings in the Brandywine Isolate," *Alabama Journal of Medical Sciences* (1966): 382.

[102] Brewton Berry, *Almost White* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1963), 16.

This chapter examines the genetic and sociological research on triracial groups during the 1960s and 1970s, the high point of scientific interest in these communities. During this period, sociologists, physical anthropologists, and geneticists all turned to these populations because they represented a promising new research opportunity. Geneticist Carl Witkop studied select isolates in hopes of understanding more about the transmission of genetic diseases. For physical anthropologist and anatomist William Pollitzer, the isolates represented an opportunity to test the racial dispersion of the ABO blood types. And for sociologist Brewton Berry, the isolates represented an opportunity to investigate the social degradation bred by white supremacy. Their research helped to introduce the triracial isolates to the public as a unique social and biological phenomenon within the eastern and southern United States.

The burgeoning American Indian Movement and the efforts of certain isolates to gain acceptance as Native communities punctuated scientific interest in triracial communities. As such, this chapter also examines how increased scholarly attention influenced the isolates' attempts to gain widespread acceptance as surviving Indian communities. Although the scientists who pursued these investigations largely abandoned the monoracial thinking of their predecessors, their commitment to recognizing these communities as triracial ultimately served to undermine their racial self-fashioning as Indians.

The "New" Race Study: William Pollitzer's Blood Group Genetics

Physical anthropologist William Pollitzer was one of the most prolific researchers on the triracial isolates. Between 1959 and 1972 he produced over a dozen studies that used the ABO blood groups to investigate the isolates' racial composition. Pollitzer framed his interest in the isolates as part of a broader effort to tease out the ancestral relationships between populations. Like many physical anthropologists of his day, Pollitzer received his training in another

discipline. He gained his Ph.D. in evolutionary biology at Columbia University where he studied under the direction of Theodosius Dobzhansky and L.C. Dunn.[103] Throughout his four-decade career, Pollitzer published extensively in the discipline's flagship journal the *American Journal of Physical Anthropology.*[104] Like his mentors Pollitzer believed that triracial isolates provided an unparalleled opportunity to learn more about human development. Discussing what he saw as the link between race and evolution, Pollitzer maintained that, "people realize that ethnic [or racial] differences are dynamic rather than static, quantitative rather than qualitative, relative rather than absolute—and that differences within species are the same processes that produce changes among species—a part of the ongoing process of evolution." Thus, for Pollitzer the study of race was the study of evolution.

The ABO blood groups emerged in the mid-century as an exciting new avenue for racial research. Discovered in 1901 by Austrian biochemist Karl Landsteiner of the Pathological Anatomy Institute at the University of Vienna, the ABO groups are a classificatory system of blood based on the expression of antigenic molecules on the surface of red blood cells.[105] There are four phenotypes within the ABO system—A, B, AB, and O—which are determined by three alleles of a single gene with the A and B alleles functioning as co-dominant to the recessive O

[103] As Stanley Garn observed in 1964, "I think we can say there is far more physical anthropology now, but much of it is being done by physiologists, serologists, biochemists and others not formally trained in physical anthropological disciplines." Stanley Garn, Physical Anthropology Decreasing?" *Current Anthropology* 5 (1962): 106.

[104] Clark Spencer Larsen, "William Sprott Pollitzer, 6 May 1923-12 March 2002," *American Journal of Physical Anthropology* 119 (2002): 1. In addition to genetic studies of the Melungeons, the Lumbee, and the Catawba of South Carolina, Pollitzer also studied isolated populations in Zimbabwe and Brazil. In addition to the triracial isolates, Pollitzer also authored studies on other Indian communities like the Seminole Indians and the Kalmocks of Pittsburgh. Although Pollitzer published extensively on triracial isolates his most celebrated work is his 1999 study, *The Gullah People and their African Heritage*.

[105] There are over twenty recognized human blood groups systems of which the ABO and the Rhesus (RH) systems are the most medically important.

allele.[106] Proponents of blood group genetics, also called serological genetics, touted the blood groups as a more objective and scientifically valid method or racial study as opposed to older methods that relied on comparing measurements of the arms, legs, and hair.

William Boyd, a professor of immunochemistry at Boston University, was also a vocal proponent for the use of serological genetics in the study of racial difference. He, along with fellow supporters Theodosius Dobzhansky and L.C. Dunn, pushed for an increase in blood group studies, as they believed the blood groups could define races more accurately. Although he was trained in immunochemistry Boyd considered himself a member of the anthropological community. In addition to serving as editor of the *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, Boyd published multiple articles aimed at physical anthropologists in which he set out the case for blood group genetics. Boyd drew upon Dobzhansky's genetic definition of race and repackaged it for anthropologists. His 1942 book, *Blood Grouping Technic*, outlined what he saw as the proper criteria for racial research. [107] As he explained, "blood groups are characteristics genetically determined, by a known mechanism, absolutely objective in character, absolutely unaffected by environment, not subject to mutation at any rapid rate, and so far as we are able to discover by extensive investigation, non-adaptive."[108] Boyd hoped that blood group genetics would replace craniometry and anthropometry as the main tool of racial anthropology.[109]

---

[106] W.M. Watkins "The ABO Blood Group System: Historical Background," *Transfusion Medicine* 11 (2001): 243.

[107] In keeping with the post-war theme of making racial theories palatable to the public Boyd, with co-author Isaac Asimov, turned the text into a children's book titled *Races and People,* which was published in 1955.

[108] William Boyd and Fritz Schiff, *Blood Grouping Technic: A Manual for Clinicians, Serologists, Anthropologists, and Students of Legal and Military Medicine* (New York: Interscience Publishers, 1942), 198.

[109] Boyd, "The Use of Genetically Determined Characters, Especially Serological Factors such as Rh, in Physical Anthropology" Southwestern Journal of Anthropology 3 (1947): 49

Despite Boyd's appeal a number of anthropologists were reluctant to adopt blood group genetics. Carlton Coon was especially critical of serological studies and Boyd's insistence that physical anthropologists take up their study. Coon represents a vocal faction of physical anthropologists who accused the blood group proponents of trying to discredit the validity of traditional physical anthropology. That Boyd referred to traditional physical anthropology as "interpretation-deficient" and "regrettable" only confirmed Coon's suspicions.[110] Coon objected to Boyd's outsider status and defended morphology and culture as the defining features of race. As Coon explained:

> Boyd feels that we should base our classification of races on characters the genetics of which are known. In other words, blood groups. I do not agree with him. Race depends on the few but critical, if genetically unknown, differences between human populations, which relate to man's adaptation to his environment, physical and social. Just because we do not know about the exact manner of transmission of skin color, nose form, and still to be discovered differences in the nervous system does not mean that these are not the important factors on which racial differences depend. I further feel that the geneticists are little less than gods, and they too, like the atomic physicists, have much to learn.[111]

Furthermore, Coon surmised that the only reason scientists were avoiding morphological traits was because of the history of racism associated with them. [112] As a result, he had little use for blood group studies, which in his mind were the methodological outcome of science's new commitment to political correctness.

---

[110] William Boyd, *Genetics and the Races of Man: An Introduction to Modern Physical Anthropology* (Boston: Little Brown and Company, 1950), 66. Boyd, "The Use of Genetically Determined Characters, Especially Serological Factors such as Rh, in Physical Anthropology" *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology* 3 (1947): 49

[111] Carlton Coon to Joseph Birdsell, August 7, 1952 Box 13 Carlton Coon Papers, National Anthropological Archives, Washington DC

[112] Carleton Coon to Carleton Putnam, 19, July 1960 Box 10, Coon Papers, NAA

Although Coon and Boyd occupied opposite ends of the ideological spectrum in terms of their ideas about race and the appropriate methodologies by which to measure it, Boyd's new genetic studies of race continued to incorporate the older methods of racial investigation. Thus, although Pollitzer subscribed to the new genetic definition of race, his studies continued to incorporate morphological measurements. His methodological decisions reflect the fact that although scientists were committed to reevaluating the race concept, they remained undecided about what parts of the old system should remain and what parts should give way to change.

Through his work on triracial isolates, Pollitzer sought to investigate the links between social status, genes (blood groups) and morphological traits, congenital anomalies, and disease. To this end Pollitzer hoped to build upon Laurence Snyder and William Boyd's serology studies on Native Americans with the inclusion of blood group data on southeastern Indians. As the first formally trained geneticist to perform blood group studies amongst Native Americans, Laurence Snyder helped to advance the notion that native bodies contained keys to human evolution that could not be obtained from other sources. Native Americans invited research interest because they were considered the earliest form of man and thus attracted the attention of those interested in studying human evolution. According to Snyder, because of the promise of what they might reveal about human evolution, Native Americans represented the "nearest approach to a true 'racial' study of blood groups."[113] Citing his contention that, "the little information now available on the incidence of [the blood groups] in Indians is confined to those communities in Western states," Pollitzer asserted that the "data on the Indians in the southeast [was] not only

[113] Lawrence H. Snyder "Human Blood Groups: Their Inheritance and Racial Significance," *American Journal of Physical Anthropology* 9, no. 2 (1926): 235.

valuable in itself, but for the light it may shed on the contribution of the Indian to the American Negro."[114]

Pollitzer also saw himself building upon the work of geneticists interested in race mixture. More specifically, he saw his work as building upon that of geneticist Curt Stern. A pioneering geneticist and researcher of Drosophila, Stern also made a name for himself in human genetics, particularly in regards to his theories on race mixing. Stern theorized that miscegenation and "passing" had greatly equaled out the genetic inheritance between whites and blacks, and that both groups shared the same genetic factors except for those determining physical appearance.[115] Stern speculated that racial mixing had progressed to the point that, "If there were complete intermingling of races, we would hardly notice the difference…because there are only 10 per cent Negroes now and those 10 percent have only 75 percent African genes."[116] As the triracial isolates were believed to be part Indian, Pollitzer hoped to expand Curt's research by investigating the degree of Native American gene flow into the African American population.[117] Like Stern, Pollitzer was interested in how social and cultural factors played upon the human species. According to Pollitzer, "We are not just biological organisms,

[114] "Research Plan and Supporting Data RG 6175 (A)" Box 1, William Pollitzer Papers, National Anthropological Archives, Washington D.C. (hereafter Pollitzer Papers). Pollitzer's interest in the blood group genetics of Native Americans came after almost three decades of serological work that focused almost exclusively on Native American tribal groups in the western United States. Between 1923 and 1960 these communities were the subjects of over sixty blood group studies.

[115] "Model estimates of the frequency of white and near-white segregants in the American Negro" Box 34 Curst Stern Paper, APS; Stern was also a signatory on the 1950 UNESCO Statement on Race. John A. Osmundsen, "Isolated Community in Southeast Bears Out Geneticist Theory," *New York Times*, May 28, 1965.

[116] "What the South Really Fears About Mixed Schools," *U.S. News & World Reports*, Sept. 19, 1968, 82.

[117] "Research Plan and Supporting Data RG 6175 (A)" National Institute of Health Application

but sociocultural ones as well. Parish boundaries and economic opportunities govern the flow of genes over time and thus affect our genetic heterogeneity."[118]

Pollitzer released over a dozen studies on the blood group genetics of triracial isolates, with most of his work focused on just seven triracial communities—the Melungeons of Eastern Tennessee, the Lumbee Indians of North Carolina, the Cherokee Indians of North Carolina, the Haliwa Indians of North Carolina, the Cajuns of Alabama, and the Brass Ankles and Catawba Indians of South Carolina. It is likely that his choice of communities was influenced by their proximity to the University of North Carolina, where Pollitzer spent his career teaching anatomy in the University's medical school. Physical proximity to his research populations also increased the likelihood that his blood samples would be preserved during transit.

By the time Pollitzer began his fieldwork amongst the triracial isolates they had already been subjected to decades of scientific skepticism regarding their racial claims. He routinely encountered reluctance as potential subjects proved hesitant to open up to him about their racial ancestry or allow him to perform any studies. In order to curtail this resistance Pollitzer deployed a number of tactics, some deceptive, in order to encourage participation in his blood group studies. For example, before embarking on his 1958 study of the Cherokee Indians of North Carolina, Pollitzer reached out to tribal chief Jarrett Blythe, Dr. K.S. Dugan of the U.S. Public Health Service Indian Hospital, as well as the superintendent of the Cherokee school in order to enjoin the men to support his study.[119]

---

[118] Ibid.

[119] Pollitzer to Dugan, October 16, 1957; Pollitzer to Henry Barnes October 26, 1957; Pollitzer to Gilliam October 16, 1957, Box 1, Pollitzer Papers, NAA

When these letters failed to produce an increase in research participants Pollitzer decided to address the Cherokee families directly although he withheld from them the true objectives of his study. Instead he told the Cherokee he was conducting a survey in order to determine the frequency of blood anemia within the population. In exchange for their participation, Pollitzer promised to provide each participant with a card indicating their blood type, as well as to treat and report any anemia cases to the county health officer. Pollitzer hoped that the perceived health benefits of the study would entice higher participation. In addition to pointing out the potential life-saving function of the blood cards, Pollitzer stressed the economic benefits of participation. As he explained, "such laboratory work done in a clinic would cost each child several hundred dollars."[120]

Although Pollitzer was largely successful in getting Cherokee children to participate in the study, eventually their parents expressed their "discontent with all this blood-letting."[121] Although it was a less emphasized aspect of his letters, Pollitzer also stressed his view that the Cherokee blood study represented a significant contribution to genetics and anthropology.[122] Aside from the issues related to the blood drawing, many participants also objected to being interrogated about their racial ancestry.

Racial politics internal to the communities also greatly complicated Pollitzer's ability to attract research participants. A number of triracial groups had splintered during the past half-century over the question of whether they should submit to classification as black or whether they would continue to maintain their separate identity. Such was the case in 1957, when a

[120] Ibid.

[121] Pollitzer to R.E. Rosenfield March 18, 1960, Box 1, Pollitzer Papers, NAA.

[122] William Pollitzer to Mr. Gilliam October 1957, Box, 1 Pollitzer Papers, NAA.

segment of Cherokee "considering itself to be Indian, formed an exclusive association."[123] Although the two factions recombined in the 1960s, tensions surrounding the racial splintering persisted. For these reasons, the Cherokee were wary of Pollitzer's blood study. Their suspicions were further inflamed by Pollitzer's preference for so-called "full-blood" research subjects. In order to circumvent any possible awkwardness Pollitzer avoided directly interrogating the Cherokee about their racial ancestry. Rather he obtained information about the degree of racial mixing and inbreeding directly from the Cherokee's tribal secretary.[124]And although Pollitzer expressed that he was "certainly understanding and sympathetic" to the Indians' need to privacy, he maintained that the scientific importance of the study far outweighed any negative impact his study might have on the Cherokee's identity claims.[125]

Pollitzer's interest in separating the "full-blood" Cherokee out from the rest of the population became clear when he finally published the results of his study in 1966. Published in the *American Journal of Human Genetics* under the title "Factors in the Microevolution of Triracial Isolate," Pollitzer reconstituted the Cherokee into two groups—Indian and non-Indian—in order to study the genetic consequences of their 1957 splintering. Because membership in the newly formed Indian association was by invitation only and restricted to those "who appeared healthy and non-Negroid," Pollitzer deduced that, "the remainder of the isolate was considered to be Negro," although he acknowledged that both groups looked the same.[126]

---

[123] William Pollitzer, R.M. Menegaz-Bock, and J.C. Herion, "Factors in the Microevolution of a Triracial Isolate," *American Journal of Human Genetics* 18, no. 1 (January 1966): 27.

[124] Like most formalized tribal communities, the Cherokee required that their members submit their degree of Indian ancestry when applying for membership Charlotte Sneed to William Pollitzer, August 1, 1960, Box 1, Pollitzer Papers, NAA.

[125] Ibid.

[126] Pollitzer, "Factors in the Microevolution of a Triracial Isolate," 27.

Thus, Pollitzer's ultimate objective in identifying the full-bloods was so that he could compare the blood frequencies between the two populations. Despite noting that the "non-Indian group are slightly more Negroid in appearance, have far more medical problems, and have a slightly lower rate of fertility," their blood group data indicated more white and just as much Indian ancestry as the "Indian" groups. Pollitzer determined the blood type frequencies for the "Indian" segment of the Cherokee was 18% White, 41% Negro, and 41% Indian, while the non-Indian segment had gene frequencies showing 35% White, 34% Negro, and 31% Indian mixture.[127] Although he provided no commentary on what the gene frequencies indicated for his conception of a triracial isolate, he acknowledged that the two groups were more similar genetically and attributed it to their reorganization in the 1960s.[128]

From the Cherokee study, one of the first in which Pollitzer was the lead researcher, two themes emerged that characterize the remainder of his studies during the 1960s and 1970s. First, Pollitzer was committed to measuring the racial composition of his triracial subjects. Although Pollitzer noted the incidence of various diseases, the majority of his studies were spent diagnosing the racial composition of his research subjects. And second, his studies depended upon Pollitzer concealing their true intentions. Although many communities had concerns about the nature of Pollitzer's research they were largely encouraged to participate because they believed in the health benefits or because they were encouraged by those in positions of power. Both circumstances characterize Pollitzer 1969 study on the Melungeons of Hancock, Tennessee.

[127] Pollitzer, "Factors in the Microevolution of a Triracial Isolate," 37.

[128] Ibid.

Only through collaboration with the county doctor was Pollitzer able to gather the blood samples he need to conduct his racial analysis.[129]

Pollitzer's research also helped to support the identity claims of his subjects. For instance his 1969 study on the Catawba Indian largely confirmed their public avowal as a people who were exclusively white and Indian. The Catawba, the only federally recognized tribe in the state of South Carolina, agreed to the termination of their trust relationship with federal government in 1959. Tribes identified as eligible for termination had to show their potential for full-integration into society. For the Catawba this potential was evidenced by their employability and independence from government programs. According to a 1958 report, 47 percent of the tribe worked in industry, 20 percent were skilled laborers, 7 percent were in the armed forces, 15 percent held odd jobs, and only 3 percent received public assistance. In these respects the Catawba had already achieved full integration.[130] For many observers, the Catawba's racial make-up only seemed to confirm their assimilation. As one observer noted, "Even in race-conscious South Carolina the Catawba for all practical purposes are white men. They attend white schools, and intermarry freely."[131]

[129] William S. Pollitzer and William H. Brown, "Survey of Demography, Anthropometry, and Genetics in the Melungeons of Tennessee," *Human Biology* 41, no. 3 (1969): 388.

[130] "Tiny Tribe of Catawbas Turns New Leaf," *Advocate* (Baton Rouge, LA), Thursday Sept. 6, 1962. What is important to note is that Catawba employment gains were not owed to their trust relationship to government. Despite gaining federal recognition in the late 1860s the Catawba were largely ignored by the federal government until 1943 when the Bureau of Indian Affairs placed 3,434 acres in trust on behalf of tribe. No other social welfare services were provided. See Ulrich, *American Indian Nations*, 96.

[131] "Catawbas Make New Break With Past," *Augusta Chronicle* (Augusta, GA), August 20, 1962, 14.

Pollitzer described the Catawba study as an investigation of the group's physical anthropology and cultural change.[132] In addition to blood typing the 104 participants, he took measurements for skin, color, hair form, stature, head length, head breadth, nose length, and nose width. Although Pollitzer noted that, "the mixed Catawba Indians varies widely, from those with straight black hair, wide cheeks, and coppery color, to those hard to those who are indistinguishable from the Caucasian population." Pollitzer also compared the Catawba blood group data with the frequencies tabulated from blood group research on the "Charleston Negro," the "Cherokee Indian 'full-bloods,'" and the "English White," which he described as "three populations similar to the probable ancestors of the Catawba"[133] From this data Pollitzer computed the Catawba's racial composition as 59% White and 41% Indian. Pollitzer traced this admixture back to the colonial period when white Mormon missionaries began a church mission on the Catawba reservation.[134]

Although Pollitzer's research methods might lead one to believe that he held little regard for the consequences of his research, his refusal to publicly identify his research subjects suggests that he understood his claims carried material consequences for his subjects. Concerns that public identification might cause embarrassment to the isolates influenced his decision to avoid publicly naming them. In explaining his silence on the issue, Pollitzer maintained that, "It is not for formal ethics alone that I avoid spelling out the group name in print; it is for the very practical matter of saving their reputation, their social position, and possibly their lives."

---

[132] William Pollitzer, "Catawba Indians: Morphology, Genetics, and History" *American Journal of Physical Anthropology* 26 (1967): 5.

[133] Pollitzer, "Catawba Indians," 8. The blood group frequencies for the Charleston Negro and the Cherokee full-bloods taken from studies that Pollitzer himself conducted. See Pollitzer 1958 and Pollitzer, 1962. The Blood group data for the English White taken from Race and Sanger 1962.

[134] Pollitzer, "Catawba Indians," 8.

Pollitzer worried that the public might pick up on his studies and use them to challenge the isolates' racial identity. This concern was not unfounded. In a 1973 article, the *Greensboro Record* cited Pollitzer's 1964 study as evidence that the Lumbee "probably have more Negro and white ancestry than Indian in their racial composition."[135] Unfortunately for the Lumbee, the article's release coincided with the submission of their first application for federal acknowledgement. The recirculation of Pollitzer's study in the 1970s illustrates how scientific investigations were mobilized to cast doubts on the groups' identity claims.

Disease and Triracal Isolates

Although an interest in racial mixture inspired much of the early research on the isolates, the 1960s research on their disease inheritance has had an equally long lasting influence on public conceptions of the isolates. In this regard, the work of oral pathologist Carl Witkop is very important. Unlike much of the sociological research, which has treated a marginalized social position as the defining feature of a triracial isolate, Witkop is responsible for popularizing the presence of genetic defects as a defining feature of triracial communities. Witkop was not the first to take up such studies. S.T. Snedecor and W.K. Harryman described a high incidence of polydactylism and albinism among the Jackson-Whites of New York and New Jersey.[136] Similarly, Charles A. Weslager's 1943 study on the Nanticoke Indians of Delaware found several cases of microphthalmia.[137] Yet, his work is noteworthy as he is the first to use the genetic diseases to make inferences about the isolates' racial composition. Carl Witkop gained

[135] "Researchers Say Lumbee Bloodlines Diluted" *The Greensboro Record* (Greensboro, NC), May 16, 1973, A9.

[136] S.T. Snedecor and W.K. Harryman, "Surgical Problems in Hereditary Polydactylism and Syndactylism," *Journal of Medical Society* 37 (1940): 443.

[137] Charles A. Weslager, *Delaware's Forgotten Folk: The Story of the Moors and Nanticokes* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1943), 15-16.

his DDS and Master's in oral pathology from the University of Michigan. In 1950 Witkop began his career as an oral pathologist with the National Institute of Dental Research (NIDR). After becoming interested in the use of genetic methodologies in his research on dental and dermatological disorders, Witkop founded the Human Genetics Section of the NIDR.[138] His 1962 book, *Genetics and Dental Health*, is considered the first volume to discuss the genetics of dental and orofacial disorders.

Witkop's research on triracial isolates represents just a small share of genetic research on isolated communities circulating between the 1950s and 1970s. "Isolated inbred groups" were one of just a few "special categories" of people regarded genetically useful. Inbred populations attracted the attention of scientists because the recessive alleles that caused genetic disorders tended to concentrate in these populations. The fact that many isolated communities, including those of triracial origin, shared common surnames only increased their appeal to researchers who used the surnames to trace the degree of inbreeding. Racially mixed populations were also viewed as valuable research subjects since their variability of traits could substitute for the results of controlled hybridization and gene flow.[139]

Much of the research on genetic isolates focused on indigenous communities located outside of the U.S., usually in South America, as well as other populations in Africa believed to have experienced little evolutionary change. In general, researchers looked for undeveloped locales where they could approximate what geneticist James Neel has called "the biology of

[138] Burton L. Shapiro and Jarda Cervenka, "Carl J. Witkop, Jr. (1920-1930): In Memoriam" American Journal of Human Genetics 53 (1993): 528; Jaroslav Cervenka, "Carl J. Witkop Jr., MS, DDS," Journal of Dental Research 81 (2002): 444.

[139] Daniel Kevles, *In the Name of Eugenics*, 193. Glass and Li pioneered racially mixed populations as examples of gene flow.

precivilized man."[140] Because scientists believed these "primitive" populations were quickly vanishing, there was great pressure to study them before the barriers facilitating their isolation were completely overcome.[141] Many American scientists assumed that centuries of urban industrialization and cultural development made encountering such populations impossible, yet there were a few populations whose way of life approximated the conditions of precivilization. In addition to the triracial isolates, the Pennsylvania Amish and the Kalmuck Mongols of New Jersey and Pennsylvania were two of the U.S. populations that attracted the attention of geneticists during the mid-century. Their presumed genetic isolation and cultural stasis promised to yield answers on morphology, disease, and genetic drift.

Although Pollitzer's research on the isolates brought them to broader national attention, he was unable secure the same professional accolades as Witkop, who established himself as a "preeminent authority" on pigment and dental disorders through his path-breaking research on the Brandywine population, also known as the present-day Pisctaway Indians. Witkop first became aware of this population when three patients, all cousins, were admitted to the Children's Hospital of Washington, D.C. with a number of genetic conditions. In addition to generalized albinism, the patients also presented with various forms of dentinogenesis imperfecta, congenital heart disease, and congenital deafness.[142] Between 1955 and 1963 Witkop conducted fieldwork among the Brandywine people. In 1966 he published an article based of this research, which he described as "a joint study of the historic, genetic, medical, dental, and sociologic aspects of a

[140] James V. Neel, *Physician to the Gene Pool: Genetic Lessons and Other Stories*, (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1994), 119.

[141] James Neel used the term "primitive" to describe those populations that were preliterate, aggregated in tribes, primarily hunter-gatherers, and organized in social systems determined by kinship. It should be said that he did appreciate the pejorative undertones of the term.

[142] Carl Witkop et. al., Medical and Dental Findings in the Brandywine Isolate," *Alabama Journal of Medical Sciences* (1966): 382.

triracial isolate."[143] Witkop examined marriage and baptismal records, took medical surveys, and conducted individual interviews with over 11,000 members of the isolate.

Witkop's article bears several striking similarities to Pollitzer's blood group studies. Like Pollitzer, Witkop began with an overview of the isolates' history and racial makeup. Witkop even included a list he adapted from Calvin Beale showing the location and population size of all the purported triracial isolates. So too was Witkop interested in detailing the degree of physical diversity found among the isolate. For instance, he noted "a considerable dissociation of physiognomic features" that produced light colored individuals with flared nostrils or thick lips.[144] Unlike Pollitzer, however, Witkop was not interested in the degree of racial mixture. Although he noted that his subjects possessed the physical features of all three races, he was principally concerned with the practice of inbreeding and its relationship to congenital diseases. Witkop discovered two etiologically different types of oculocutaneous albinism among the Brandywine—the tyrosinase-positive and tyrosinase-negative forms.[145] He attributed both to decades of inbreeding. According to Witkop, the Brandywine had the highest incidence of albinism known in the world.[146]

Witkop published several more articles throughout the 1960s and 1970s and each built upon his earlier work with the Brandywine. For example, his 1972 article published in the *American Journal of Physical Anthropology* compared the frequency of tyrosinase-positive albinism in multiple populations. From this data Witkop theorized that this form of albinism

[143] Ibid.

[144] Ibid.

[145] Jaroslav Cervenka, "Carl J. Witkop, Jr., MS, DDS" Journal of Dental Research 81 (2002): 444.

[146] Carl Bernstein, "'Wesorts,' Long Closely Inbred, Face Serious Genetic Problems," *Omaha-World Herald*, December 23, 1970, 15; "Races Blend in 'Wesorts' of Maryland" *The Jersey Journal*, December 31, 1970, 6s.

occurred in higher frequencies among Native peoples from Central America, the southwestern United States, and in those "mixed racial isolates which represent remnants of Indian populations of the eastern U.S." Although not the explicit goal of research, Witkop used his genetic research to advance theories about the isolates' racial makeup.

Brewton Berry's Almost White

While William Pollitzer and Carl Witkop investigated the genetic problems posed by the isolates, sociologist Brewton Berry set out to learn more about their social status.[147] Berry, who received his Ph.D. in sociology from the University of Edinburgh in 1930, hoped to expand upon the work of Everett Stonequist. Stonequist's 1937 book *The Marginal Man* focused on the psychological pressure faced by ethnic and racial minorities attempting to navigate cultural differences. "The Marginal person," Stonequist argued, "was one who is poised in psychological uncertainty between two or more social worlds, reflecting in his soul the discords and harmonies, repulsions and attractions of these worlds."[148]

According to Berry, the Lumbee, Wesorts, and other triracial communities were a "raceless people, neither fish nor fowl, neither white, nor black, not red, nor brown," and thus epitomized Stonequist's marginal man theory. With funding from the Julius Rosenwald Foundation, Berry spent a year conducting interviews with the white and black neighbors of select triracial communities in order to understand their social customs. However, when he published the study in 1963 under the title *Almost White*, he claimed that his source came from

[147] Brewton Berry, *Almost White* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1963), 16.

[148] Everett Stonequist, *The Marginal Man: A Study I n Personality and Culture Conflict* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1937).

"twenty five years…[of] searching out and visiting these hybrid communities."[149] This discrepancy in Berry's methodology is significant because in a work that sought to get to the psychological condition of marginal people, their voices are largely absent. Instead Berry based much of his analysis on the opinions of outsiders, most of which was disparaging towards the triracial communities. As such, many groups were felt angered and marginalized by what they could have possibly seen as the deliberate exclusion of their voices.

Berry wrote *Almost White* for a general audience with the hope of removing the misunderstandings and prejudice surrounding triracial people. For this reason, Berry shunned the term "triracial isolate" and chose instead to adopt "mestizo" as the new collective term designating persons of presumed white, black, and Indian ancestry. Berry maintained that "mestizo," a Spanish term used to describe persons of multiracial ancestry, was less inflammatory than "triracial isolates" because "all these folks readily admit they're mixed."[150] By referring to triracial communities as "mestizos," Berry was able to avoid the more derisive monikers used by the groups' black and white neighbors. According to Berry, one informant warned him against referring to these communities by their pejorative titles for fear that Berry might have to be "cut down out of a tree."[151] This instance was not out of the ordinary; much of the book is spent detailing the discomfort felt by blacks and whites who, unsure of the group's proper racial designation, agonized over the appropriate racial terminology. Yet, despite adopting a seemingly more innocuous moniker, Berry continued to refer to triracial people as "racial orphans," "mystery people," and "in-between people." The use of such terminology

[149] Berry, *Almost White*, viii.

[150] Ibid., 40.

[151] Ibid., 30

underscores Berry's supposition that these groups lacked any real place in American society. To this end he posited the mestizo's lack of group loyalty, pride, and cultural heritage as further proof of their marginalized racial status.[152]

Berry divided his book into eleven chapters detailing the location, customs, and social status of two hundred communities of white, Indian, and black ancestry. Throughout, Berry cast himself as sympathetic to the communities' plight as a mixed race people in a society that only recognized two races. In the introductory chapter, "The Myth of the Vanishing Indian," Berry detailed how inconsistences in the census had contributed to the popular yet ultimately incorrect assumption that the Indian was vanishing. According to Berry, "If, on the one hand, we followed the same practice with respect to the Indian that we do with the Negro (namely, 'one drop of Negro blood makes one a Negro'), the number of Indians today would doubtless run into the tens of millions."[153] In this statement Berry offered a stunning critique of American racial orthodoxy. Yet, other statements reveal that Berry possessed a view of race that was as complicated and threatening to the isolates' racial self-fashioning as the one-drop rule. While on the one hand arguing for a more expansive notion of Native identity, Berry dismissed mixed-race Native people's claims to be "biologically Indian." Nevertheless, Berry maintained that each group deserved recognition as separate and distinct race. The real damage, Berry argued, was in trying to force mixed race people into a single racial category.

The next three sections, "Where Are They?," "What the Whites Believe," and "What the Negro Thinks," explore how feelings of anti-blackness influenced how triracial people came to view themselves and how they were seen by their black and white neighbors. Two important

[152] Ibid., 87.

[153] Berry, *Almost White*, 8-9.

aspects of mid-century racial thinking stand out in these sections: the enduring belief that racial mixture, particularly black ancestry, could be discerned, and the belief that race determined individual character. Not only did Berry's respondents believe that they could deduce black ancestry by the presence of "Negro body odor" or "the shape of the foot," but they also attributed the overall character and development of triracial peoples to the presence of the three races.[154] In this regard Berry was surprised to find that despite varying attitudes about whether or not triracial populations should be seen as degenerate or morally upright, there was overwhelming agreement that these groups embodied the essential qualities of the three contributing races. "Mestizos," he parroted, "are lazy because of their Negro blood, deceitful because of the Indian, and for whatever virtue there is in them they can thank their philandering white procreators."[155]

From a sociological perspective, the last six chapters— "Etiquette," "How They Live," "Their Schools," "Almost Red," "Almost Black," and "Almost White"—are the most interesting because they are the closest Berry ever gets to providing insight on the isolates' own understanding of their racial formation. These sections are noteworthy because they detail the daily lives of the various triracial groups with special attention to education, politics, and their access to social welfare programs. As Berry aptly notes, the struggle to gain their own schools had been critical to the mestizos' racial formation because unlike their participation in other institutions, school attendance was compulsory. As such, schools represented the one place where triracial people were forced to racially identity themselves. For this reason, Berry based his determination of whether a group skewed more closely red, white, or Indian, on whether or not their children attended Indian, white, or black schools. The Lumbee, Chickahominy, and

[154] Ibid., 43 and 58.

[155] Ibid., 55.

Nanticoke Indians, all of which gained their own state-sponsored Indian schools, were thus "almost red." Similarly, Berry reasoned that the Frilots of Louisiana were "almost black" because their children were forced to attend black schools. These designations, of course, were not necessarily how these groups' self-identified, yet Berry's characterizations are instructive because they highlight a theme that was present in many of the earlier studies on triracial communities—the role that social proximity to other racial groups played in how researchers framed triracial individuals.

Perhaps more than any of the other studies produced during this period, Berry's *Almost White* closely echoes the tone of the eugenic investigations published during the early twentieth century. Although he professed to be cautious about making generalizations, like the eugenicists before him, they abound in his treatment of his triracial subjects. In a statement closely mirroring the conclusion reached in Arthur Estabrook and Ivan McDougle's *Mongrel Virginians*, Berry describes the mestizos as "poor, isolate, and pathetic." Not only did these groups "eke out a miserable existence," but "their Indian blood has been diluted with that of whites—and, in many instances Negroes. They have forgotten their Indian tongue, cast off their Indian culture, and failed even to remember their tribal identification."[156] For these reasons, Berry considered the Wesorts of Maryland, the Issues of Amherst County, and even the Jackson Whites of New York as nothing more than "quasi-Indians" or "Indians by courtesy."[157] Their ultimate goal, he argued, was to gain entrance into white society. He even quoted Walter Plecker when he described the Virginia Indians as being preoccupied with "securing recognition first as whites, and if that fails,

[156] Ibid., 12.

[157] Ibid., 16.

as Indians."[158] Agreeing with Plecker, Berry dismissed the decades-long efforts of groups like the Chickahominy, Lumbee, and Nanticoke to gain public recognition as Indians. Instead he categorized these groups as "reluctant Indians" who would rather be white. With such pronouncements it should come as no surprise that Berry's study was accused of having caused significant damage to his subjects' reputations. Pollitzer blamed Berry for driving participants away from his studies. According to Pollitzer, the book had caused considerable "harm" among the Haliwa people. Since the book's release Pollitzer claimed that there had been at least five murders in the Haliwa community as the result of racial tensions stoked by the book.[159]

Conclusion

Calvin Beale, William Pollitzer, Carl Witkop, and Brewton Berry approached their studies of triracial populations with a multitude of assumptions about the biological and sociological character of these populations. Most of these assumptions, however, were not borne out. For instance, while expecting to confirm reports that extreme malnutrition had led to an increase in diabetes among the North Carolina Cherokee, Pollitzer's serological testing revealed that the group's hemoglobin levels were well within the normal range. [160] Neither did their research verify the groups' supposed isolation. While Berry outright acknowledged that triracial peoples were relocating to urban centers, Pollitzer remained more firmly wedded to the notion of isolation. Even when he encountered communities that were no longer isolated Pollitzer did not reevaluate his beliefs about triracial isolates. Instead, he attributed any inconsistencies to poor timing. In his 1969 study on the Melungeons, for instance Pollitzer maintained that "a study of

[158] Ibid., 62.

[159] Pollitzer to Frank Livingstone, April 20, 1966, Box 1, Pollitzer Papers, NAA.

[160] Amoz Chernoff to K.S. Dugan February 13, 1958

the Melungeons of a half century ago would undoubtedly have revealed a larger, more distinctive, more inbred population. A study of the people a half century hence would probably reveal a population more diverse."[161]

In 1972, when the *American Anthropologist* published a special issue devoted to triracial communities, scientists were once again debating the race concept. An increasing number of geneticists and anthropologists were now defending the clinalist position, which posited that differences in gene frequencies were on a continuum, and used blood group genetics to do so. Building on a theory first advanced by Julian Huxley, Frank Livingston argued that human diversity was better understood as clinal rather than racial difference. Human populations did not form discrete racial clusters, he argued, but varied geographically across populations.[162] While they did not necessarily subscribe to the clinal theory, the contributors—Beale, Pollitzer, historian Lynwood Martell, and sociologist B. Eugene Griessman--hoped their articles would reveal "how arbitrary but how formidable is this human boundary called 'race.'"[163]

Taken as a whole, the research on triracial isolates and the reactions it elicited reveal the extent of scientific debate about the contested and ultimately unstable nature of race. Although a number of scientists committed themselves to a new genetic conception of race, many assumptions regarding the nature of racial difference and racial formation remained unchanged. Pollitzer's investigations of blood group frequencies, Witkop's research on inherited disease, and Berry's study of the isolates' social conditions, while meant to challenge the race concept, only served to reify race as a valid mode of scientific analysis. Yet, their work was not simply the

[161] Pollitzer, "Survey of Demography, Anthropometry, and Genetics in the Melungeons of Tennessee: An Isolate of Hybrid Origin in Process Dissolution" *Human Biology* (September 1969): 395.

[162] Frank Livingston "On the Non-Existence of Human Races," Current Anthropology 3 (3) 1962

[163] B. Eugene Griessman, "The American Isolates," American Anthropologist (1972): 694.

importation of old racial theories into new methodological approaches. All three researchers saw their work as improving upon older methods of racial analysis. William Pollitzer aptly encapsulated the inherent tensions of mid-century research on triracial isolates when he described his work as based "on the notion that there is some fixed and rigid definition of race," while also pushing his audience to understand that "race is always in a state of flux, it's a continuum."[164]

[164] Researchers Say Lumbee Blood Diluted, *The Greensboro Record*, March 16, 1972, A9.

EPILOGUE

On January 9, 2012, Maryland Governor Martin O'Malley signed two executive orders formally recognizing the Piscataway Indians of Maryland. Set to the beat of hand drums, O'Malley signed the documents while flanked by leading tribal members at a State House ceremony attended by more than three hundred Piscataway and other guests.[1] The ceremony marked the end of the Piscataway's almost 34-year quest to obtain state recognition. Two previous governors considered the Piscataway for recognition in 1999 and in 2003, but both chose not to proceed with recognition citing the Piscataway's failure to prove that they were a continuous community since 1790.[2] Accusations that the Piscataway were cultural frauds hoping to use state and federal recognition as a stepping-stone to a casino also played a role in these earlier denials.[3]

Considering how difficult it was for the Piscataway to achieve state recognition, it is surprising that Governor O'Malley chose to downplay its significance at the gathering. "Today is a day of recognition. It is a day of arrival." O'Malley proclaimed, "To all the Piscataway people: You did not need an executive order to tell you who you are."[4] In placing the emphasis on the Piscataway's self-identification, O'Malley's comments ignored the fact that the absence of outside recognition carried serious consequences for the Piscataway's material and psychological

[1] "Washington-area tribes gain Maryland State Recognition" National Museum of the American Indian Blog, January 10, 2012. http://blog.nmai.si.edu/main/2012/01/washington-dc-area-tribes-gain-maryland-state-recognition.html Accessed: June 1, 2016.

[2] Garland, "Group Looses Bid For Tribal Recognition," The Baltimore Sun, September 23, 2003, http://articles.baltimoresun.com/2003-09-26/news/0309260250_1_piscataway-tribal-recognition-savoy

[3] Greg Garland, "Indian Tribal Claims Raises Question of Identity, Intentions" The Baltimore Sun, April 2, 1999.

[4] Michael Dresser, "O'Malley Formally Recognizes Maryland Tribe," January 9, 2012, *The Baltimore Sun*, http://articles.baltimoresun.com/2012-01-09/news/bs-md-omalley-tribes-20120109_1_piscataway-indian-nation-piscataway-conoy-confederacy-tribal-recognition Accessed: June 1, 2016.

wellbeing. With state recognition the Piscataway were now eligible for more than 17 million dollars in federal funding for education, housing, public health, and other programs. State recognition also meant that Piscataway-owned businesses were now eligible for minority business status, a designation that qualified them for state and local government contracts.[5] And for a people who had endured centuries of cultural erasure, state recognition was a major source of pride. As one tribal member put it succinctly, "We waited 200 years to get our identity back."[6]

Of the four resurgent tribal communities discussed in this study, the Piscataway Indians were the last to receive state recognition. The Ramapough and Monacan Indians were granted state recognition almost thirty years earlier, in 1980 and 1989 respectively, while the Nanticoke have been recognized since the early twentieth century.[7] Yet, despite formally recognizing the Monacans in 1989, it took another twelve years before the state of Virginia accepted responsibility for its role in the Indians' documentary erasure through the Racial Integrity Act. And this was only after the Monacans teamed with other tribal groups in the state to propose a bill that would allow those Indians wrongly classified to receive corrected vital records free of charge. Prior to the bill, which was passed by the General Assembly in 1997, Virginia's state registrar refused to waive the eight-dollar administrative fee for a corrected document, claiming that there was no evidence that the office had erred in its previous racial classification of the

[5] Michael Dresser, "O'Malley Formally Recognizes Piscataway Tribe," *The Baltimore Sun*, January 9, 2012. Accessed June 4, 2016 http://articles.baltimoresun.com/2012-01-09/news/bs-md-omalley-tribes-20120109_1_piscataway-indian-nation-piscataway-conoy-confederacy-tribal-recognition

[6] Ibid.

[7] "Ramapough Timeline," (Mahwah: Ramapough Lenape Nation, 2013), 17, http://www.ramapoughlenapenation.org/wp-docs/Timeline2013.pdf, accessed June 9, 2016; Samuel Cook, "The Monacan Indian Nation: Asserting Tribal Sovereignty in the Absence of Recognition," *Wicazo Sa Review* 17, no. 2 (Autumn 2002): 99, 105; Act of 1903 State Laws of Delaware XXII Chapter 470 p.986

state's native population.[8] Yet, the decision to pursue legislation was not about the monetary fee involved but served as an important step towards restitution for past injustices. It was also a way for the Indians to force the state into acknowledging its past history of racial oppression. After more than a century of social marginalization, racial discrimination, and prejudice, the Monacan, Piscataway, Nanticoke, and Ramapough welcomed state recognition as an affirmation of their long denied identity. Although the twentieth and twenty-first century brought major changes that allowed the emergent tribal groups to receive public acceptance as Indians, these victories were hard fought, and remain incomplete.

The absence of federal acknowledgement serves as a reminder for the Piscataway and other groups that despite a public more willing to accept them as Indians, their identity formation projects remain circumscribed by their mixed-race ancestry. Federal recognition has historically served as one of the principal ways in which Native Americans have maintained boundaries between themselves and their non-Indian neighbors. Much like language served in the nineteenth century to separate "authentic" and "inauthentic" Indians, federal acknowledgement has in the twenty-first century influenced perceptions of the real. For federally non-recognized tribes, acknowledgement is both symbolically and materially important because it brings access to a wider array of federally funded programs like health care, housing assistance, and educational programs.[9] However, as the Piscataway case makes clear, even some non-federally recognized tribes, typically those that have state recognition, enjoy some economic privileges derived from their special status. For a people who had endured at least a century or more of being unable to

[8] Samuel Cook, "The Monacan Indian Nation," 105.

[9] Susan Greenbaum, "What's In a Label? Identity Problems in Southern Indian Tribes," *The Journal of Ethnic Studies* 19:2 (1991): 107

publicly assert their identity because state bureaucrats, white neighbors, and social scientific experts refuted it—federal recognition meant that these opinions ceased to matter.

The Federal Acknowledgement Process provides a useful opportunity to examine how social science continued to influence the racial self-fashioning of these mixed-race communities during the twenty-first century. Technically speaking, federal recognition, which confers tribal status, is not a racial status but a legal process that establishes a political relationship between a group as a tribe and the federal government. And yet race weighs heavily in the process. Because petitioning groups must provide evidence of their continuous existence as an Indian community, racialized ideas about identity rooted in antiquated notions of biology and culture continue to inform the political and social claims that Indians of mixed ancestry have been able to make.

When the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) established the Federal Acknowledgement Process in 1978, they laid out seven criteria used to determine a petitioners' qualifications for acknowledgement, the first of which was that the petitioners be able to prove their continuous existence as an Indian community from "historical times" to the present. The other six criteria include: continuous existence as a distinct Native American community inhabiting a particular area; the continuous existence of a tribal government exercising authority over its constituents; a constitution or similar organizing document; evidence that membership consists of the descendants of a historically identifiable tribe; the condition that tribal members did not belong to any other tribe; as well as the condition that applicants had not been previously subject to congressional action that terminated or prohibited the establishment of a federal relationship.[10] Eastern and southern native communities have had a difficult time meeting this criteria because

[10] When first established the regulations were designated as Part 54 of Title 25 of the Code of Federal Regulations (May 9, 1978). In 1978 the regulations were redesigned Part 83 of Title 25 of the Code of Federal Regulations. See 83.7 (a)-(g) for the list of criteria.

for centuries their racial ancestry was recorded variably as "mulatto," "colored, and even "white," but hardly ever as "Indian." It is not enough that petitioners' self-identity as Indian, they also must prove that their white neighbors and social scientific experts accepted them as such. Their ability to meet federal criteria is also hindered by the fact that the criteria reflects a particular idea of Native American culture, one largely informed by the history of reservation Indians in the United States.

The Ramapough Mountain Indians are the only one of the four groups discussed in this study that pursued federal recognition through the BIA's Federal Acknowledgement Process.[11] Although the Ramapough submitted a letter stating their intent to petition for federal acknowledgement in 1978, it took twelve years before they had secured the necessary documentation and cleared the bureaucratic hurdles that allowed them to formally submit their application. The time and expense involved in the federal recognition process is a major obstacle that dissuaded other groups from pursuing recognition.[12] The Ramapough's final application, which they submitted in 1990, contained over a thousand pages of documents, which consisted of newspaper clippings, marriage and death certificates, genealogies, and other evidence, meant to prove their existence as an Indian community. Although the Ramapough submitted a great deal of documentation they were hard pressed to find sources that verified their Indian identity. For this reason, they also submitted Elizabeth Kite's 1912 eugenic study completed through the

[11] The Monacan Indians are currently pursuing acknowledgement but they chose not to go through the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Instead, in 2000 they along with the states' other six tribal groups sought support to introduce a bill to Congress that would grant the federal acknowledgement. Congress has yet to take action on the bill and it has been reintroduced every year since. For more on the Monacan's quest for federal acknowledgement see, Samuel Cook, "The Monacan Indians: Asserting Sovereignty in the Absence of Federal Acknowledgement," *Wicoza Sa Review* 17, no. 2 (2002): 91-116.

[12] Billy Tayac of the Piscataway Indian Nation cites budgetary concerns and the time involved as the main reasons for his tribes' reluctance to pursue federal recognition. Mark Miller, "Two Maryland Tribes Won't Seek Federal Recognition," *The Daily Record*, January 16, 2012, http://thedailyrecord.com/2012/01/16/two-maryland-indian-tribes-won%E2%80%99t-seek-federal-recognition/ accessed June 3, 2016.

Vineland Training School. Although Kite was interested in the Ramapough as far as they represented an opportunity to study feeblemindedness in a "White, Indian, and Negro" community, her work was also one of the few documentary sources to acknowledge the Ramapough's Native American ancestry.[13] The BIA's Branch of Acknowledgement and Research (BAR) spent three years deliberating over the materials before issuing a public report in 1993 that recommended against acknowledging the Ramapough.

Out of the seven criteria that the federal government used to define an Indian tribal community, the BAR staff, which included a historian, anthropologist, and genealogist, found that the Ramapough failed to meet four of the seven requirements: continuous existence as "American Indian," continuous identification as a distinct American Indian group inhabiting a specific area, continuous political authority over group members, and evidence that group members descended from a historically identifiable tribe.[14] As far as the federal government was concerned, in failing to meet these requirements the Ramapough did not exist as a tribe.

Although the BIA maintained that "groups of descendants will not be acknowledged solely on a racial basis," applicants needing to establish descent have been forced to rely on historical records that used racial identifiers, and the U.S. Census represents the most frequently utilized source material. Census data weighed heavily in the BAR's decision to not recommend the Ramapough for acknowledgement. In discussing why the census data for one Ramapough ancestor was inadequate to prove his status as an Indian, BAR researchers asserted that, "The one-time identification of Richard DeGroat (b. 1845) as 'Indian' by the census enumerator in

[13] Elizabeth Kite, *The Jackson Whites: A Study in Racial Degeneracy*, (Manuscript, Vineland, NJ, 1911) n.p. Elizabeth Sarah Kite Papers, 1864-1959 Box 1 A Rutgers University and Special Collections Archives

[14] "Proposed Findings Against Acknowledgement of the Ramapough Mountain Indians Inc.," Federal Register, December 8, 1993, 64662.

1875 is not acceptable evidence of Indian tribal ancestry because other identifications in the census record differed."[15] The report went on to state that ultimately, "without corroborating evidence, a one-time identification of an individual as 'Indian' cannot be considered reliable evidence for the ethnicity of that individual."[16]

Ethnographic research also weighed heavily in the BIA's decision to deny the Ramapough federal acknowledgement. The BAR's anthropological report found that although the Ramapough had existed as an isolated community for two hundred years, they did so not as an Indian community but as a "colored community with some Indian ancestry," a description that is strikingly similar to how Elizabeth Kite described them in the early twentieth century.[17] According to the BAR researchers, the Ramapough began living as an insular community in the 1800s and struggled to maintain an identity that was separate from whites and black. In a move that was strikingly similar to white elite efforts negate the Ramapough's racial self-identity, BAR researchers argued that because the Ramapough had sometimes chosen to participate in the social and religious activities of their white and black neighbors they had failed to preserve their unique identity. Frank Speck reached the same conclusion concerning the Ramapough's presumed cultural assimilation in in his 1912 study on the community. Like Speck, BAR researchers argued that the Ramapough's association with their blacks and white neighbors was enough to disprove their culture.

---

[15] Technical Report," Summary Under the Criteria and Evidence for Final Determination against Federal Acknowledgement of the Ramapough Mountain Indians. United States Department of Interior, Office of Federal Acknowledgement (January 1996), 98.

[16] "Technical Report," Summary Under the Criteria and Evidence for Final Determination against Federal Acknowledgement of the Ramapough Mountain Indians. United States Department of Interior, Office of Federal Acknowledgement (January 1996), 98.

[17] U.S. Department of Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Office of Federal Acknowledgment, "Summary Under the Criteria and Evidence for Final Determination Against Federal Acknowledgement of the Ramapough Mountain Indians Inc.," 1996, 7.

Since its inception, the Federal Acknowledgement Process has faced the criticism that its requirements were too rigid for communities that historically lacked any formalized relationship with the government.[18] In 1994, the BIA moved to revise the criteria for acknowledgement with the hopes of addressing some of these concerns. Namely bureau officials sought to streamline the process so that the application was more expedient, and they also amended the criteria to reduce the burden of proof of petitioners.[19] The most notable change that emerged out of the 1994 revision was that criterion 83.7 (a) petitioners were now required to show their continuous existence as Native American group since 1900.[20] The Ramapough were offered and accepted the opportunity to have their application reconsidered under the new criteria. In February of 1996, Assistant Secretary of the Indians Affairs Ada Deer issued the "Notice of Final Determination." In it she found that the Ramapough had proven that they had been consistently accepted as Indians since 1900 but they still failed to meet the other three criteria.[21] Arguing that the BIA had developed rigid and ultimately arbitrary criteria for recognition, the Ramapough appealed their decision all the way to the Supreme Court, which declined to hear their case in 1999, thus ending their quest for recognition.[22]

---

[18]There is a vast literature that discusses the impact of race on federal tribal recognition. For examples see, Terry Anderson, "Federal Recognition: The Vicious Myth" American Indian Journal (1978): 7-19: Susan Greenbaum, "What's In a Label? Identity Problems in Southern Indian Tribes," *The Journal of Ethnic Studies* 19:2 (1991): 107-125; William Quinn, Jr., "Federal Acknowledgement of Indian Tribes? The Historical Development of a Legal Concept," *American Journal of Legal History* 34 (1990): 351-63;Paul Spruhan, "Indian As Race/ Indian as Political Status: Implementation of the Half-Blood Requirement Under the Indian Reorganization Act, 1934-1945" *Rutgers Race & Law Review* (2006):

[19] Angela A. Gonzales and Timothy Q. Evans, "The Imposition of Law: The Federal Acknowledgement Process and the Legal De/Construction of Tribal Identity," in *Recognition, Sovereignty Struggles, & Indigenous Rights in the United States*, ed. Amy O'Den, (Chapel Hill: UNC Press, 2013), 175.

[20] Part 83 of Title 25 of the Code of Federal Regulations

[21] "Notice of Final Determination," February 6, 1999, 4476.

[22] Douglas Martin, "Ronald Van Dunk, 68, Chief Red Bone of the Ramapough Mountain Indians Is Dead: Trying to Win Federal Tribal Recognition and Reclaim a Lost Heritage," *New York Times*, April 8, 2001, 46.

Although scientific experts continued to negatively impact the Ramapough's public self-fashioning that did not stop them from developing relationships with their own experts. In addition to hiring their own genealogist to gather history on their ancestors, the Ramapough consulted an archaeologist in order to determine their tribal ancestors. It was archaeologist Herbert Kraft who first suggested that the Ramapough were the descendants of the Munsee-speaking Indians who lived in the Ramapo Mountains during the eighteenth century.[23] The Ramapough have since incorporated the Munsee insignia into their tribal banner. In seeking out their own experts, the Ramapough have continued the work began in the early twentieth century in which mixed-blood racial communities used scientific experts to help buttress their identity claims.

Although native communities continue to work with researchers, it is important to note that the development of such oversight agencies as the Institutional Review Board and a greater concern for the social impact of anthropological research has fundamentally altered the way that researchers engage with these communities. In her work on the Lumbee's efforts to gain recognition, Karen Blu has noted that federal recognition marks an anomalous moment when Indians invite anthropologists to do research in their communities and in ways largely dictated by the Indians themselves.[24] Whereas Speck, Mooney, and others thought they were "discovering" the Indian remnants, tribal communities are now directing research initiatives and setting the terms of engagement.

---

[23] Technical Report, 23

[24] Karen Blu, "Region and Recognition; Southern Indians, Anthropologists, and Presumed Biology," in *Anthropologists and Indians in the New South* ed., Rachel A Bonney and J. Anthony Paredes (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2001), 71-85, 71.

As much as the Ramapough, Monacans, and Nanticoke have had to contend with their particular history as isolated communities of presumed multiracial ancestry, their campaigns for recognition at both the state and federal level were and continue to be influenced by the broader politics of Native American sovereignty, particularly as it relates to the establishment of Indian gaming. With the passage of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act of 1988, federally recognized tribes were granted the right to establish any gambling ventures on their reservations that were also legal in the state.[25] Although state recognition does not automatically grant federal recognition, anti-gambling opponents have accused petitioning tribal groups of using state recognition as a stepping-stone towards their ultimate goal of federal recognition and the establishment of casinos. In 1993, the same year that Governor William Shaefer refused to sign an executive order recognizing the Piscataway Indians because of his opposition to gambling, 49 out of 50 governors petitioned Congress to modify the Indian Gaming Act.[26] Anti-gambling opposition was so strong in the state of Maryland that the Piscataway were forced to renounce their right to start a casino in exchange for O'Malley's support for recognition in 2012.[27] As much as essentialized notions of race and culture continue to hamper the racial formation projects of mixed-blood Indians, the Piscataway case reveals that identity politics were not the only politics involved.

Anti-gambling lobbyists as well as business owners wishing to freeze the competition posed by Indian gambling were not above publicly questioning the cultural authenticity of those

[25] *Indian Gaming Regulatory Act*, 25 U.S.C. § 2701.

[26] Ibid.,59.

[27] Childs Walker, "Md. Recognition of Piscataway Adds Happy Note to Complicated History," *Baltimore Sun*, January 6, 2012, http://articles.baltimoresun.com/2012-01-16/news/bs-md-piscataway-history-20120116_1_piscataway-indian-nation-mervin-savoy-piscataway-conoy-confederacy.

tribal groups seeking recognition, especially if that meant victory for their side. In 1993, businessman and casino developer Donald Trump sued the federal government alleging that the Indian Regulatory Gaming Act had discriminated against him because it provided an unfair economic advantage to Native Americans.[28] When his lawsuit failed Trump, who owned the Atlantic City based Trump Castle, Trump Plaza, and Trump Taj Mahal, began publicly questioning the racial identity of the Ramapough. Because the Ramapough were located only two hours from Atlantic City, the establishment of a casino would present a significant competition for Trump and other Atlantic City casino owners. When the Ramapough staged a demonstration to protest what they viewed as Trump's attempts to undermine their claims, Trump goaded demonstrators by publicly questioning their racial ancestry to the media. "They sure as hell don't look like Indians to me," Trump asserted.[29] Ronald Van Dunk, chief of the Ramapough Indians, was particularly offended by Trump's racially charged attack. Defending the racial heritage of his peoples Van Dunk contended: "Maybe we don't look like we came off a nickel like some people want us to be, but we've kept the same names from history on down, even if we were part of the melting pot."[30] Van Dunks' comments are noteworthy because they mark one of the few instances in which a member of any of the four tribes has openly acknowledged any multiracial ancestry. What is more interesting about the Trump/Van Dunk exchange is that it reveals the extent to which the groups' presumed multiracial ancestry continues to influence their public perception.

[28] Wayne Kings, "Trump In A Federal Lawsuit, Seeks to Block Indian Casinos," *New York Times*, May 4, 1993, B6.

[29] Douglas Martin, "Ronald Van Dunk, 68, Chief Red Bone of the Ramapough Mountain Indians Is Dead: Trying to Win Federal Tribal Recognition and Reclaim a Lost Heritage," *New York Times*, April 8, 2001, 46.

[30] Ibid.

The challenges posed by the identity claims of mixed-blood Indians persist despite, and perhaps because of, the rise of the multiracial identity movement. The end of Jim Crow brought with it various racial realignments in the United States, perhaps the most notable of which was the end of legalized segregation and the political disenfranchisement of African Americans. G. Reginal Daniel has described the multiracial identity movement as a social and political initiative aimed at challenging institutions, policies, conditions and rules directly and indirectly based off the one-drop rule.[31] Although its ideologies and goals have varied, one of the principal achievements of the multiracial identity movement is that it made "multiracial" an operative social category and racial descriptor, as evidenced by the push to introduce a multiracial category in the 2000 U.S. Census.

The multiracial identity movement also encouraged more people to assert their previously marginalized racial ancestry. This is perhaps one reason that the number of people reporting Native American ancestry has risen astronomically since 1970. Between the 1970 and 1980 census there was a 72 percent increase in people self-identifying as Native American. In 1980 that number was at just over 1,364,000.[32] Many of these newly self-identified Indians were persons of multiracial ancestry who did not have the same cultural backgrounds or physical appearance generally associated with Native Americans. With these newly minted Indians also came efforts to formally organize in order to pursue state and federal recognition. Critics of this ethnic resurgence have openly questioned the veracity of these new identity claims. William Quinn, a former ethnologist with the Bureau of Indian Affairs has christened the phenomenon

[31] G. Reginald Daniel, *More Than Black?: Multiracial Identity and the New Racial Order* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2001), 3.

[32] William W. Quinn Jr,."The Southeast Syndrome: Notes on Indian Culture Descendant Recruitment Organizations and Their Perceptions of Native American Culture," *American Indian Quarterly* 14, no.2 (Spring 1990): 151.

the "Southeast syndrome," as the largest numbers of newly self-identifying native groups have emerged out of the southeast. [33] As communities residing along the eastern seaboard who took active steps to assert their public identities as Indians during the late 1970s, the Ramapough, Monacans, Piscataway, and Nanticoke have been described as part of this trend. The Piscataway were particularly implicated because they constellated their membership through recruitment, a practice that was heavily criticized as a sign of clear cultural inauthenticity.

The rise of direct-to-consumer DNA testing that allows participants to trace their descent from ancestral populations, usually Native American, represents the latest attempt to link race, biology, and culture. Between 2001 and 2006 nearly five hundred thousand people purchased these tests.[34] Circe Strum has documented how persons who self-identify as Caucasian or African American have used these tests to lay claim to Native American ancestry, typically Cherokee.[35] The twenty-first century has also brought efforts to insert DNA testing into determinations of state and federal recognition. In 2000, the Vermont legislature introduced a bill that would have established standards and procedures for DNA testing that would determine one's Native American ancestry. The Western Mohegan, a tribal group situated along the New York and Vermont border enthusiastically supported the bill. At the time of the bill's introduction the Mohegan were having their own DNA sampled in order to determine their tribal ancestors. Although it failed to pass the measure was framed as a real boost to Native Americans who, like the Mohegans lacked genealogical evidence about their ancestors and were thus unable

[33] Ibid.149.

[34] Blaine Bettinger, "How Big is the Genetic Genealogy Market?" *The Genetic Genealogist* (blog), November 6, 2007, http://thegeneticgenealogist.com/2007/11/06/how-big-is-the-genetic-genealogy-market/.

[35] Circe Strum, Becoming Indian: The Struggle over Cherokee Identity in the Twenty-first Century (Santa Fe: School for Advanced Research Press, 2011), 56-57.

to satisfactorily prove their ancestry.[36] Taken as a whole, these examples demonstrate that culture, race, and biology continue to be linked as the constitutive components of identity in both scientific practice and in the public imagination.

For all the hope that science has engendered regarding its ability to get to racial "truths," the Melungeon Core Y DNA project serves as a careful reminder that DNA testing can also undermine how people come to know themselves. Family Tree DNA, a direct-to-consumer DNA company, sponsored the study which launched in 2010 in order to coincide with the release of the company's latest DNA test, Family Finder, a mail-in testing system that promised consumers the ability to genetically determine the geographic origins of their ancestors. Researchers tested males with known Melungeon heritage using Y chromosomal testing. In total, 19 families or presumed Melungeon heritage participated in the project. In addition to the genetic testing researchers also consulted several historical sources including Walter Plecker's list of presumed Melungeons names, articles written on the Melungeons by Will Allen Dromgoole, in addition to voting records and other sources.[37] Unfortunately for the Melungeons, these results did not match long held notions regarding their racial heritage. "There were a whole lot of people upset by this study," said lead researcher Roberta Estes, "They just knew they were Portuguese or Native American."[38] Although the DNA testing can only reveal genetic inheritance, as Estes' description of the Melungeons' response to the DNA testing reveals, for some Melungeons it also promised to reveal their culture. But what happens when, in the Melungeons' case, self-

[36] Kim TallBear, "DNA, Blood, and Racializing the Tribe," *Wicazo Sa Review* 18, no.1 (Spring 2008): 81-107, 82.

[37] Roberta J. Estes et. al, "Melungeons, A Multi-Ethnic Population," 20, http://www.dnaexplain.com/Publications/PDFs/MelungeonsMulti-EthnicPeopleFinal.pdf.

[38] Travis Loller, "Melungeon DNA Study Reveals Ancestry, Upsets 'A Whole Lot of People,' *The Associated Press*, May 24, 2012.

conception fails to map with biology "truths"? For Melungeons and other triracial groups, the scientific negation of their avowed identity is devastating.

Several themes emerge from the twenty-first century experiences of the Ramapough, Monacans, Nanticoke, and Piscataway that are useful for thinking about the historical role that the biological and social sciences have played in the construction of racial meaning. First, American's faith in science to reveal essential "truths," is an important reason that scientific experts have had and continue to have a central role in adjudicating issues of identity. And while scientists, as a result of their professionalization, have had an important role in the framing of their disciplines as sites of truth making, attention to how Americans have engaged with biological and social scientists throughout history also reveals that participants had their own agendas and expectations.

For those committed to white supremacy, access to scientific expertise meant that they did not have to confront the fact that despite their public avowals that blackness was obvious, racial detection was not. This tension was made all the more apparent by those social scientists who spend the first decades of the twentieth-century outlining the social and psychological conditions that made the mixed-blood an eminent threat. Thus, white supremacists' commitment then to eugenics during the 1920s and 1930s was their attempt to shore up the threats posed to white supremacy by evoking scientific expertise in their racial making projects. So too were Native Americans the objects of social and biological science invested in and welcoming of scientific researchers. On the one hand their interest reflects the extent to which they understood that scientific expertise lent their identity claims legitimacy. Yet, for southern and eastern Indians, many of whom lacked a documentary history of their ancestors, social and biological

scientists also presented a chance opportunity to access uncover essential truths about themselves that had been lost.

Secondly, both the twentieth and twenty-first century mark the importance placed on deriving scientific knowledge particularly from Native American bodies. The idea that Native Americans represented, in both a biological and cultural sense, man's earliest form has served to engender two theories regarding the importance of Native American research subjects that informed both twentieth and twenty-first century research: The idea that Native Americans were disappearing and thus needed to be studied before it was too late, and well as the idea that Native American bodies held the key to certain forms of knowledge that could not be gleaned from elsewhere.

Finally, both periods illustrate America's preoccupation with determining the boundaries of race and investment in deciding in who gets to make those decisions. Ultimately, the efforts to elucidate the identity of triracial communities reveals the many contradictions and fictions that lay at the heart of America's racial formation project

REFERENCES

Newspapers

Advocate

Afro-American

Amherst New Era Progress

Augusta Chronicle

Duluth News Tribune

Los Angeles Times

National Labour Tribune

New York Times

Omaha World Herald

Philadelphia Inquirer

Richmond Planet

Richmond News-Leader

Richmond Times-Dispatch

Sacramento Bee

Springfield Republican

The Baltimore Sun

The Broad Ax

The Daily Record

The Greensboro Record

The Jacksonian

The Los Angeles Times

The Nashville American

The Sunday Herald

The Virginia Pilot

Trenton Evening Times

Tulsa World

Watertown Daily Times

Archives Consulted

Albert and Shirley Small Special Collections, University of Virginia Library, Charlottesville, Virginia

M.E. Grenander Department of Special Collections and Archives, Albany University Library, Albany, New York

American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

United States National Agricultural Library, Beltsville, MD

National Anthropological Archives, Washington, D.C.

Works Cited

Abramson, Rudy, and Jean Haskell, eds. *Encyclopedia of Appalachia*. 1 edition. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 2006.

Aikman, K. B. "Race Mixture." *The Eugenics Review* 25, no. 3 (October 1933): 161–66.

Allen, Garland E. "The Eugenics Record Office at Cold Spring Harbor, 1910-1940: An Essay in Institutional History." *Osiris* 2 (1986): 225–64.

Allen, James Lane. "Through Cumberland Gap on Horseback." *Harper's Magazine*, June 1886.

Alversson, Jan Åke. "The Process of Ethno(re)genesis among the Weehayak of the Gran Chaco." *Revista Del CESLA* 10 (2007): 139–56.

American Association of Physical Anthropologists. *A History of American Physical Anthropology, 1930-1980*. New York, N.Y.: Academic Press, 1982.

Arcos-Burgos, M., and M. Muenke. "Genetics of Population Isolates." *Clinical Genetics* 61, no. 4 (April 2002): 233–47.

Ardizzone, Heidi, and Earl Lewis. *Love on Trial: An American Scandal in Black and White*. First Edition edition. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2002.

Babcock, William H. "The Nanticoke Indians of Indian River, Delaware." *American Anthropologist* 1, no. 2 (1899): 277–82.

Baker, Lee D. *Anthropology and the Racial Politics of Culture*. Durham NC: Duke University Press Books, 2010.

Barkan, Elazar. *The Retreat of Scientific Racism: Changing Concepts of Race in Britain and the United States between the World Wars*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Bateau, Allen. *The Invention of Appalachia*. Tuscon: University of Arizona Press, 1990.

Beale, Calvin. "American Triracial Isolates: Their Sttus and Pertinence to Research." *Eugenics Quarterly* 4 (1957).

Beaulieu, David L. "Curly Hair and Big Feet: Physical Anthropology and the Implementation of Land Allotment on the White Earth Chippewa Reservation." *American Indian Quarterly* 8, no. 4 (1984): 281–314. doi:10.2307/1183660.

Berkhofer, Robert F. *The White Man's Indian: Images of the American Indian from Columbus to the Present*. 1st Vintage Books ed edition. New York: Vintage, 1979.

Berry, Brewton. *Almost White*. New York: Macmillan, 1963.

Binney, Allison. "Dilemmas of Federal Recognition: Reforming the BIA Process." *Native Americas* XIX, no. 1 (June 30, 2002): 24.

Blackmar, Frank W. "The Smoky Pilgrims." *American Journal of Sociology* 2, no. 4 (1897): 485–500.

Blankenship, Roy. *The Life and Times of Frank G. Speck 1881 - 1950*. Philadelphia (Pa.): Department of Anthropology, 1991.

Blu, Karen I. *The Lumbee Problem: The Making of an American Indian People*. New edition edition. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2001.

Bond, Horace Mann. "Two Racial Islands in Alabama." *American Journal of Sociology* 36, no. 4 (January 1, 1931): 552–67. doi:10.1086/215475.

Bradley, William. "Hobnobbing with Hillbillies." *Harper's Monthly Magazine*, May 1915, 91–103.

Branscome, James. *Annihilating the Hillbilly: The Appalachians' Struggle with America's Institutions*. Appalachian Movement Press, 1971.

Brewer, William. "Moonshining in Georgia." *Cosmopolitan* 23, no. 12 (1897): 127–34.

Brooks, James F., ed. *Confounding the Color Line: The (American) Indian - Black Experience in North America*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2002.

Campbell, John C. *The Southern Highlander and His Homeland*. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2004.

Carroll, Charles. *The Negro A Beast Or In the Image of God*. First Edition edition. St. Louis: American Book and Bible House, 1900.

Carver, Ada. "Redbones." *Harper's Monthly Magazine*, February 1925, 257–70.

Castle, W. E. "Biological and Social Consequences of Race-Crossing." *American Journal of Physical Anthropology* 9, no. 2 (April 1, 1926): 145–56. doi:10.1002/ajpa.1330090212.

Cohen, David Steven. *The Ramapo Mountain People*. 1st edition. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1986.

Coleman, Arica L. *That the Blood Stay Pure: African Americans, Native Americans, and the Predicament of Race and Identity in Virginia*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2013.

Conklin, Edward. *Heredity and Environment in the Development of Men*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1915.

Cook, Samuel R. "Anthropological Advocacy in Historical Perspective: The Case of Anthropologists and Virginia Indians." *Human Organization* 62, no. 2 (2003): 193–201.

———. "The Monacan Indians: Asserting Sovereignty in the Absence of Federal Acknowledgement." *Wicoza Sa* 17, no. 2 (2002): 91–116.

Cox, Earnest S. *White America*. Richmond: White American Society, 1923.

Dall, Caroline. "The Late Frederick Douglass. No Negro Blood In His Veins: Interesting Reminiscences by Mrs. Dall." *Springfield Republican*, December 22, 1899.

Daniel, G. Reginald. *Racial Thinking in the United States: Uncompleted Independence*. Edited by Paul Spickard. Notre Dame, Ind: University of Notre Dame Press, 2004.

Darnell, Regna. *Invisible Genealogies: A History of Americanist Anthropology*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2001.

Davenport, Charles. *Race Crossing in Jamaica*. Washington, D. C.: Carnegie Institute, 1929.

Davis, F. James. *Who Is Black?: One Nation's Definition*. 10 Anniversary ed edition. University Park, Pa: Penn State University Press, 2001.

Deutsch, Nathaniel. *Inventing America's "Worst" Family: Eugenics, Islam, and the Fall and Rise of the Tribe of Ishmael*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2009.

Dexter, Ralph. “Contributions of Frank G. Speck (1881-1950) to Ethnobiology.” *Journal of Ethnobiology* 4, no. 2 (December 1984): 171–76.

Dickinson, A. “Race Mixture: A Social or Biological Problem.” *The Eugenics Review* 41 (1949): 81–85.

Dippie, Brian W. *The Vanishing American: White Attitudes and U.S. Indian Policy*. Revised Edition edition. Middletown, Conn.: University Press of Kansas, 1991.

Dobzhansky, Theodosius, Ashley Montagu, and C. S. Coon. “Two Views of Coon’s Origin of Races with Comments by Coon and Replies.” *Current Anthropology* 4, no. 4 (1963): 360–67.

Dominguez, Virginia R. *White By Definition: Social Classification in Creole Louisiana*. First Edition. New Brunswick, N.J: Rutgers University Press, 1986.

Dorr, Gregory Michael. “Assuring America’s Place in the Sun: Ivey Foreman Lewis and the Teaching of Eugenics at the University of Virginia.” *Journal of Southern History* 66 (May 2000): 257–96.

———. *Segregation’s Science: Eugenics and Society in Virginia*. 1 edition. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2008.

DuBois, W. E. B. “Amalgamation.” *Crisis* 23, no. 2 (December 1921): 55–56.

———. “Lies Agreed Upon.” *Crisis* 11, no. 4 (February 1916): 187.

———. “The Talented Tenth.” In *The Negro Problem: A Series of Articles by Representative American Negroes of Today*, edited by Booker T. Washington. New York: J. Pott & Company, 1903.

Dunlap, A.R., and C.A. Weslager. “Trends in the Naming of Tri-Racial Mixed-Blood Groups in the Eastern United States.” *American Speech* 22, no. 2 (1947): 81–87.

Dunn, L.C. “Some Results of Race Mixture in Hawaii.” *Eugenics in Race and State* 2 (1921): 109.

Estabrook, Arthur H. “Blood Seeking Environment.” *Eugenical News*, 1926, 106–14.

———. “Triple Crosses in the South: Indian, White, Negro.” *Eugenical News* 9 (1924): 58–59.

Estabrook, Arthur H., and Ivan E. McDougle. *Mongrel Virginians: The Win Tribe*. Text is Free of Markings edition. Baltimore: The Williams & WILKINS COMPANY, 1926.

Evrie, John H. Van. *White Supremacy and Negro Subordination*. Van Evrie, Horton & Company, 1870.

Farber, Paul, and Hamilton Cravens. *Race and Science: Scientific Challenges to Racism in Modern America*. First Edition edition. Corvallis, Or: Oregon State University Press, 2009.

Ferguson, Lauren Kathryn. “Indian Blood or Life Blood: An Analysis of the Racialization of Native North American Peoples.” M.A. Thesis, Montana State University, 2005.

Field, Les. “Complicities and Collaborations Anthropologists and the ‘Unacknowledged’ Tribes of California.” *Current Anthropology* 40 (1999): 193–210.

Forbes, Jack D. “Mustee, Half-Breeds and Zambos in Anglo North America: Aspects of Black Indian Relations.” *American Indian Quarterly* 7, no. 1 (1982): 57–83.

———. *Africans and Native Americans: The Language of Race and the Evolution of Red-Black Peoples*. 2nd ed. edition. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1993.

———. “The Manipulation of Races, Caste, and Identity: Classifying Afro-Americans, Native Americans and Red-Black People.” *The Journal of Ethnic Studies* 17, no. 4 (1990): 1–51.

Frazier, E. Franklin. *The Negro Family in the United States*. New York: Dryden Press, 1948.

———. *The Negro Family in Chicago*. University of Chicago Sociological Series. Chicago, Ill., The University of Chicago press, 1932. //catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/001265043.

Fredrickson, George M. *The Black Image in the White Mind: The Debate on Afro-American Character and Destiny, 1817-1914*. 1st edition. Middletown, Conn. : Scranton, Pa: Wesleyan, 1987.

Frost, William Goodell. “Our Contemporary Ancestors In The Southern Mountains.” *Appalachian Heritage* 4, no. 4 (1976): 70–80. doi:10.1353/aph.1976.0019.

Garroutte, Eva Marie. “The Racial Formation of American Indians: Negotiating Legitimate Identities within Tribal and Federal Law.” *American Indian Quarterly* 25, no. 2 (2001): 224–39.

Gates, R. R. (Reginald Ruggles). *Heredity and Eugenics*. New York, Macmillan, 1923. http://archive.org/details/heredityeugenics00gate.

———. *Heredity in Man,*. Constable & company, 1929.

G.B.J. “Review: The Racial Integrity of the American Negro.” *Social Forces* 30, no. 4 (May 1952): 481.

Gilbert, William Harlan. “The Wesorts of Maryland: An Outcasted Group.” *Journal of the Washington Academy of Sciences* 35, no. 8 (1945): 237–46.

Gilmore, Glenda Elizabeth. *Gender and Jim Crow: Women and the Politics of White Supremacy in North Carolina, 1896-1920*. 1st New edition edition. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1996.

———. *Who Were the Progressives?* First Edition edition. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin’s, 2002.

Gleach, Frederick. “Anthropological Professionalization and the Virginia Indians at the Turn of the Century.” *American Anthropologist* 104, no. 2 (2002): 499–507.

Goldberg, David Theo. *Racist Culture: Philosophy and the Politics of Meaning*. Oxford England ; Cambridge, Mass: Blackwell, 1993.

Grant, Madison. *The Passing of the Great Race*. New York: Scribner's Sons, 1916.

Gray, Andrew, Gray D. Heinen, Kirsten Hastrup, and Peter Elsass. "On Anthropological Advocacy." *Current Anthropology* 31, no. 4 (1900): 387–90.

Greenbaum, Susan. "In Search of Lost Tribes: Anthropology and the Federal Acknowledgement Process." *Human Organization* 44, no. 4 (1985): 361–67.

Griffin, Larry J. "Whiteness and Southern Identity in the Mountain and Lowland South." *Journal of Appalachian Studies* 10, no. 1/2 (2004): 7–37.

Gross, Ariela J. *What Blood Won't Tell: A History of Race on Trial in America*. Cambridge, Mass.; London: Harvard University Press, 2010.

Hale, Grace Elizabeth. *Making Whiteness: The Culture of Segregation in the South, 1890-1940*. New York: Vintage, 1999.

Hallowell, A. Irving. "Frank Gouldsmith Speck, 1881-1950." *American Anthropologist* 53 (1951): 67–87.

Hamies-Bartlof, Melanie. "Policies and Attitudes: Public Education and the Monacan Indian Community in Amherst County, Virginia, from 1908 to 1965." Ph.D. diss, Virginia Commonwealth, 2004.

Hantman, Jeffrey L. "Between Powhatan and Quirank: Reconstructing Monacan Culture and History in the Context of Jamestown." *American Anthropologist* 92 (September 1990): 676–90.

Harjo, Suzan Shown. "Native Identity: A Circle of Sovereignty." *Native Americas* XIX, no. 1 (June 30, 2002): 82.

Harkins, Anthony. *Hillbilly: A Cultural History of an American Icon*. 1st edition. New York: Oxford University Press, 2003.

Harper, Roland. "The Most Prolific People." *Eugenical News*, 1938, 29–31.

Harris, Cheryl I. "Whiteness as Property." *Harvard Law Review* 106, no. 8 (1993): 1707–91. doi:10.2307/1341787.

———. "Whiteness as Property." *Harvard Law Review* 106, no. 8 (1993): 1707–91.

Harry, Debra. "GENETICS AND NATIVE IDENTITY: Will Science Determine?" *Native Americas* XIX, no. 1 (June 30, 2002): 52.

Harte, Thomas J. "Trends in Mate Selection in a Tri-Racial Isolate." *Social Forces* 37, no. 3 (1959): 215–21. doi:10.2307/2572965.

Hauptman, Laurence M., and Jack Campisi. "The Voice of Eastern Indians: The American Indian Chicago Conference of 1961 and the Movement for Federal Recognition." *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 132, no. 4 (1988): 316–29.

Herskovits, Melville Jean. *The American Negro: A Study in Racial Crossing*. Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1964.

Hester, James J. "Pioneer Methods in Salvage Anthropology." *Anthropological Quarterly* 41, no. 3 (1968): 132–46. doi:10.2307/3316788.

———. "Pioneer Methods in Salvage Anthropology." *Anthropological Quarterly* 41, no. 3 (1968): 132–46. doi:10.2307/3316788.

Hicks, George L, and Philip E Leis. *Ethnic Encounters: Identities and Contexts*. North Scituate, Mass.: Duxbury Press, 1977.

Hicks, George, and Frank Speck. "Cultural Persistence Versus Local Adaptation: Frank Speck's Catawba Indians." *Ethnohistory* 12, no. 4 (1965): 343–54.

Higginbotham, A. Leon, and Barbara Kopytoff. "Racial Purity and Interracial Sex in the Law of Colonial and Antebellum Virginia." *Georgetown Law Review* 77, no. 6 (August 1989): 1967–2029.

Higginbotham, Evelyn Brooks. *Righteous Discontent: The Women's Movement in the Black Baptist Church, 1880-1920*. Revised edition. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1994.

Hill, Jonathan D. *History, Power, and Identity*. University of Iowa Press, 1996. https://muse.jhu.edu/book/20712.

Hinsley, Curtin. *The Smithsonian and the American Indian: Making a Moral Anthropology in Victorian America*. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1994.

Hirsch, Nathaniel D.M. "An Experimental Study of the East Kentucky Mountaineers." *Genetic Psychology Monographs* 3 (March 1928): 183–244.

Hollinger, David. "Amalgamation and Hypodescent: The Question of Ethnoracial Mixture in the History of the United States." *The American Historical Review* 108, no. 5 (December 2003): 1363–90.

———. "The Hidden History of Mestizo America." *The Journal of American History* 82, no. 3 (1995): 941–64.

Holmberg, Allan. "Participant Intervention in the Field." *Human Organization* 14 (1955): 23–26.

Houck, Peter W. *Indian Island in Amherst County*. 2nd edition. Lynchburg, Va: Warwick House Pub, 1993.

Hudson, Charles M. *The Catawba Nation*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1970.

Inscoe, John C., ed. *Appalachians and Race: The Mountain South from Slavery to Segregation*. New edition edition. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2005.

Jacobson, Matthew Frye. *Barbarian Virtues: The United States Encounters Foreign Peoples at Home and Abroad, 1876-1917*. 1st edition. New York: Hill and Wang, 2001.

Jennings, H. S. Herbert Spencer. *The Biological Basis of Human Nature*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1930.

Johnson, Charles S. "Editorial." *Opportunity* 3, no. 34 (1925): 291.

———. *Growing Up in the Black Belt: Negro Youth in the Rural South*. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1941.

Johnson, Walter. "The White Slave, the Slave Trader, and the Politics of Racial Determination in the 1850s South." *Journal of American History* 87, no. 1 (2000): 13–38.

Jones, J. Hardy, and Parenton, Vernon J. "The People of Frilot Cove: A Study of Racial Hybrids." *American Journal of Sociology* 57 (1951): 145–49.

Kevles, Daniel J. *In the Name of Eugenics: Genetics and the Uses of Human Heredity*. Reprint edition. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1998.

Kite, Elizabeth. "The Pineys." *The Survey*, October 1913, 7–13, 38–40.

———. "Two Brothers." *The Survey*, May 2, 1912, 1861–64.

Kushner, David Z. "Powell's Racial and Cultural Ideologies." *Israeli Studies in Musicology* 5 (2006): 1–15.

Lal, Barbara Ballis. "Black and Blue in Chicago: Robert E. Park's Perspective on Race Relations in Urban America, 1914-44." *The British Journal of Sociology* 38, no. 4 (1987): 546–66. doi:10.2307/590916.

Laughlin, Harry. "Eugenics in America." *Eugenics Review*, April 1925, 28–35.

———. "Eugenics in America." *Eugenics Review* 17 (April 1925): 28.

Lemire, Elise. *"Miscegenation": Making Race in America*. Reissue edition. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009.

Livingstone, Frank B., and Theodosius Dobzhansky. "On the Non-Existence of Human Races." *Current Anthropology* 3, no. 3 (1962): 279–81.

López, Ian Haney. *White by Law 10th Anniversary Edition: The Legal Construction of Race*. Revised and Updated: 10th Anniversary ed. edition. New York: NYU Press, 2006.

Lowery, Malinda Maynor. *Lumbee Indians in the Jim Crow South: Race, Identity, and the Making of a Nation*. First Edition, 1st Printing edition. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2010.

Lowie, Robert. *Culture and Ethnology*. New York: Horace Liveright, 1917.

Lubin, Alex. *Romance and Rights: The Politics of Interracial Intimacy, 1945-1954*. Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 2009.

MacDill, Marjorie. "Will Blending of Races Produce Super-Men?" *The Science News-Letter* 12, no. 346 (1927): 337–43. doi:10.2307/3902551.

Maclachlan, John. "Distinctive Cultures in the Southeast: Their Possibilities for Regional Research." *Social Forces* 18, no. 2 (1939): 210–15.

MacMurchy, Henry. "The Relation of Feeble-Mindedness to Other Social Problems." *Journal of Psycho-Asthenics* 21 (1916): 58–63.

Marks, Jonathan. "The Origins of Anthropological Genetics." *Current Anthropology* 53, no. S5 (2012): S161–72. doi:10.1086/662333.

———. *Human Biodiversity: Genes, Race, and History*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter, 1995.

Marotta, Vince. "Civilisation, Culture and the Hybrid Self in the Work of Robert Ezra Park." *Journal of Intercultural Studies* 27, no. 4 (2006): 413–33. doi:10.1080/07256860600936911.

Mathews, Fred H. *Quest for an American Sociology: Robert E. Park and the Chicago School*. First Edition edition. Montreal: Univ of Toronto Pr, 1977.

———. "Social Scientists and the Culture Concept, 1930-1950: The Conflict between Processual and Structural Approaches." *Sociological Theory* 7, no. 1 (Spring 1989): 87–101.

McCulloch, Oscar. *Tribe of Ishmael: A Study in Social Degradation*. Indianapolis: Charity Organization Society, 1888.

McKee, James B. *Sociology and the Race Problem: The Failure Of A Perspective*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1993.

McLoughlin, William. "Red Indians, Black Slavery, and White Racism: America's Slaveholding Indians." *American Quarterly*, n.d.

Mencke, John G. *Mulattoes and Race Mixture: American Attitudes and Images, 1865-1918*. Ann Arbor, Mich.: UMI Research Press, 1979.

Merrell, James. "The Racial Education of the Catawba Indians." *The Journal of Southern History* 50, no. 3 (August 1984): 363–84.

Meyer, Melissa. *Thicker Than Water: The Origins of Blood as Symbol and Ritual*. 1 edition. New York: Routledge, 2005.

Miles, Tiya. *Ties That Bind: The Story of an Afro-Cherokee Family in Slavery and Freedom*. 2 edition. Oakland, California: University of California Press, 2015.

Miller, Mark Edwin, and Chad Corntassel Smith. *Claiming Tribal Identity: The Five Tribes and the Politics of Federal Acknowledgment*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2013.

Mjoen, Jon Alfred. “Biological Consequences of Race-Crossing.” *Journal of Heredity* 17, no. 5 (May 1, 1926): 175–82.

Mohawk, John C. “The ‘Disappearing Indian’: 20th Century Reality Disproves 19th Century Prediction.” *Native Americas* XIX, no. 1 (June 30, 2002): 40.

Molina, Natalia. *Fit to Be Citizens?: Public Health and Race in Los Angeles, 1879-1939*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006.

Montagu, Ashley. *Man’s Most Dangerous Myth: The Fallacy of Race*. Walnut Creek: AltaMira Press, 1942.

Mooney, James. “The Powhatan Confederacy, Past and Present.” *American Anthropologist* 9, no. 1 (1907): 129–52.

Moses, L. G. *Indian Man: A Biography of James Mooney*. First Edition edition. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1984.

Muller, H. J. “On the Variability of Mixed Races.” *The American Naturalist* 70, no. 730 (September 1, 1936): 409–42. doi:10.1086/280683.

Murfree, Mary Noailles. *In The Tennessee Mountains*. CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform, 2010.

Murphree, Daniel Scott. *Native America: A State-by-State Historical Encyclopedia*. ABC-LIO, 2007.

Murray, Paul T. “Who Is Indian? Who Is Negro? Virginia Indians in the World War II Draft.” *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 95 (1987): 215–31.

Nash, Gary B. “The Hidden History of Mestizo America.” *The Journal of American History* 82, no. 3 (1995): 941–64. doi:10.2307/2945107.

Naylor, Celia E. *African Cherokees in Indian Territory: From Chattel to Citizens*. 1 edition. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2008.

Newitz, Annalee, and Matt Wray, eds. *White Trash: Race and Class in America*. New York: Routledge, 1996.

Ngai, Mae M. *Impossible Subjects: Illegal Aliens and the Making of Modern America*. Updated edition with a New Foreword edition. Princeton University Press, 2014.

Novick, Peter. *That Noble Dream: The “Objectivity Question” and the American Historical Profession*. Cambridge England: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

Oakley, Christopher Arris. *Keeping the Circle: American Indian Identity in Eastern North Carolina, 1885-2004*. University of Nebraska Press, 2007.

O’Brien, Gerald V. *Framing the Moron: The Social Construction of Feeble-Mindedness in the American Eugenic Era*. Reprint edition. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2016.

O'Brien, Jean M. *Firsting and Lasting: Writing Indians out of Existence in New England*. Minneapolis: Univ Of Minnesota Press, 2010.

Olumide, Jill. *Raiding the Gene Pool: The Social Construction of Mixed Race*. London ; Sterling, Va: Pluto Press, 2002.

Omi, Michael, and Howard Winant. *Racial Formation in the United States*. 3 edition. New York: Routledge, 2014.

Ordover, Nancy. *American Eugenics: Race, Queer Anatomy, and the Science of Nationalism*. 1 edition. Minneapolis: Univ Of Minnesota Press, 2003.

Park, Robert E. "Human Migration and the Marginal Man." *American Journal of Sociology* 33, no. 6 (1928): 881–93.

———. "Mentality of Racial Hybrids." *American Journal of Sociology* 36 (1931): 534–51. doi:10.1086/215474.

Pascoe, Peggy. *What Comes Naturally: Miscegenation Law and the Making of Race in America*. 1 edition. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Pearson, Karl. *Mendelianism and the Problem of Mental Defect*. Vol. 9. London: Cambridge University Press, 1914.

Perdue, Theda. *Mixed Blood Indians: Racial Construction in the Early South*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2005.

Perdue, Theda, and Michael D. Green. *The Columbia Guide to American Indians of the Southeast*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2005.

Philp, Kenneth. "Termination: A Legacy of the Indian New Deal." *Western Historical Quarterly* 14 (1983): 165–80.

Plecker, Walter. "Virginia's Attempt to Adjust the Color Problem." *American Journal of Public Health* 15 (February 1925): 111–15.

Pollitzer, W. S., K. K. Namboodiri, W. H. Coleman, W. H. Finley, W. C. Leyshon, G. C. Jennings, and W. H. Brown. "The Cajuns of Southern Alabama: Morphology and Serology." *American Journal of Physical Anthropology* 47, no. 1 (July 1977): 1–6. doi:10.1002/ajpa.1330470103.

Pollitzer, William S. "The Physical Anthropology and Genetics of Marginal People of the Southeastern United States." *American Anthropologist* 74, no. 3 (1972): 719–34.

Pollitzer, William S., Donald Rucknagel, Richard Tashian, Donald C. Shreffler, Webster C. Leyshon, Kadambari Namboodiri, and Robert C. Elston. "The Seminole Indians of Florida: Morphology and Serology." *American Journal of Physical Anthropology* 32, no. 1 (January 1970): 65–81. doi:10.1002/ajpa.1330320109.

Porter, Frank. *Strategies for Survival: American Indians in the Eastern United States*. New York: Praeger, 1986.

Price, Edward. "The Mixed-Blood Racial Strain of Carmel, Ohio, and Magoffin County, Kentucky." *Journal of Science* 50 (November 1950): 281–90.

Ratner, Nichole Hahn. *White Trash: The Eugenic Family Studies, 1877-1919*. Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1988.

Raushenbush, Winifred. *Robert E. Park: Biography of a Sociologist*. First Edition edition. Durham, N.C: Duke University Press, 1979.

Reardon, Jenny. *Race to the Finish: Identity and Governance in an Age of Genomics*. 1 edition. Princeton University Press, 2009.

Reardon, Jenny, and Kim TallBear. "'Your DNA Is Our History': Genomics, Anthropology, and the Construction of Whiteness as Property." *Current Anthropology* 53, no. S5 (2012): S233–45. doi:10.1086/662629.

Reuter, Edward Byron. "The American Mulatto." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 140 (November 1928): 36–43.

———. *The Mulatto in the United States: Including A Study of the Role of Mixed-Blood Races Throughout the World*. Boston: Badger, 1918.

Rice, Stuart R. "Biological Limits in the Development of Society." *Journal of Heredity* 15 (April 1924): 183–86.

Robin, Rachel. "What Ain't Called Melungeon Is Called Hillbillies." *Forum of Modern Language Studies* 40 (2004): 259–78.

Robinson, Charles Frank. *Dangerous Liasons: Sex and Love in the Segregated South*. Fayetteville: University of Arkansas Press, 1999.

Rountree, Helen C. *Pocahontas's People: The Powhatan Indians of Virginia through Four Centuries*. 1st ed. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1990.

———. *The Ethnoregenesis of a Virginia Indian Tribe: The Nansemond Indians Tribal Association*. Norfolk: Helen Rountree, 1987.

Saunt, Claudio. *Black, White, and Indian: Race and the Unmaking of an American Family*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.

———. "Rethinking Race in Culture in the Early South." *Ethnohistory* 53 (2006): 399–405.

Semple, Ellen Churchill. "The Anglo-Saxons of the Kentucky Mountains: A Study in Anthropogeography." *The Geographical Journal* 17 (June 1901): 588–623.

Shannon, Alexander Harvey. *The Racial Integrity of The American Negro.* Washington: Public Affairs Press, 1953. //catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/000339280.

Shapiro, Henry D. *Appalachia on Our Mind: The Southern Mountains and Mountaineers in the American Consciousness, 1870-1920*. 1st New edition edition. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1986.

Silber, Nina. "What Does America Need So Much As Americans?: Race and Northern Reconciliation with Southern Appalachia, 1870-1900." In *Appalachians and Race: The Mountain South From Slavery to Segregation*, edited by John C. Inscoe, 245–58. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky Press, 2001.

Singer, Lester. "Ethnogenesis in Negro Americans Today." *Social Research* 29, no. 4 (1962): 419–32.

Smedley, Audrey, and Brian Smedley. "Race in North America: Origin and Evolution of a Worldview." Accessed May 11, 2016. http://www.amazon.com/Race-North-America-Evolution-Worldview/dp/0813345545?ie=UTF8&qid=1462942607&ref_=tmm_pap_title_0&sr=8-1.

Smith, Barbara Ellen. "De-Gradations of Whiteness: Appalachia and the Complexities of Race." *Journal of Appalachian Studies* 10, no. 1/2 (2004): 38–57.

Smith, J. David. *The Eugenic Assault on America: Scenes in Red, White, and Black*. Fairfax, Va.; Lanham, MD: George Mason University Press; Distributed by National Book Network, 1993.

Smith, J. Douglas. *Managing White Supremacy: Race, Politics, and Citizenship in Jim Crow Virginia*. 1st New edition edition. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2002.

Smith, Sherry L. *Reimagining Indians: Native Americans through Anglo Eyes, 1880-1940*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Speck, F. G., and C. E. Schaeffer. "Catawba Kinship and Social Organization with a Resume of Tutelo Kinship Terms." *American Anthropologist* 44, no. 4 (1942): 555–75.

Speck, Frank. "Reflections Upon the Past and Present of the Massachusetts Indians." *Bulletin of the Massachusetts Archaeological Society* 4 (1943): 33–38.

———. "Remnants of the Machapunga Indians." *American Anthropologist* 18 (1916): 271–76.

———. "The Catawba Nation and Its Neighbors." *The North Carolina Historical Review* 16 (1939): 404–17.

———. "The Ethnic Position of the Southeastern Algonquian." *American Anthropologist* 26 (1924): 184–200.

———. "The Jackson Whites." *The Southern Workman*, February 1911.

———. *The Rappahannock Indians of Virginia*. S. New York: Museum of the American Indian, Heye Foundation, 1925.

———. “The Road to Disappearance: Creek Indians Surviving in Alabama, A Mixed Culture Community.” *American Anthropologist* 51 (1949): 681–82.

Spencer, Frank. “The Rise of Academic Physical Anthropology in the United States (1880-1980): A Historical Overview.” *American Journal of Physical Anthropology* 56 (1981): 353–64.

Stepan, Nancy. *The Idea of Race in Science: Great Britain, 1800-1960*. 1st US Edition edition. Hamden, Conn: Archon, 1982.

Stern, Alexandra Minna. “Improving Hoosiers: Indiana and the Wide Scope of American Eugenics.” *Indiana Magazine of History*, September 1, 2010. https://scholarworks.iu.edu/journals/index.php/imh/article/view/12557.

Stocking, George W. *Race, Culture, and Evolution; Essays in the History of Anthropology [by] George W. Stocking, Jr*. New York: Free Press, 1968.

Stubblefield, Anna. “‘Beyond the Pale’: Tainted Whiteness, Cognitive Disability, and Eugenic Sterilization.” *Hypatia* 22, no. 2 (2007): 162–81.

Sturm, Circe. *Becoming Indian: The Struggle over Cherokee Identity in the Twenty-First Century*. Santa Fe: School for Advanced Research Press, 2011.

———. *Blood Politics: Race, Culture, and Identity in the Cherokee Nation of Oklahoma*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002.

Sturtevant, William. “Creek Into Seminole.” In *North American Indians in Historical Context*, edited by Eleanor Burke Leacock and Nancy Ostreich Lurie, 91–128. New York: Random House, 1971.

Svingen, Orlan. “Jim Crow, Indian Style.” *American Indian Quarterly* 11, no. 4 (1987): 275–86.

Takaki, Ronald. *Strangers from a Different Shore: A History of Asian Americans, Updated and Revised Edition*. Revised and Updated edition. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1998.

Taliman, Valerie. “Termination by Bureaucracy.” *Native Americas* XIX, no. 1 (June 30, 2002): 8.

Tayac, Gabrielle. “’To Speck With One Voice’: Supra-Tribal American Indian Collective Identity Incorporation Among the Piscataway, 1500-1998.” Ph.D. diss, Harvard, 1999.

Taylor, Carol M. “W.E.B. DuBois’s Challenge to Scientific Racism.” *Journal of Black Studies* 11, no. 4 (1981): 449–60.

Thompson, Edgar T. “The Little Races.” *American Anthropologist* 74, no. 5 (1972): 1295–1306.

Tsosie, Rebecca. “Tribal Membership and ‘Indian Status’: Federal Indian Law in the Post-Martinez World.” *Native Americas* XIX, no. 1 (June 30, 2002): 19.

Turner, William H., and Edward J. Cabbell, eds. *Blacks in Appalachia*. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky Press, 1985.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. *Measuring America: The Decennial Censuses From 1790-2000*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 2007.

Vincent, George E. "A Retarded Frontier." *American Journal of Sociology* 4, no. 1 (July 1, 1898): 1–20. doi:10.1086/210767.

Wailoo, Keith, Alondra Nelson, and Catherine Lee, eds. *Genetics and the Unsettled Past: The Collision of DNA, Race, and History*. 1 edition. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 2012.

Wallenstein, Peter. *Tell the Court I Love My Wife: Race, Marriage, and Law--An American History*. New York: St. Martin's Griffin, 2004.

Wallis, Wilson D. "Variability in Race Hybrids." *American Anthropologist* 40, no. 4 (1938): 680–97.

Ward, Jason. "'A Richmond Institution': Earnest Sevier Cox, Racial Propaganda, and White Resistance to the Civil Rights Movement." *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 16 (2008): 262–93.

Warner, Charles Dudley. *Studies in the South and West with Comments on Canada*. New York: Harper, 1889.

Washburn, Wilcomb E. *Red Man's Land White Man's Law: Past and Present Status of the American Indian*. Second Edition edition. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1995.

Weslager, C. A., and L. T. Alexander. *Delaware's Forgotten Folk: The Story of the Moors and Nanticokes*. 1st Paperback Ed edition. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006.

———. *The Delaware Indians: A History*. Reprint edition. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1990.

Williams, Walter L., ed. *Southeastern Indians Since the Removal Era*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1979.

Williamson, Joel. *New People: Miscegenation and Mulattoes in the United States*. Baton Rouge: LSU Press, 1995.

Wolfe, Patrick. "Land, Labor, and Difference: Elementary Structures of Race." *The American Historical Review* 106, no. 3 (2001): 866–905. doi:10.2307/2692330.

Wood, Karenne, and Diane Shields. *The Monacan Indians: Our Story*. Amherst: Monacan Indian Nation, 1999.

Woodson, Carter G. "The Beginnings of the Miscegenation of the Whites and Blacks." *The Journal of Negro History* 3, no. 4 (1918): 335–53. doi:10.2307/2713814.

Yanow, Dvora. *Constructing "Race" and "Ethnicity" in America: Category-Making in Public Policy and Administration*. Armonk, N.Y.: Routledge, 2002.

Zackodnik, Teresa. “Fixing the Color Line: The Mulatto, Southern Courts, and Racial Identity.” *American Quarterly* 53, no. 3 (September 2001): 420–51.