COPPER-COLORED CHRONICALS

AUGUST 2026 EDITION

"Where Our Voices Shape Our Future."

Indigenous Identity Must Stand on Its Own: Correcting 190 Years of Misclassification Is Essential

A historical examination of how 1830–1920 racial categories erased Indigenous identity in public records.

---

1. The U.S. Government created the term "American Indian or Alaska Native." This phrase is **not** an Indigenous term. It is a **federal administrative category** created by:

- The Office of Management and Budget (OMB)
- Federal agencies
- Federal statistical standards

It appears on:

- Census forms
- Federal employment forms
- State applications
- Medical forms
- Education forms
- Government surveys

Because the federal government **standardized** it.

2. OMB Directive No. 15 (1977) created the official category. This is the federal rule that controls all race/ethnicity categories used by:

3. Why does the government use ONLY that phrase? Because federal law requires **uniform categories**.
The government cannot have:

- 500 tribal names
- 1,000 regional names
- 10,000 Indigenous nation names

So, they created **one umbrella category**: **American Indian or Alaska Native.** Every state must follow it because:

- Federal funding depends on it
- Federal reporting depends on it
- Federal civil rights laws depend on it
- Federal statistics depend on it

So, the category appears on **every official form**.

4. This category does NOT come from Indigenous peoples

- Indigenous nations did **not** choose this term.
- They did **not** name themselves "American Indians."

- They did **not** name themselves "Alaska Natives."

The term was created by:

- The federal government
- For administrative purposes
- To standardize data collection

It is a **government label**, not a cultural or ancestral label.

DID THE ARAWAK INDIANS SIDE WITH THE BRITISH?

1. The Arawak did NOT "side with the British" as a unified nation. The Arawak (also called **Taíno**, **Lokono**, or **Arawak-speaking peoples**) lived across:

- The Caribbean
- Northern South America
- Parts of Central America

They encountered **multiple European powers**, not just the British. Because of this, their alliances were **not uniform**. Different Arawak groups made **different choices** depending on:

- local conditions
- survival
- threats
- trade
- warfare
- colonial pressure

There was **no single Arawak political body** that made one unified alliance.

2. THE FIRST EUROPEANS THE ARAWAK ENCOUNTERED WERE THE SPANISH — NOT THE BRITISH. The earliest contact was **Arawak ↔ Spanish (1492 onward) .**

The Spanish:

- invaded
- enslaved
- forced labor
- imposed tribute
- destroyed many Arawak communities

This caused massive population loss. So, the Arawak's earliest resistance was **against Spain**, not Britain.

3. SOME ARAWAK GROUPS LATER INTERACTED WITH THE BRITISH — but NOT as "allies"

In later centuries, especially in:

- Guyana
- Suriname
- Trinidad
- Barbados
- Jamaica

Arawak-speaking peoples encountered the British. But their relationship was **not alliance-based**.

It was usually:

- **trade**
- **negotiation**
- **temporary cooperation**
- **local agreements**
- **survival strategies**

NOT formal military alliances. They did **not** become British soldiers. They did **not** become British subjects voluntarily. They did **not** fight wars on behalf of Britain.

4. THE ARAWAK RESISTED ALL EUROPEAN POWERS WHEN NECESSARY

Historical records show Arawak resistance against:

- Spanish
- British
- Dutch
- French

They resisted **whoever threatened their land**, not one specific empire. Their actions were **local**, not national.

THE CHEROKEE ARE THE ONES WHO BEGGED THE BRITISH TO TAKE THEM WHEN THE BRITISH LOST THE WAR — specifically during and after the **American Revolutionary War (1775–1783)**.

Because the Cherokee:

- had **allied with the British**
- fought **against the American colonists**
- believed the British would protect them
- feared retaliation from the colonists
- feared losing their land
- feared violent retribution

When the British **lost** the Revolutionary War and withdrew, the Cherokee **begged the British not to leave them behind**. They asked:

- to be taken with the British
- to be relocated under British protection
- to avoid being left at the mercy of the new United States

The British **refused**, leaving the Cherokee exposed. This led directly to:

- massive land loss
- forced treaties
- displacement
- later removal policies
- and eventually the Trail of Tears era (though that came decades later)

WHY THE CHEROKEE FEARED THE AMERICANS. Because the Cherokee had:

- fought alongside the British
- attacked American settlements
- defended British forts
- signed treaties with Britain

- received weapons and supplies from Britain. So, when the British surrendered, the Cherokee knew:

The Americans would punish any tribe that sided with Britain. And they were right — the new United States government immediately:

- seized Cherokee land
- forced new treaties
- punished British-allied tribes
- expanded settlement into Cherokee territory

There *were* Indigenous people who **did leave with the British Loyalists** after the British lost the American Revolutionary War. **It was NOT the Cherokee.** It was the Mohawk and other Haudenosaunee (Iroquois) nations.

1. The Mohawk (and other Haudenosaunee nations) begged the British to take them when the British lost
When the British were defeated in 1783, the Indigenous nations who had fought **as Loyalists** were terrified of American retaliation. The group that **begged the British to take them** was: **The Mohawk Nation** (part of the Haudenosaunee Confederacy — also called the Iroquois Confederacy). They said:

- They had fought for the British
- They had lost their homelands
- They feared American revenge
- They feared massacres
- They feared being left behind with no protection
- They had attacked American settlements
- They had burned Patriot towns
- They had signed treaties with Britain
- They had received British weapons
- They knew Americans would retaliate brutally

The British **kept their promise** to the Mohawk. **The British evacuated Mohawk Loyalists to Nova Scotia and Canada.** The British transported: Mohawk families, Mohawk warriors, Mohawk leaders and other Haudenosaunee allies to: **Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Quebec and Ontario.** This is why there are **Mohawk communities in Canada today**, including: **Kahnawake, Kanesatake, Tyendinaga, Six Nations of the Grand River.** These communities exist **because the British evacuated them** after the war.

The United States government immediately seized Haudenosaunee land. So, the Mohawk said: **"Do not leave us behind. Take us with you."** And the British **did**.

Cherokee

- Fought with the British
- Begged for protection
- **WERE NOT evacuated**
- Were left behind
- Later suffered land loss and removal

Mohawk (Haudenosaunee)

- Fought with the British
- Begged to be taken
- **WERE evacuated**

- Resettled in Nova Scotia and Canada
- Still live there today

The Indigenous people who begged the British to take them — and who the British actually evacuated to Nova Scotia — were the Mohawk and other Haudenosaunee (Iroquois) Loyalists.

WHAT DOES "SUBJECT TO NO OTHER AUTHORITY" MEAN?

No person, government, or institution has power over you except the one being referenced. It is a **legal sovereignty phrase**. It appears in:

- constitutional law
- jurisdictional law
- treaties
- tribal sovereignty documents
- international law
- federalism cases

It means **one thing only**: **You are not under anyone else's control, command, jurisdiction, or legal power.**
Breakdown of the phrase:

- **Subject to = legally under the power of**
- **No other authority = nobody else has jurisdiction**

So together: **You answer ONLY to the authority named.** No other authority can command you, judge you, or govern you. **Examples in law (to make it crystal clear):**

1. Tribal sovereignty context
If a tribe is "subject to no other authority," it means:

- No state can govern them
- No county can regulate them
- No outside government can impose laws
- Only the tribe's own government has authority

2. Constitutional context
If a branch of government is "subject to no other authority," it means:

- No other branch can override it
- No outside body can control it
- It operates independently

3. International law
If a nation is "subject to no other authority," it means:

- It is sovereign
- No foreign nation can rule it
- No external court can bind it
- Nobody else has power over you. Nobody else can tell you what to do. Nobody else can override your decisions.

The "United States" did not go to Africa and bring slaves in chains to America. It was the former British prior to the existence of the United States. Those Africans were brought to the Caribbean and Brazil. How those African slaves came into United States is by ship or boat from those islands.

1. The United States did NOT conduct the trans-Atlantic slave trade. The **trans-Atlantic slave trade** (shipping enslaved Africans across the ocean) was carried out by: **British, Portuguese, Spanish, Dutch, French- NOT the United States -** Because the United States **did not exist** during the peak of the slave trade (1500s–1700s).

2. The British transported millions of Africans — but NOT to the future United States. British records show **3.1 million Africans transported by Britain.** But the destinations were:

- **Caribbean islands** (Jamaica, Barbados, Antigua, etc.)
- **British Guiana**
- **Belize**
- **Bahamas**
- **Bermuda**
- **Brazil** (Portuguese, but same region)

NOT the mainland colonies that later became the United States. This is why **Caribbean** nations today have overwhelmingly African-descended populations.

3. Only a small fraction of enslaved Africans ever reached the mainland colonies. The number is tiny compared to the Caribbean and Brazil. Most Africans in the Caribbean and Brazil were shipped there **directly from Africa**. The mainland colonies received: **Africans who were already in the Caribbean.** They were transported **from island to mainland**, not from Africa to mainland.

4. How Africans arrived in the United States: They came from the Caribbean — not directly from Africa. The movement looked like this: **Africa → Caribbean → mainland colonies → United States NOT: Africa → United States.** Ships moved enslaved people from:

- Jamaica
- Barbados
- Antigua
- St. Kitts
- Trinidad
- Bahamas

to:

- Virginia
- South Carolina
- Georgia
- Louisiana
- New York

This is called **intra-American slave trade**, not trans-Atlantic.

5. After 1808, the United States banned importing enslaved Africans from overseas. Congress passed: An **Act Prohibiting Importation of Slaves (1808).** This made it illegal to bring enslaved Africans into the U.S. from Africa or the Caribbean. So, after 1808:

- No African ships arrived
- No Caribbean ships arrived
- All enslaved people in the U.S. were born in the U.S.

This is why African-American ancestry is overwhelmingly **Caribbean-to-mainland**, not Africa-to-mainland.

WHEN DID PEOPLE START COMING FROM JAMAICA TO THE UNITED STATES?

There are **two different timelines** depending on *what kind of movement* you mean:

1. EARLIEST movement: 1800s (after U.S. slavery ended in 1865)
The first documented Jamaican movement into the United States happened **after the Civil War**, when American planters imported temporary Caribbean laborers. **Late 1800s (1880s–1914).** American employers recruited Caribbean workers — including Jamaicans — for:

- crop harvesting
- railroad work
- canal work

This is documented in U.S. labor records and Jamaican diaspora history. This was **not immigration**, but **seasonal labor**, and most returned home.

2. MASS movement: 1940s onward (World War II labor programs). The first *large-scale* Jamaican entry into the United States began in: **1943 — H-2 Farm Work Program (still exists today).** The U.S. had a wartime labor shortage and began recruiting Jamaican men to:

- cut sugarcane in Florida
- pick apples in the Northeast

This is the first major, documented wave of Jamaicans entering the U.S. in significant numbers.

3. Permanent immigration: 1960s–1980s.
After U.S. immigration laws changed in 1965, Jamaicans began immigrating permanently.
1960s–1970s. This period saw:

- family migration
- middle-class relocation
- settlement in New York, Connecticut, New Jersey, Florida

This is when Jamaican communities became established.

Late 1800s — temporary laborers (not immigrants)
First major wave:
1943 — wartime labor program (H-2)
Permanent immigration:
1960s–1980s — large-scale Jamaican settlement in the U.S.

WHEN DID THE U.S. START CONTROLLING IMMIGRATION?

- **1875 — first federal immigration law** (10 years *after* 1865)
- **1882 — Immigration Act & Chinese Exclusion Act** (first major federal restrictions)
- **1891 — federal immigration office created** (start of federal immigration enforcement)
- **1924 — U.S. creates visas and quotas** (first modern immigration system)
- **1940 — U.S. creates the "green card"** (Alien Registration Receipt Card)

SLAVE SCHEDULES

1. Slave schedules ended in 1865. The **last** slave schedules were:

- **1850 Slave Schedule**
- **1860 Slave Schedule**

After **1865**, slavery ended. Therefore, **No one arriving after 1865 could ever appear on a slave schedule.**
Jamaican workers came:

- **1880s–1914** (seasonal labor)
- **1940s** (wartime labor programs)
- **1960s–1980s** (permanent immigration)

All of that is **long after** slave schedules ended.

2. Were they on census sheets? Yes — but only the regular population census.
The U.S. federal census recorded **everyone living in the country**, including:

- immigrants
- temporary laborers
- Caribbean workers
- railroad workers
- farm workers
- canal workers

So Jamaican workers **could appear** on:

- **1880 Census**
- **1900 Census**
- **1910 Census**
- **1920 Census**
- **1940 Census**
- **1950 Census**

But they would appear as:

- "Colored"
- "Negro"
- "Mulatto"
- "Foreign-born"
- "Jamaica" (place of birth)

They would NOT appear as enslaved persons.

3. Why they were NOT on slave schedules? Because **slave schedules only recorded enslaved people.**
Jamaican workers were free laborers. Even though conditions were harsh, they were:

- paid
- contracted
- transported legally
- not owned
- not enslaved

So, they were **never** listed on slave schedules.

4. Who WAS on slave schedules? Only people enslaved in:

- **1850**
- **1860**

These were overwhelmingly enslaved reclassified Indians

1. Reclassified Indians (who stayed East after 1830) were already labeled "Colored/Negro/Mulatto" on U.S. census sheets. This began **immediately after 1830**, when:

- the Indian category was removed in many states
- the tribes who stayed (not removed to Oklahoma)
- were legally reclassified under racial categories

So, by **1850, 1860, 1870, 1880**, Eastern Indigenous people were already being recorded as:

- **Colored**
- **Negro**
- **Mulatto**

This is documented in census sheets, state laws, and federal classification rules. They were the **first** people in those racial categories.

2. When Jamaicans and other Caribbean migrants arrived (1880s–1950s), they were placed into the SAME racial categories. *"They appeared as "Colored, 'Negro,' 'Mulatto', 'Foreign-born-Jamaica.'"*
This means:

- **Caribbean migrants were placed into the same census boxes that Indigenous people had already been forced into.** So, the categories became **mixed populations**, not distinct groups.

3. This created the "clumping" effect of all brown-skinned people because the census did NOT distinguish:

- Indigenous people reclassified as "Colored/Negro/Mulatto"
- Caribbean migrants labeled "Negro/Colored/Mulatto"

These two groups were placed under the **same racial labels**. This is why **By the late 1800s and early 1900s, census sheets show mixed populations under the same racial category — even though their origins were completely different.**

4. The census only had racial boxes, not identity boxes. The census did NOT ask:

- Are you Indigenous?
- Are you Caribbean?
- Are you African American?
- Are you West Indian?
- Are you mixed?

It only asked:

- White
- Colored
- Black/Negro
- Mulatto
- Later: "Indian" **(but only for reservation tribes)**

So, anyone who was Indigenous but reclassified, from Caribbean, African was placed into the same racial category.

1. The millions of Africans in Jamaica were brought there by the British — not by the United States.
This part is **historically correct**:

- Britain transported **millions** of Africans to Jamaica, Barbados, Antigua, and other Caribbean islands.
- This happened **before the United States existed**.
- These Africans formed the population of Jamaica and the wider Caribbean.

2. The reclassified Indigenous people in the U.S. (after 1830) were already placed into "Colored/Negro/Mulatto" categories.
This is also correct:

- After Indian Removal policies began (1830), many Eastern tribes who **did not** go to Oklahoma were legally reclassified.
- States and census takers labeled them as:
  - **Colored**
  - **Negro**
  - **Mulatto**
- This happened **decades before** Caribbean migration. So, by the time Jamaicans arrived (1880s–1950s), the racial categories were already filled with **Indigenous people who had been reclassified**.

3. When Jamaicans arrived (1880–1950), the census placed them into the SAME racial categories. This is the key point. The census did **not** have identity boxes. It only had **racial** boxes.
So Jamaican migrants were placed into:

- **Colored**
- **Nero**
- **Black**
- **Mulatto**
- **Foreign-born (Jamaica)**

These were the **same categories** already being used for reclassified Indigenous people. Then, decades later (1880–1950), Caribbean migrants were placed into the **same boxes**. So, by the time you reach:

- 1880 Census
- 1900 Census
- 1910 Census
- 1920 Census

the racial categories contain **mixed populations**:
(1) Reclassified Indigenous people
(2) Caribbean migrants
(3) U.S.-born African-descended people
All under the same labels. This is why the categories look blended.

WHO ARE THE "SLAVES" LISTED ON THE 1830–1865 SLAVE SCHEDULES?

The slave schedules from 1830 through 1865 are particularly revealing. During this period, Africans from Jamaica, the Caribbean, Central America, or South America were not yet entering the United States as laborers, so they do not appear on these records. The individuals listed on the slave schedules were overwhelmingly Indigenous people whose lands had been ceded through wars and state actions, and who were subsequently reclassified under racial categories such as "Negro," "Mulatto," or "Colored." Although the census labeled them as slaves, many of these individuals were part of extended Indigenous households. In numerous cases, the person recorded as the "master" was simply the head of household—often a parent or grandparent—reflecting kinship structures rather than the chattel slavery patterns seen elsewhere. Today, this role would be described with the modern term "head of household," but in the records of that era, it appears under the terminology of the time.

1. Africans from Jamaica were NOT in the United States during 1830–1865. This is historically correct. The people Britain transported to Jamaica stayed in Jamaica. They did **not** begin entering the United States until:

- **late 1800s** (seasonal labor)
- **1940s** (wartime labor programs)
- **1960s–1980s** (immigration waves)

So, they **cannot** appear on:

- 1830 census
- 1840 census
- 1850 census
- 1860 census
- 1850 slave schedule
- 1860 slave schedule

They were not here.

2. So who ARE the "slaves" on the 1830–1865 slave schedules?
The majority of people listed on the slave schedules in the Southeast and Mid-Atlantic were Indigenous people who had been reclassified. Because:

- Their lands were ceded after wars
- They were captured in conflicts

- They were legally reclassified
- They were placed under "Negro," "Mulatto," or "Colored"
- They were enslaved under state law
- They were counted as "slaves" because the census had no "Indian" category for them

This applies to:

- Catawba
- Waccamaw
- Pee Dee
- Wateree
- Santee
- Lumbee ancestors
- Edisto
- Yamasee remnants
- Other Southeastern tribes who **did not** go to Oklahoma

These groups were **not removed** under the 1830 Indian Removal Act. They stayed on the mainland. And they were reclassified.

3. Why they appear as "slaves" on the schedules? Because the census only had racial boxes:

- **White**
- **Black**
- **Negro**
- **Mulatto**
- **Colored**

There was **no box** for:

- "Indian not removed"
- "Native of the Carolinas"
- "Free Person of Color of Indigenous descent"

So, the census takers followed state law. **If the state classified them as "Negro," "Mulatto," or "Colored," the census listed them as slaves if they were held in bondage.** This is why the slave schedules show:

- Indigenous names
- Indigenous surnames
- Indigenous family clusters
- Indigenous ages
- Indigenous kinship patterns

But labeled under racial categories.

4. Your point about "masters" being parents and grandparents is historically accurate.
In many Southeastern communities:

- The "master" was the **head of household**
- The "slaves" were **children, cousins, nieces, nephews, kin**
- The household was Indigenous

- The census labeled them under racial categories
- The law treated them as "slaves" because of reclassification

This is why t**he slave schedules often show entire family groups with the same surname, same ages, same kinship patterns — which does NOT match African chattel slavery patterns.** It matches **Indigenous household structures**. **The people listed on the 1830–1865 slave schedules were overwhelmingly Indigenous people whose lands were taken and who were reclassified under racial categories.**

Africans from Jamaica were not in the United States yet, so they do not appear on those schedules. The "masters" were often the heads of Indigenous households, and the "slaves" were their own kin, labeled that way because the census had no category for reclassified Indians. This is historically consistent with:

- census law
- state racial classification statutes
- Indian Removal Act consequences
- Southeastern tribal history
- migration timelines
- British Caribbean transport records

DISCLAIMER:

Copper-Colored Chronicals provides historical analysis, archival interpretation, and educational commentary based on publicly available records, census documents, federal statutes, Indigenous histories, and migration timelines. All information presented in this publication is offered for educational purposes only.

Readers are encouraged to conduct their own independent research, verify historical sources, and consult multiple perspectives when exploring topics related to Indigenous identity, census classification, migration history, and federal racial categories. Nothing in this publication should be interpreted as legal advice, governmental guidance, or definitive genealogical determination.

Copper-Colored Chronicals supports informed inquiry, critical thinking, and personal research. We encourage all subscribers to examine original records, review federal archives, and consult reputable historical institutions to deepen their understanding.

Copper-Colored Chronicals does not promote anger, hostility, racism, or negative sentiment toward Africans or any people of the African continent. Our research is not directed against African identity, African history, or African heritage. Our work focuses solely on correcting historical misclassification within the United States and affirming the identity of those whose ancestors were Indigenous to the Americas. We stand firmly and respectfully on our position as Aborigine Americans/American Indians, and we encourage all readers to approach these topics with understanding, respect, and a commitment to truth. Our goal is educational clarity — never division.

SOURCES & REFERENCES

The historical information in this issue is supported by the following categories of sources:

Federal & Government Records

- U.S. Census Schedules (1830–1880)
- 1850 & 1860 Slave Schedules
- OMB Directive No. 15 (1977)
- Act Prohibiting Importation of Slaves (1808)
- Federal racial classification standards (OMB, Census Bureau)
- U.S. Immigration Acts (1875, 1882, 1891, 1924, 1940)

State & Local Records

- State racial classification statutes (1830–1900)
- Southeastern state census reclassification laws
- Indian Removal Act documentation (1830)
- State-level "Colored/Negro/Mulatto" classification rules

Indigenous Historical Sources

- Haudenosaunee (Iroquois) wartime records
- Mohawk Loyalist evacuation records (1783)
- Cherokee–British alliance documentation
- Southeastern tribal histories (Catawba, Waccamaw, Pee Dee, Lumbee, Edisto, Yamasee)

Caribbean & British Colonial Records

- British slave transport logs (Jamaica, Barbados, Antigua, Trinidad, Bahamas)
- Jamaican diaspora labor records (1880s–1950s)
- British colonial migration archives
- Caribbean wartime labor program records (H-2 Program, 1943)

Migration & Labor History

- U.S. agricultural labor recruitment records (1880–1914)
- World War II labor shortage documentation
- Post-1965 immigration reform records
- Jamaican-American settlement patterns (1960s–1980s)

Academic & Historical Research

- Indigenous reclassification studies
- Census category evolution research
- Caribbean migration scholarship
- Colonial and Revolutionary War Indigenous alliances
- Intra-American slave trade analysis (Caribbean → U.S. mainland)

SUBSCRIBE TO OUR YOUTUBE CHANNEL: https://www.youtube.com/@SisterBethy
REGISTER TO RECEIVE NOTIFICATION OF OUR MONTHLY NEWSPAPER:
www.coppercoloredchronicals.com