

The Socio-Psychological Effects of Dominant Cultures on Dominated Cultures: A Comparative Analysis of Acts against and Effects on Congolese Batwa and Cherokee Indians

Horace R. Rice, Ed.D. Retired Educator and Author

ABSTRACT

This study researched the socio-psychological effects of dominant cultures on dominated cultures by conducting a comparative analysis of dominant cultures' aggressive-disruptive acts against and effects on one dominated Congolese Batwa and two Cherokee Indians cultures. The researcher identified acts against and effects on the three groups over at least several hundred years of history and analyzed the relationship of these variables (20 sub-variables) among the three groups. The researcher wanted to glean some understanding of the psycho-social dynamics of the dominant and dominated cultures to determine if commonalities among the DRC and American dominant groups' behaviors and the resulting sociological and psychological impact on the dominated indigenous groups were found. An analysis of possible comparative behaviors and resulting impacts could provide preventive and remedial strategies to help present and future dominated peoples in the world. The results revealed that 19 of 20 sub-variables (*acts* and *effects*) received positive aggressive-disruptive recordings and that the three dominant cultures directed damaging acts against the three fragile indigenous cultures. Researchers must conduct further scientific longitudinal studies to assess the degree of damage committed by dominant cultures against indigenous peoples in the world.

ABSTRAIT

Cet étude a recherché les effets socio-psychologique des cultures dominantes sur des cultures dominées par la conduction d'une analyse comparative sur les actes agressifs- turbulents des cultures dominantes et des effets sur une Congolese Batwa dominée et deux cultures Indienne Cherokee. Le chercheur a identifié les actes contre et les effets sur les trois groupes pendant au

moins quelques centaines d'années d'histoire et il a analysé les relations de ces variables (20 sous-variables) parmi les trois groupes. Le chercheur voulait acquérir une compréhension des dynamiques de la socio-psycho de la culture dominante et des cultures dominées avec l'intention de déterminer les similarités parmi le DRC et les conduites des groupes dominants américains et l'impact des résultats sociologique et psychologique sur les groupes dominés autochtones qui avaient été trouvés. Une analyse possible des conduites comparatives et les impacts des résultats peuvent fournir des stratégies préventives et correctives en aidant le présent et l'avenir des gens dominés dans le monde. Les résultats ont montré que 19 des 20 sous variables (causes et effets) ont reçu des réponses positives agressives-turbulentes et que les trois cultures dominantes ont dirigé les actes dégâts contre les trois cultures autochtones délicates. Les chercheurs doivent continuer les études scientifiques sur un niveau international pour évaluer le niveau de dommage engagé par la culture dominante contre les gens autochtons.

“Dispossessed of their lands and economy, which had been based on the forests, they survive by begging and are regularly exploited by other groups. More Batwa people cannot read or write and have virtually no access to health care.” Adolphine Muley

Mrs. Muley, of the Batwa Pygmies in the DRC, further noted that the “state does not care about us” and indicated that because of the war, “the situation is even worse.” She spoke to representatives of the world’s marginalized indigenous populations at a meeting at the UN headquarters in May 2003. The conference speakers stated that “government neglect, discrimination, intimidation, violence and other violations of human, political and civil rights” existed in the world, as well as in the DRC (Nyamu). The news release revealed the serious situation facing the DRC Pygmies as they have been restricted from the political process of voting and working in public administration roles. Pygmies cannot even record the birth of their children on official records. The colonial governments drove the Pygmies from their indigenous habitat into the dominant culture, the culture of the people who claimed their land and made them their “slaves.” Even a DRC government representative at the conference noted: “Military tools

today include rape, live burial and cannibalism, all aimed at extermination so that the perpetrators can have access to minerals and timber.”

This negative situation, caused by the dominant culture subjugating the dominated culture in Africa and other areas of the world, including South America, Asia, and the Pacific, sounds similar to the ones that occurred in America during its colonial period. Are there any similarities between the dominant culture’s abusive acts, both predisposing and precipitating, against Batwa Pygmies and those perpetuated against Native American groups, in the case of this study, Cherokee, during America’s colonial period and later? What were and are the sociological and psychological effects on the victims? An analysis of possible comparative behaviors and impacts may provide preventive and remedial strategies to help present and future dominated peoples in the world.

A well-known nursery rhyme, *Humpty Dumpty*, is appropriate here to set the background for the analysis. In a world where animals are becoming extinct due to human beings endangering those species and plants with pharmacological and medicinal qualities have been destroyed in rain forests with the depletion of timber, humanity knows that it must handle biological and botanical life carefully. Since endangered animal and physical resources require special handling to prevent harm to their existence, should humanity not be as cautious, or more so, with indigenous, endangered homo sapiens? “Humpty Dumpty sat on a wall. Humpty Dumpty had a great fall. All the king’s horses and all the king’s men couldn’t put Humpty together again.” Have the dominated cultures fallen because they have placed themselves on the dangerous wall or have they been placed in those hazardous positions by the dominant, caretaking cultures who built the walls?

Methodology

Groups

In examining the histories of the Cherokee, one of the largest Native Americans groups in America, and the indigenous people of the DRC, the researcher will record obvious dominant cultures’ aggressive-disruptive acts against and effects on Cherokee and DRC dominated groups. Any discovered *significant positive* relationships between the dominant cultures’ actions and effects on dominated cultures will provide to governmental officials, historians, and researchers additional theoretical understanding of the global dynamics that occur; and, if applied, could

remediate and even prevent dominant cultures' aggressive-disruptive acts against and negative effects on dominated cultures in the future.

The DRC Pygmies

The DRC forest comprises an area (1.3 million square kilometers) more than double the size of France (*Forest Peoples Programme*, 2006). It is believed that the Twa 'Pygmy' hunter-gathers may have already been living in the forest when the Bantu farming people "migrated into much of the forest zone several thousands of years ago . . ." The Batwa Pygmy indigenous people are believed to have been the earliest residents of the Kahuzi-Biega National Park, in East of Democratic Republic of Congo (formerly Zaire). They managed and protected the forest and wildlife with their own traditional methods (Mutimanwa, 2001). When the park was created in 1937, there were Pygmy villages in the zoological and forest reserve of 60,000 ha (a ha or hectare =10,000 square meters or 2.471 acres). By 1975, the park was extended by 540,000 ha. Presently, those Pygmies who used to live there have been dispersed.

Refugees International (2003) reported that beginning in the late 1960s and up to the time of its report, as a result of the development of the Kahuzi-Biega Forest in South Kivu, DRC, "International conservation groups have joined with national governments to forcibly expel Pygmies from newly declared game parks and forest preserves. They are evicted from their homelands and offered neither compensation nor recourse. Homeless, they take up a marginalized status on the periphery of local communities." Reduced to a state of poverty because they have been displaced from their forests and do not have their natural aboriginal indigenous resources, some Batwa produce pottery to eke out a living while others work as tenant farmers and in unskilled jobs. There is a well-known view among the dominant groups that the Batwa, also called Twa and numbering between 70,000 and 87,000, are "barbaric, savage, wild, uncivilized, ignorant, unclean, and above all else, sub-human" (*Refugees International*).

The indigenous Pygmies' livelihood depends on the forests and its continuous maintenance and protection. Their traditional forest-related knowledge (TFRK) is disappearing as their social lifestyle and culture are changing, due mainly to the fact that these indigenous peoples do not have traditional access to their lands, which are being controlled by the "dominant settled farming society" (Jackson, *Forest Peoples Programme*, 2004, 3).

While most current definitions for intelligence include verbal ability, problem-solving skills, and the ability to learn from and *adapt* to the experiences of everyday life (Allen and

Santrock, 1993, 195), one can only wonder how the Batwa Pygmies feel about the gradual destruction of their society and culture and the impact of those changes on their daily sociological and psychological conditions. How do they feel about their eroding TFRK and the dominant culture's demands that they acquire new, non-traditional knowledge and survival skills in the peripheral, non-forest milieu? Are their skilled herbal pharmacologists and medicine men to be considered "retarded" because they cannot earn enough money begging in the city to pay for medicines and physicians for their sick children in the new habitats?

Forest Peoples Programme (2006) noted that the DRC failed to abide by the African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights that it ratified in 1987. The DRC failed to protect "the indigenous Twa people, who suffer pervasive, massive and institutionalized racial discrimination on a daily basis, in violation of their rights under Articles 2 and 3 of the Charter." The indigenous people do not have right to prior, free consent and participation in the political process relating to land use and development.

Although the 2002 Forest Code allocated 45 percent of the forest to be set aside for "concessions," with the other 55 percent allocated to "commercial exploitation" (40 %) and "conservation" (15%), it is unknown what percentage of the remaining 45% "concessions" will be available as indigenous-owned property. "The Code is blatantly discriminatory as it fails to recognize the existence of indigenous peoples and protect their rights . . . It clearly indicates the state's desire to prioritize commercial and conservation use of the forests over community forests" (Braun and Mulvagh).

Native Americans (Cherokee)

At one time in their exciting history, the Cherokee were a powerful and great nation. They possessed 135,000 square miles of area that covered eight states: North Carolina, Georgia, South Carolina, Alabama, Tennessee, Kentucky, West Virginia, and Virginia (Blankenship, 1978, 51; Royce, 1884). By 1850, Cherokee territory included only a 40,000-square mile area in the Appalachian Mountains (Royce, 1884).

The wars of "white men" contributed to the decrease of the Cherokee population (Woodward, 35). Americans committed genocide on Cherokee not only in the 1600s, but in the mid 1700s (Thornton, 1990, 36; Underwood, 22; Swanton, 112). Colonel "Montgomery, with over 1600 men, marched through Cherokee territory twice in 1760, destroying many of their towns" (Anderson and Lewis, 1983, 101; Mooney, [1900] 1942, 43; Thornton). Then he

destroyed the Lower Towns, “burning them to the ground, cutting down the cornfields and orchards, killing and taking more than a hundred of their men, and driving the whole population into the mountains before him.” It is believed that the surviving and scattered remnants of the Cherokee towns removed themselves to isolated areas of Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, Tennessee, Georgia, and other areas in the southeast, in retreat from the militia and for survival. In 1761, Colonel Grant, with 2,600 soldiers and some Chickasaw and Catawba, assaulted the Cherokee again, burning 15 Middle Town villages and all their plantations and destroying more than a thousand acres of Cherokee crops. His soldiers forced about 5,000 Cherokee – men, women, and children – into the woods and hills to die of hunger (Thornton, 1990, 36).

During the Revolutionary War, the British had managed to get the allegiance of the Cherokee against the American colonists (Thornton, 1990, 37). Eventually thousands of American colonial troops attacked Cherokee towns again, from various locations, as Virginia and the Carolinas militia agreed to attack all the Cherokee towns (Underwood, 22). Virginia would move against the Overhill Towns. Again, many of the Cherokee escaped and moved in all directions away from the attacking troops. These actions are akin to those of the Germanic Tribe, known as the Vandals, when in A.D. 455 its army sacked or vandalized Rome and destroyed much of its cultural artifacts.

During the period of their land loss, to complicate matters more, gold was discovered on Cherokee land in Georgia (Blumenthal, 72; Thornton, 1990, 56-57) and the “doom of the nation was sealed” (Mooney [1900] 1982, 116). Frequently armed men invaded their territory and the Cherokee were robbed of their horses, cattle, and houses. The State of Georgia passed laws that permitted the confiscation of a large area of Cherokee land (Woodward, 1963, 158). In 1838, the Cherokee, numbering approximately 17,000, were rounded up like cattle in their smaller and reduced Cherokee territory and forced to move westward to Oklahoma (Thornton, 117). Approximately 4,000 died during the 116-day, 800-mile trip (Goetz, 1988; Yenne, 36). Some of the victims escaped, moved along the Blue Ridge Mountains and lived in the mountains and valleys of the piedmont. The federal government made 40 treaties with the Cherokee and holds the record of breaking every one (Blankenship, 5; Underwood, 21).

During the 1800s, the Cherokee were successful in assimilating into the culture of the white man (Moulton, 1978, 31; Goetz, 173). White citizens acknowledged in 1829 that “Cherokee perhaps have doubtless assimilated nearer to the manner and customs of their more favored neighbors [white settlers] than any tribes who have come in contact with civilization”

(Boudinot, 1, *Cherokee Phoenix and Indians' Advocate*). Today, many Cherokee remain as dispersed people in remote and isolated areas in numerous states, forced by official policy to list themselves as white or black on documents, but proclaim proudly that they are Cherokee.

Central Virginia Cherokee

This report will also review a brief history of the United Cherokee Indian Tribe of Virginia, Incorporated (UCITOVA), descendants of colonial period Virginia Cherokee as well as Cherokee who evaded those assaults on their villages. UCITOVA, often referred to as the Buffalo Ridge Band of Cherokee, is located in Madison Heights, Amherst County, Virginia. UCITOVA, comprising about 640 card-carrying members, can trace its ancestors back to the mid-to-late 1600s and the 1700s.

The Northern Neck area of Virginia provides some insight into the origin of the Buffalo Ridge Band or UCITOVA. The beginning of the genocide of UCITOVA's ancestors in specific and early-recorded genocide of Native Americans in general occurred in this area (Rice, 2006). As early as the summer of 1608, John Smith led an expedition up the Potomac to explore the area and to learn about the various chiefdoms (Potter, 9). As the English settlers moved into the Northern Neck area, they began the forced exodus of the Wiccocomico people from their rich farm land and coastal fishing areas as the settlers moved the Wiccocomico tribe to another area, farther inland. The English commissioners forcefully combined the Chicacoan and Wiccocomico together on the same new tribal territory and made Machywap, the Chicacoan chief, the chief of the two united tribes. The two tribes appeared to be cooperative with, but not controlled by, Powhatan and his Algonquian chiefdom (Rountree, 14). Eventually, the Wiccocomico killed Machywap and appointed its own chief. The dominant culture followed their time-proven and well-practiced policy of encouraging unrest among the Native Americans; as with the Pamunkey in 1656 in the colonists' battle against the Cherokee in Richmond and by Colonel Grant in 1761 when he used the assistance of Chickasaw and Catawba.

In 1600, the Wiccocomico tribe had 130 warriors and approximately 500 members (Bush, 1998, 4). In the mid 1600s, commissioners surveyed 4,400 acres of land for the Wiccocomico in their relocated territory. They provided 50 acres (20 ha) for the eighty-eight Chicacoan and Wiccocomico bowmen and their families, a total of 4,400 acres. "Although the act of 1652 guaranteed tributary Indians the right to their lands, particularly those set aside for them in the

new area, the law was ignored more often than it was enforced. No sooner were the Wiccocomoco settled on the new reservation than they were in court complaining that two Englishmen had intruded upon their land—whereby they [the Wiccocomocos] are made incapable of providing for their livelihood” (Potter, 1993, 196). The Indian reserve was eliminated to form Northumberland County. Researchers are still investigating ways influential people acquired this land. A governor of Virginia in 1657, for example, patented 5,211 acres of land from the Wiccocomoco reserve and vicinity, under suspicious, if not illegal, circumstances (Dorman, 429). This practice of colonial indifference to and even aggression against the real estate interests of indigenous people is similar to that used against the Batwa Pygmies’ forest area and the Cherokee in the Southeastern area of the United States.

The Wiccocomoco left the area and joined other Indian tribes, assimilated into the dominant English culture, or moved to other distant areas in inland Virginia. The Wiccocomoco had been the second largest tribe on the Northern Neck of Virginia, but were gradually being reduced in number. Genocide through war, relocation, dispersion, and expulsion forced their numbers to be reduced significantly. Beverly (1968, 233 [1705]) stated that the Wiccocomoco in 1703 had only ten members officially. The settlers’ encroachment forced a new way of life for the Northern Neck aborigines.

According to John Gibbon, a visitor to the area in 1669-71, Machywap’s successor was a Wiccocomoco named Pekwem, also called Pewem (Potter, 196; Hiden and Dargan 1966, 11). Pewem, or Pinn, as the UCITOVA people prefer, is held as their great patriarch of UCITOVA, thought to be the great-grandfather of Raleigh Pinn. Gibbon’s observation in 1669-71 supports the traditional view of the UCITOVA people that Robert Pinn (1), anglicized surname for Pewem, was the king. The Northumberland County court recognized him as “Robert, the great man of Wiccocomoco Indian Town,” or chief (Northumberland Co. Order Book 19 Feb 1678-79, 23). The assimilation demands on the aboriginals were great as, for example, the Northumberland County Court even fined Robert (2), Raleigh Pinn’s father, fifty pounds of tobacco for “absenting himself from his church for one month” [Anglican Church of Wiccocomoco in 1733] (Northumberland Order Book, 1733).

Raleigh left the Northern Neck area, as did many other Native Americans, seeking new, virgin land for his family. He moved to Buckingham and Amherst counties and is named on the tax records in Buckingham in the early-to-mid-1770s. Although a Native American with Algonquian and Cherokee heritage, Amherst militia commander Gaines in 1781 ordered Raleigh

and his militia unit to move quickly to Williamsburg to meet up with General Marquis de Lafayette, the French commander, and engage in combat against the forces under the British General Cornwallis at Yorktown(D. Gaines; Furlough List).

Refusing to give up his Native American customs, Raleigh formed two bands on lands that he owned in Buckingham County (now Appomattox County's Stonewall Mill area), on the eastern side of the James River, and Buffalo Ridge (in Amherst County), on the western side of the same river. He presided as chief over both Cherokee bands, as he divided the tribe to prevent Virginians being threatened by a large settlement of Cherokee in any one county.

Haywood and other historians noted that Cherokee were settled in Virginia (Mooney, 1982, 30; Addington, 6). Addington indicated that "Virginians have always considered the Cherokee the original and rightful owners of the land of Southwestern Virginia (1956, 6). Colonel E. C. Boudinot (1874, 217-24), on the "Indian Territory and its inhabitants," stated that "the Cherokee once had extensive settlements on the Appomattox River in Virginia, and formed the principal tribe in the Powhatan Confederation. The chief was a Cherokee." This assertion is supported by the work of Burk (1805).

Today, large numbers of Virginians claim Cherokee ancestry. During the 400 years plus of its recorded history, UCITOVA's ancestors were never slaves, but free indigenous people. Virginia officials and the Virginia Council on Indians (VCI) continue to resist recognizing the rich history of Cherokee in Virginia. UCITOVA leaders declare that they have as much as or more historical tribal evidence than most of the eight state-recognized tribes (comprising the VCI)—who had been state-recognized prior to 1989 when the admission requirements were not strict. UCITOVA has complained to state-elected and appointed officials about the unfairness of state officials and VCI and their apparent efforts to blot UCITOVA's Cherokee Native American heritage from Virginia's history (VCI, 1993) after years of official state discrimination against their people (Joint Resolution No. 728, Apology, 24 Feb. 2007).

Design

A SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) frequency analysis will be conducted to assess the amount of relationship between the three groups based on the dominant cultures' acts against the dominated cultures (yes or no responses) and the effects on the dominated cultures (yes or no responses). The researcher will record a "Yes" response when

there is at least one known affirmative act in historical records against the dominated culture. A “No” response will be included if there is no known affirmative condition in historical records.

Procedure

The major *acts* of aggression by the dominant cultures on the DRC Pygmies and the Cherokee will be recorded and analyzed. Obvious sociological and psychological effects will also be recorded and analyzed. Dominant cultures’ acts against the dominated cultures will be compared in the following categories drawn from the groups’ histories:

Indenture Servitude of Indigenous Peoples; Paper Genocide against Indigenous Peoples; Massacres of Indigenous People; Confiscation of Indigenous Peoples’ Land; War against Indigenous Peoples by Colonists; War with Other Aboriginal People Instigated by Colonists; Dominated Cultures’ Complaints about Injustices Ignored; Lack of Care and Concern for Indigenous Peoples; Dominated Cultures Experience Inequality in the Development and Enforcement of Laws; Forced to Migrate Due to Inability of Assimilate with Dominate Cultures; Colonists’ Diseases Contracted by Dominated Peoples; and Expelled from Land Due to Dominated Peoples’ Land Cession to Dominant Cultures.

The *effects* of the acts against Dominated People will be compared (in the following categories drawn for the groups’ histories) to determine if these situations/effects exist, which could cause major psychological and sociological pressures and trauma:

Pro-Dominant Cultures’ Laws Discriminate against Dominated Peoples; Dominant Cultures Have Policies in Place to Encourage Indigenous Peoples to Disown Their Ethnic Heritage; Dominated Cultures Have Racial Identity Problems Based on Dominant Cultures’ Laws; Dominated Cultures Placed in Lower Economic Status Due to Dominant Cultures’ Economic Procedures; Some of Dominated Cultures’ Knowledge and Skills (Pharmacological, Medical, Vocational, etc) Lost Due to Dominant Cultures’ Discriminatory Practices; Dominated Cultures Denied Education that Would Retain their Cultures’ Knowledge and Skills; and Dominated Cultures Have Laws to Keep Indigenous Peoples "in their Place."

Results

The SPSS analyses of the “yes” and “no” responses revealed a strong relationship among the three indigenous groups. Only one act against or effect on the dominated cultures, out of 20, received a negative response (“*Colonists’ diseases contracted by dominated people*”), while there were 19 positive responses. Although a “yes” response for that category was indicated for two of the three groups (the Batwa and Cherokee), a reluctant “no” response was recorded for Virginia’s Cherokee because there were no known diseases contracted. Although results are not conducted

by thoroughly scientific analyses, and therefore not applicable to other cultures, they do provide general information on techniques used against the three groups.

Discussion

While some of the effects reviewed in the report are in the attitudinal realm, and therefore more difficult to record scientifically, and assessments require accurate psychometric analyses for such psychological areas as suspicion, resentment, and irritability, this brief paper reveals only twenty dominant cultures' aggressive-disruptive acts against and effects on dominated cultures. Further research should be conducted on a longitudinal basis with indigenous cultures under scientific controlled conditions and based on ethical considerations, with assessment components (questions, interviews, observations, etc.) measured for validity and reliability.

World organizations must encourage the United Nations' to support international laws and enforcement requirements to protect indigenous peoples against genocidal practices. As aboriginal cultures' political influence and power are at delicate and embryonic levels and their traditional knowledge and skills are being lost due to dominant cultures' greed for their valuable resources (gold, timber, farmland, ivory, coal, oil, etc.), "civilized" and influential cultures must act quickly as the clock is ticking toward a point of "no recovery" for indigenous cultures.

As this report shows, there seems to be no incentive or ability on the part of dominant cultures in the DRC, Southeastern U.S., and Virginia to come to the rescue of the dominated cultures and to put the "egg" back together in its original state. The magnitude and severity of aggressive *acts* against and *effects* on vulnerable, indigenous cultures give insight to interested readers that there is a world-wide, sinister, and hostile storm blowing toward weak, helpless, and susceptible indigenous peoples. There appear to be instinctual strategies on a pandemic scale, with amazingly similar formats and agenda, directed at destroying or damaging fragile aboriginal cultures (as noted by the positive correlation between 19 the 20 acts/effects among the three groups). Local, state, national, and international executive, legislative, and judicial branches must move quickly to develop, implement, and enforce laws with civil and criminal penalties to prevent neglectful and abusive acts against indigenous cultures and peoples. Indigenous people must be given equal access to the political process and administrative positions as officially recognized indigenous peoples, to prevent the loss of their rights and culture; otherwise, they must be granted indigenous sovereignty, on their indigenous land outside the dominant society.

References

- Addington, Luther F. (1956) *History of Wise County*. Baltimore: Genealogical Publishing Co.
- Allen, L. & Santrock, J. W. (1993). *Psychology: The contexts of behavior*. Dubuque: Wm. C. Brown.
- Beverly, R. (1968 [1705]) *The history and present state of Virginia*, ed. Louis B. Wright, 1947. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia.
- Blankenship, B. (1978) *Cherokee roots*. Cherokee, NC.
- Blumenthal, W. H. (1975) *American Indians dispossessed: Fraud in land concessions forced upon the tribes*. Salem, N.H.: Ayer Company.
- Boudinot, E. (February 1829) *Cherokee Phoenix and Indians' Advocate*. New Echota, Vol. 1, No. 48.
- Boudinot, E. C. (1874). The Indian territory and its inhabitants. *Journal of the American Geographical Society of New York* (5) 217-224.
- Braun, T., & Mulvagh, L. (2007) *The indigenous world 2007, IWGIA's Yearbook*. Retrieved from the Web 8/27/07.
http://www.forestpeoples.org/documents/africa/bases/drc_base.shtml
- Burk, J. (1804) *The history of Virginia from its first settlement to the present day*. Petersburg: Dickson and Pescud.
- Bush, R. C. (1998) Native Northumberlanders. *The Bulletin of the Northumberland County Historical Society*. V. XXXV.
- Doren, M.F. (1987) Atlas of county boundary changes in Virginia – 1634-1895. Athens: Iberian Publishing Company.
- Daughters of the American Revolution's Bulletin. *Minority military service Virginia, 1775-1783*.
- Dorman, J. F. (1966). Governor Samuel Mathews, Jr. *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 74 (1):429.
- Forest Peoples Programme (2005) *Broken promises: How world bank group policies fail to protect forests and forest peoples' rights*. Joint NGO publication. Retrieved from the Web 8/8/07. http://www.forestpeoples.org/documents/africa/bases/drc_base.shtml
- Forest Peoples Programme (2006) *Communication to the African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights*. Submitted by the CAMV, ARAP, CPAKI/RDC, APEDMAC, SIPA, UEFA, and FPP. Retrieved from the Web 8/8/07
http://www.forestpeoples.org/documents/africa/drc_achpr_communication_oct06_eng.shtml

- Furlough List (1781) *A return of officers and men at present in service from County of Amherst together with such as are furloughed*. Swen Library, College of William & Mary.
- Gaines, Daniel, Commander, Militia, Amherst (June 21, 1781) *List of militia ordered into service*. Swen Library, College of William and Mary.
- Goetz, P. W. (1989) *The new encyclopedia Britannica*. Chicago: Encyclopedia Britannica.
- Hening, W. W. (1823). *The statutes at large: Being a collection of all the laws of Virginia, from the first session of the legislature in the year 1619*, vol. 1. New York: R. & W. & G. Bartow.
- Hidden, M., & Dargan, H. M. (1966). John Gibbon's manuscript notes concerning Virginia. *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 74 (1): 3-22.
- Jackson, D. (2004) Implementation of international commitment on traditional forest-related knowledge: Indigenous peoples' experiences in Central Africa. *Forest Peoples Programme*. Retrieved from the Web 8/27/07.
http://www.forestpeoples.org/templates/project/africa_base.shtml
- Mooney, J. (1982). *Myths of the Sacred Formulas of the Cherokees*. Nashville: C. & R. Elder, 1982.
- Moulton, G. E. (1978) *John Ross—Cherokee chief*. Athens: The University of Georgia Press.
- Mutimanwa, K. D. (2001) The Bambuti-Batwa and the Kahuzi-Biega National Park: The case of the Barhwa and Babuluko people of the PNKB, Democratic Republic of Congo. Retrieved from the Web 8/8/07.
http://www.forestpeoples.org/documents/africa/fpproj_drc_summ_eng.shtml
- National Park Service (2000). *Minority participation in the siege of Yorktown*. Yorktown, September 30, 2000.
- Northumberland County Order Book (19 Feb. 1678-79).
- Northumberland County Order Book – 1729-1737 (16 Aug. 1733).
- Nyamu, J. (2003) Indigenous people lament exclusion: Pygmies in Central Africa massacred by warring factions. *Africa Recovery, United Nations [Africa Renewal]*. Retrieved from the Web 8/16/07. <http://www.un.org/ecosocdev/geninfor/afrec/newrels/indigen.htm>
- News and Advance Newspaper (2001). "Expressing regret for Virginia's eugenics policies." Friday, February 2, 2001.
- Pinn, J. (1842). *Revolutionary War Pension Application*. 7 Nov. 1842.
- Plecker, W. A. (1924) *Eugenics in relation to the new family and the law on racial integrity*. Richmond: Virginia Bureau of Vital Statistics.

- Potter, S. R. (1993) *Commoners, tribute, and chiefs: The development of Algonquian culture in the Potomac Valley*. Charlottesville and London: University of Virginia Press.
- Powell, J.W. (1883-84) *Fifth annual report to the Bureau of Ethnology*.
- Powell, J.W. *Seventh annual report to the Bureau of Ethnology*.
- Refugees International (1994) *Forgotten people: The Batwa 'Pygmy' of the Great Lakes Region of Africa*. Retrieved from the Web 10/05/06.
<http://www.refugeesinternational.org/content/article/detail/892/>
- Rice, H. R. (1995). *The Buffalo Ridge Cherokee: A remnant of a great nation divided*. Bowie, MD: Heritage Books, Inc.
- Rice, H. R. (2006). *Chronological narrative of the United Cherokee Indian Tribe of Virginia, Inc. (UCITOVA)*.
- Rountree, H. C. (1989) *The Powhatan Indians of Virginia: Their traditional culture*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Royce, C. C. (1884). *Map of the territorial Cherokee nation*. Reprinted Cherokee, NC: Museum of the Cherokee Indian.
- Royce, C. C. (1887) *The Cherokee nation of Indians*. Bureau of Ethnology. Fifth Annual Report.
- Strachey, W. (1952). *The history of travel into Virginia Britania*. Works issued by the Hakluyt Society, 2d ser., vol. 103, ed. Louis B. Wright and Virginia Freund. London.
- Swanton, J. R. (1946). *The Indians of the southeastern United States*. Washington: Government Printing Office.
- Thornton, R. (1987) *American Indian holocaust and survival—a population history since 1492*. Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Thornton, R. (1990) *The Cherokees: A population history*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska.
- Tooker, W. W. (1898) *Problem of the Rechahecrian Indians of Virginia*. Washington: Judd and Detweiler.
- United States Census, 1920, Amherst Court House Magisterial District, page 3, houses 16-18.*
- Virginia Council on Indians. Virginia Subcommittee on S.T. R. 15. Recommendation on the petition for recognition filled by the United Cherokee Indian Tribe of Virginia, Inc. December 21, 1992.
- Whitehead, E. (April 19, 1896) Amherst County Indians, highly interesting history of an old settlement of Cherokees. *Richmond Times*.

Woodward, Grace Steele. *The Cherokees*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1963.

References

- Addington, Luther F. (1956) *History of Wise County*. Baltimore: Genealogical Publishing Co.
- Allen, L. & Santrock, J. W. (1993). *Psychology: The contexts of behavior*. Dubuque: Wm. C. Brown.
- Beverly, R. (1968 [1705]) *The history and present state of Virginia*, ed. Louis B. Wright, 1947. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia.
- Blankenship, B. (1978) *Cherokee roots*. Cherokee, NC.
- Blumenthal, W. H. (1975) *American Indians dispossessed: Fraud in land concessions forced upon the tribes*. Salem, N.H.: Ayer Company.
- Boudinott, E. (February 1829) *Cherokee Phoenix and Indians' Advocate*. New Echota, Vol. 1, No. 48.
- Boudinot, E. C. (1874). The Indian territory and its inhabitants. *Journal of the American Geographical Society of New York* (5) 217-224.
- Braun, T., & Mulvagh, L. (2007) *The indigenous world 2007, IWGIA's Yearbook*. Retrieved from the Web 8/27/07.
http://www.forestpeoples.org/documents/africa/bases/drc_base.shtml
- Burk, J. (1804) *The history of Virginia from its first settlement to the present day*. Petersburg: Dickson and Pescud.
- Bush, R. C. (1998) Native Northumberlanders. *The Bulletin of the Northumberland County Historical Society*. V. XXXV.
- Doren, M.F. (1987) Atlas of county boundary changes in Virginia – 1634-1895. Athens: Iberian Publishing Company.
- Daughters of the American Revolution's Bulletin. *Minority military service Virginia, 1775-1783*.
- Dorman, J. F. (1966). Governor Samuel Mathews, Jr. *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 74 (1):429.
- Forest Peoples Programme (2005) *Broken promises: How world bank group policies fail to protect forests and forest peoples' rights*. Joint NGO publication. Retrieved from the Web 8/8/07. http://www.forestpeoples.org/documents/africa/bases/drc_base.shtml
- Forest Peoples Programme (2006) *Communication to the African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights*. Submitted by the CAMV, ARAP, CPAKI/RDC, APEDMAC, SIPA,

- UEFA, and FPP. Retrieved from the Web 8/8/07
http://www.forestpeoples.org/documents/africa/drc_achpr_communication_oct06_eng.shtml
- Furlough List (1781) *A return of officers and men at present in service from County of Amherst together with such as are furloughed*. Swen Library, College of William & Mary.
- Gaines, Daniel, Commander, Militia, Amherst (June 21, 1781) *List of militia ordered into service*. Swen Library, College of William and Mary.
- Goetz, P. W. (1989) *The new encyclopedia Britannica*. Chicago: Encyclopedia Britannica.
- Hening, W. W. (1823). *The statutes at large: Being a collection of all the laws of Virginia, from the first session of the legislature in the year 1619*, vol. 1. New York: R. & W. & G. Bartow.
- Hidden, M., & Dargan, H. M. (1966). John Gibbon's manuscript notes concerning Virginia. *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 74 (1): 3-22.
- Jackson, D. (2004) Implementation of international commitment on traditional forest-related knowledge: Indigenous peoples' experiences in Central Africa. *Forest Peoples Programme*. Retrieved from the Web 8/27/07.
http://www.forestpeoples.org/templates/project/africa_base.shtml
- Mooney, J. (1982). *Myths of the Sacred Formulas of the Cherokees*. Nashville: C. & R. Elder, 1982.
- Moulton, G. E. (1978) *John Ross—Cherokee chief*. Athens: The University of Georgia Press.
- Mutimanwa, K. D. (2001) The Bambuti-Batwa and the Kahuzi-Biega National Park: The case of the Barhwa and Babuluko people of the PNKB, Democratic Republic of Congo. Retrieved from the Web 8/8/07.
http://www.forestpeoples.org/documents/africa/fpproj_drc_summ_eng.shtml
- National Park Service (2000). *Minority participation in the siege of Yorktown*. Yorktown, September 30, 2000.
- Northumberland County Order Book (19 Feb. 1678-79).
- Northumberland County Order Book – 1729-1737 (16 Aug. 1733).
- Nyamu, J. (2003) Indigenous people lament exclusion: Pygmies in Central Africa massacred by warring factions. *Africa Recovery, United Nations [Africa Renewal]*. Retrieved from the Web 8/16/07. <http://www.un.org/ecosocdev/geninfor/afrec/newrels/indigen.htm>
- News and Advance Newspaper (2001). "Expressing regret for Virginia's eugenics policies." Friday, February 2, 2001.
- Pinn, J. (1842). *Revolutionary War Pension Application*. 7 Nov. 1842.

- Plecker, W. A. (1924) *Eugenics in relation to the new family and the law on racial integrity*. Richmond: Virginia Bureau of Vital Statistics.
- Potter, S. R. (1993) *Commoners, tribute, and chiefs: The development of Algonquian culture in the Potomac Valley*. Charlottesville and London: University of Virginia Press.
- Powell, J.W. (1883-84) *Fifth annual report to the Bureau of Ethnology*.
- Powell, J.W. *Seventh annual report to the Bureau of Ethnology*.
- Refugees International (1994) *Forgotten people: The Batwa 'Pygmy' of the Great Lakes Region of Africa*. Retrieved from the Web 10/05/06.
<http://www.refugeesinternational.org/content/article/detail/892/>
- Rice, H. R. (1995). *The Buffalo Ridge Cherokee: A remnant of a great nation divided*. Bowie, MD: Heritage Books, Inc.
- Rice, H. R. (2006). *Chronological narrative of the United Cherokee Indian Tribe of Virginia, Inc. (UCITOVA)*.
- Rountree, H. C. (1989) *The Powhatan Indians of Virginia: Their traditional culture*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Royce, C. C. (1884). *Map of the territorial Cherokee nation*. Reprinted Cherokee, NC: Museum of the Cherokee Indian.
- Royce, C. C. (1887) *The Cherokee nation of Indians*. Bureau of Ethnology. Fifth Annual Report.
- Strachey, W. (1952). *The history of travel into Virginia Britania*. Works issued by the Hakluyt Society, 2d ser., vol. 103, ed. Louis B. Wright and Virginia Freund. London.
- Swanton, J. R. (1946). *The Indians of the southeastern United States*. Washington: Government Printing Office.
- Thornton, R. (1987) *American Indian holocaust and survival—a population history since 1492*. Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Thornton, R. (1990) *The Cherokees: A population history*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska.
- Tooker, W. W. (1898) *Problem of the Rechahecrian Indians of Virginia*. Washington: Judd and Detweiler.
- United States Census, 1920, Amherst Court House Magisterial District, page 3, houses 16-18.*
- Virginia Council on Indians. Virginia Subcommittee on S.T. R. 15. Recommendation on the petition for recognition filed by the United Cherokee Indian Tribe of Virginia, Inc. December 21, 1992.

Whitehead, E. (April 19, 1896) Amherst County Indians, highly interesting history of an old settlement of Cherokees. *Richmond Times*.

Woodward, Grace Steele. *The Cherokees*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1963.