

We Are Still Here!

*The Tribal Saga
of
New Jersey's Nanticoke and Lenape Indians*



John R. Norwood



NATIVE NEW JERSEY PUBLICATIONS

Copyright 2007 © by the Rev. Dr. John R. Norwood
All Rights Reserved*

Native New Jersey Publications
P.O. Box 401
Moorestown, New Jersey 08057

In Partnership With

The Nanticoke Leni-Lenape Indian Tribe
18 East Commerce Street
Bridgeton, New Jersey 08302

** Permission is granted to freely share this edition and its previous "pre-release version" in their downloadable electronic format, which are available on the internet from*

www.NativeNewJersey.org
and
www.Nanticoke-Lenape.info

We Are Still Here!
*The Tribal Saga of
New Jersey's Nanticoke and Lenape Indians*

John R. Norwood



NATIVE NEW JERSEY PUBLICATIONS

*To my father, whose name I gladly bear...
May I honor you and all of my ancestors*

*To my children...
May my generation leave a legacy you are proud to build upon*

*In praise of the Great Warrior and Chief of Heaven,
Jesus Christ,
Son of the Creator, Savior of my soul*

Preface

Much more can be said, and has been said, about the history of the Nanticoke and Lenape people who are now spread throughout North America. However, my task is to provide a brief, but comprehensive, summary of the historical information pertaining to the Nanticoke and Lenape people remaining in three interrelated tribal communities in Southern New Jersey and Delaware, with particular emphasis on how the legacy of the Lenape and Nanticoke ancestors in each community continues among the people called "Nanticoke Lenni-Lenape Indians" in New Jersey. All too often, remnant tribal communities along the eastern seaboard have been overlooked and forgotten after the main body of their people migrated away.

A lack of awareness of the history of such tribal communities is not merely unfortunate; frequently, it results in their being oppressed, mislabeled, and isolated. There is a persistent resistance to merely accepting their ongoing existence. Such opposition is sometimes for political and economic reasons; but, often it is because of racial bias and institutional arrogance based upon ignorance.

I have attempted to bring a chorus of witnesses to the pages of this work so that it is not merely my voice, but the testimony of history that upholds the legitimacy of these surviving American Indian communities. I am indebted to the work of tribal historians and researchers, both Native and non-Native, for all that they have preserved and shared. I am grateful for the support and resources provided by the Nanticoke and Lenape people in each of the three tribal communities of my relatives. Finally, for her patience, prayers, and loving assistance, I thank my wife and soul mate, who is constantly at my side and for whom I am truly grateful.

The saga of the Tribe is reflected in my personal story as well. As I struggled with issues of the affirmation of identity and heritage amid social mislabeling and misunderstanding, there were those family elders who would quietly whisper, "Don't ever forget who you are." I know the difficulty of confronting zealously stated erroneous assumptions. I know the struggle and pain of social invisibility. And now, I have been blessed to see my own children growing up with a sense of pride and the ability to assertively address misguided stereotypes. I have heard it said that, "the Indian Wars never ended, they merely changed venue." I pray that future generations will not have to fight these same old battles.

Much more information testifying to the American Indian identity and continuous tribal history of the three communities is available. Even while completing this booklet, plans for to publish a full volume in 2008 were put in motion. To all who read this booklet, please share it with others so that the word may get out and ring clear... We Are Still Here!

The Rev. Dr. John R. Norwood
Kaakluksit Pedhakquon(m)achk(w)
[Smiling Thunderbear]

October 9, 2007
New Jersey

Introduction

When most Americans think of American Indians, they think of the tribes of the mid-western United States and the history of tribal and U.S. government interactions from the mid 1800's forward. However, eastern tribal interactions with European colonists predate the formation of the United States by about 250 years, the details of which are rarely considered by those outside of the tribal communities. Also, because of racial persecution, many eastern tribal families remained in isolated communities and did not seek unwanted attention from outsiders. Cultural activities were not open to the public. Sometimes, even racial misidentification occurred in an effort to clear state and federal obligations to remaining tribal citizens. It was not until the civil rights protections from the 1960s and 1970s that many, previously hidden, eastern tribal communities and their leaders began to openly advocate for their people and promote their heritage to the public. This is the situation of the continuing tribal community of the band of Lenape and Nanticoke Indians centered in Cumberland County New Jersey. The tribal community is historically well documented, although not well known to the larger general public.

The Lenape (also known as "Lenni-Lenape" and "Delaware" Indians) and the Nanticoke are two distinct tribes. However, there is historical evidence that indicates the Nanticoke originated from among the Lenape in ancient times. Also, from at least the 1600's, many Nanticoke people migrated into Lenape territory... with some continuing north or west with migrating Lenape. The families of the tribal community in southern New Jersey originated from the Lenape and Nanticoke territorial border area. For generations, intermarriage between the tribes produced interconnected families and bloodlines. The compound tribal name, a practice not uncommon among modern tribes, honors the ancestors from the two dominant ancient tribes which comprise the modern tribal nation. Sometimes tribal members will identify themselves as "Nanticoke *and* Lenape" to avoid any confusion. As a confederation of Nanticoke and Lenape people, the tribal community has continued from ancient times and never surrendered its sovereignty to any other authority.

The Nanticoke Lenni-Lenape People (also known as Nanticoke Lenape Indians) are a tribal confederation of the core families of the Nanticoke and Lenni-Lenape whose homelands have been in Southern New Jersey and the Delmarva Peninsula from ancient times. The tribal community in Cumberland County, New Jersey, is the northernmost of three well studied and

documented, closely interrelated tribal communities, including the Nanticoke and the Lenape of Sussex and Kent Counties in Delaware. The Tribe is a sovereign American Indian Nation made up of the enrolled tribal citizens who have met the mandatory documented descent and blood quantum requirements from the historic core tribal families as set by tribal law. Tribal citizens freely submit to the jurisdiction of, and pledge allegiance to, the Tribal government of the Nanticoke Lenni-Lenape Indian Tribe and agree to abide by any and all laws and rules of the Nanticoke Lenni-Lenape government and will respect and comply with the decisions of the duly elected tribal leaders.

The Nanticoke Lenni-Lenape are governed by a nine member Tribal Council. All council members must also be enrolled citizens of the tribe, having met the mandatory tribal Indian blood quantum and core family ancestry requirements. Tribal elders continue to play an important role in guiding their people's future and serve as a constant reminder of the tribal heritage. The wisdom of the elders is honored and respected. Tribal leaders have been taught to make decisions prayerfully considering the will of the Creator and the impact of any decision through seven generations of the people. These deep spiritual values are evident in the tribal prohibition on pursuing casino development.

The Tribal headquarters is in Bridgeton, Cumberland County, New Jersey. While the majority of tribal citizens are still concentrated in southern New Jersey, many now live throughout North America. The Nanticoke Lenni-Lenape Indian Tribe has united with the Lenape Tribe of Delaware to formally express their common history and bloodlines through an inter-tribal alliance called the "Confederation of Sovereign Nentego-Lenape Tribes."

The Nanticoke Lenni-Lenape Indian Tribe is a recognized American Indian Tribe by the State of New Jersey through both concurrent legislative resolution¹ and through state statute.² The Tribe has permanent seats on the New Jersey State Commission on American Indian Affairs and is a voting member nation of the National Congress of American Indians. The history of the tribal families is honored with a permanent display at the Smithsonian Institute's National Museum of the American Indian in Washington, DC. The Tribe is a recognized State Designated American Indian Statistical Area with the United States Census Bureau and has ongoing activities with numerous federal agencies. The Tribe also maintains a 350 year old friendship with the Nation of Sweden, which had established a settlement in its homeland.

Whether a tribe has federal or state recognition (or none at all), a measure of "tribal legitimacy," used by the United States

federal government, is whether a tribe is made up of the interrelated descendants of historical tribes, who have maintained a continuous community within a contiguous geographical area for numerous generations.³ Each of the interrelated Nanticoke and Lenape tribal communities in New Jersey and Delaware meet this standard.

Table of Contents

Preface	5
Introduction	6
Narrative Historical Summary	
A Brief Historical Summary of the Lenape and Nanticoke	10
Continuing Tribalism in Southern New Jersey and Delaware	13
Tribal Reorganization and Activism in New Jersey	18
The Nanticoke Lenni-Lenape Today	19
Common Fallacies Addressed	
The Fallacy of the “Last Indian”	21
The “None Left Behind” Fallacy	23
The Fallacy of the “Federal Standard”	24
The Fallacy of “Giving Sovereignty”	26
The “Casino-Monger” Fallacy	27
The “Instant Indian” Fallacy	28
Appendixes	
The Confederation of Sovereign Nanteco-Lenape Tribes	30
Tribal Ban on Gaming	32
Cohanzick – The Tribal Grounds of the Nanticoke Lenni-Lenape	32
Friends of the Nanticoke Lenni-Lenape	34
Chronological Overview of Historical Highlights	35
Selected Bibliography	54
Endnotes	56

A Brief Historical Summary of the Lenape and Nanticoke

The Lenape (Pre-Contact to the Mid 1700's)...

For many tribal traditions and historians, the Lenape are acknowledged as the ancient “tree trunk” of the North American Indian Nations of the Algonkian (Algonquian) language family, from which many branches have sprung.⁴ The oral migration tradition of the Lenape, which is potentially thousands of years old, holds that the ancient migration from the northwest was long, arduous, and left some factions along the way, which developed into independent tribes. By the time they settled the along what would eventually be called the “Delaware River” in the woodlands of New Jersey, southern New York, eastern Pennsylvania, and northern Delaware, the Lenape (also called “Lenni-Lenape”) call themselves the “common” or “original” people, but they are respectfully referred to by many other tribes as the “grandfathers” or “ancient ones.” The Lenape Confederation is said to have extended from the headwaters of the Hudson to the headwaters of the Potomac and included the Mohican and Nanticoke.⁵

Divided into three main dialect groups based upon geography, with the Munsee in the northern part of the homeland and the closely related Unami and Unalachtigo in the central and southern regions, the Lenape were dispersed into various related sub-tribes and bands made up of numerous self-sufficient villages along waterways. Socially matrilineal⁶ and spiritually monotheistic,⁷ the Lenape are honored by their neighboring nations as peacemakers and mediators, but also feared as fierce warriors. During a brief 1524 encounter, Giovanni de Verrazano remarked that the shores of the Land of the Lenape were “densely populated.”⁸

In the early 1600's, Dutch commercial initiatives established “New Netherland” in the north of the Lenape Homeland. During the same era, the Swedes and Finns establish “New Sweden” along the Delaware Bay. The Lenape population was being decimated by the diseases of the European immigrants, yet resistance to increasing foreign incursion rallied the survivors to confront their new neighbors. In spite of the Lenape tradition of hospitality, trade and tolerance, frustration over Dutch intimidation and encroachment culminated in a war between the Lenape and the Dutch that began in 1639. New Netherland Governor Kieft woefully underestimated the strength of the Lenape warriors, “These heathens are strong in might; they have formed an alliance with seven other nations; (and) are well provided with guns, powder and lead” ... It is also reported that, “The Lenapes killed

every man 'they could get their hands on,' but unlike the Europeans,' one observer noted, 'I never heard that they did any harm to the women and children.⁹' While war with New Sweden was avoided, hostility was not unheard of. New Sweden Governor Johan Printz wrote in 1644, "Nothing would be better than that a couple of hundred soldiers should be sent here and kept here until we broke the necks of all of them.¹⁰" Printz especially resented the success of Lenape trade with the Susquehannock of Pennsylvania (a relationship that was sometimes violent and sometimes civil),¹¹ which surpassed his own attempts. His hostile intentions toward the Lenape are clear, as he states, "I should receive a couple of hundred good soldiers and in addition necessary means and good officers, then with the help of God not a single savage would be allowed to live in this river."¹² The passage of time would eventually provide an improved relationship between the Swedes and the Lenape.

By 1655, the southern Lenape were dealing with the Dutch immigrants who conquered New Sweden. However the Dutch could not resist the intent of the English to colonize the eastern seaboard; by 1664, New Netherland had fallen. Lenape numbers were catastrophically thinned by European diseases. Some estimate that the population declined by ninety percent between 1620 and 1640.¹³ The westward and northward migration of the main body of Lenape out of New Jersey occurred between 1664 and 1740. Those who remained in New Jersey sought ways to stay on the land by living among the English colonists. In spite of a season of amicable relations, ushered in by William Penn in the very early 1700's,¹⁴ those who stayed and those who migrated were confronted by new challenges to their survival as a people, their histories now taking differing courses. By the "French and Indian War" of 1754 -1763, there were Lenape, now also referred to as "Delaware Indians," who fought alongside the British, those who fought against them, and those who remained neutral.

The Nanticoke (Pre-Contact to the Mid 1700's)...

Called the "Unechtgo" by the Lenape, and originally referring to themselves as "Nentego," the Nanticoke are the "Tidewater People" and occupy the central Delmarva, primarily along the tributaries of the eastern shore of the Chesapeake Bay.¹⁵ According to the Nanticoke Chief White, speaking in the latter half of the 1700's, the Nanticoke see themselves as having originated from among the Lenape, with whom they are of

common stock, and whom they call “grandfathers.”¹⁶ The common tradition between the Lenape and Nanticoke is that the latter, along with the Shawnee, broke off from the main body of the Lenape, with the Nanticoke moving south onto the banks of the tributaries of the Chesapeake Bay. Known for the making of baskets and possessing a great number of furs and an abundance of roenoke (a form of shell money), the Nanticoke are the most numerous of all of the Delmarva tribes and are dominant over the peninsula.¹⁷ Other Indian Nations view the Nanticoke as industrious and possessing special skills. They are known to build bridgeworks over creeks and rivers and are also feared for their knowledge of herbal poisons.¹⁸

The Nanticoke encounter Captain John Smith in 1608 during his expedition of the Chesapeake tributaries. They are initially hostile, perhaps from previous negative encounters with European explorers. Even though the Nanticoke eventually come to be considered masters of trading by the English colonists, by 1642 territorial violations by European immigrants cause tensions with the Maryland Colony, resulting in war with the English.¹⁹ On May 1, 1668, the first of five treaties between the Nanticoke people and the Colony of Maryland was signed by Chief Unnacokasimmon. The Nanticoke were at the head of a confederation of tribes on the Delmarva and have absorbed the surviving Wicomiss Tribe, some of whom have been sold by the English into slavery in Barbados.²⁰ The head chief of the Nanticoke Confederation is referred to, by the English, as “emperor.” “Nanticoke” becomes a common name used to refer to all people under the influence of the tribe in the central Delmarva Peninsula, no matter what their band or tribe of origin.

During the early 1700’s, Chicone and Broad Creek Reservations are set aside for the Nanticoke. Several Indian Towns, including Puckhamee, are occupied by the tribe. By the mid-1700’s, Nanticoke also occupy the Indian River Reservation, absorbing families from dispersed Delmarva bands already living their. The persistent violations of their reservations by European incursions, together with the interference by colonial powers over matters of tribal government, results in many Nanticoke migrating away from the peninsula. Some of the migrating Nanticoke join with their Lenape “grandfathers” and their Iroquois brothers. The remnant groups that remain are still viewed as a potential threat to the Maryland Colony because of their relationships with the Lenape and the Iroquois to the north. Colonialist fears peaked after a 1742 gathering at Winnasoccum was reported to be a planning meeting for an uprising by the remaining tribal communities. In 1768, the reservations begin to be disbanded by

the colonial government, soon thereafter the highest concentration of Nanticoke remaining on the Delmarva, reside in the area of Indian River Hundred in Delaware. By the late 1700's and early 1800's, public records in Broad Creek, Indian River, and Lewis Delaware document the presence of the remnant tribal community.

Continuing Tribalism in Southern New Jersey and Delaware

While there were many semi-permanent Lenape Indian villages throughout Salem, Cumberland, and Cape May counties in southern New Jersey, there were permanent villages that were important centers, or "hubs," of Indian cultural activity in the northern, central, and southern part of the state. The southern "hub" was on the Cohansey River near Bridgeton.²¹ In spite of the mass migration of most Lenape people from New Jersey to the west and north in the early 1700's, there remained small remnant communities of mostly Christianized Indians who refused to depart. These remnant families who had survived European encroachment, diseases, violence, and cultural insensitivities, chose to remain, slowly assimilating into the larger society of European settlers, while maintaining their ethnic identity and community cohesion. The most well known of these remaining groups are the "Brotherton Indians;" however, when New Jersey formed the Brotherton Reservation for its remaining Indians in 1758, there were still New Jersey Lenape Indian families who refused to give up their independence and take up permanent residence within the reservation's boundaries. The Brotherton's attachment to the land is demonstrated in their refusal to join the main body of Lenape people who had migrated west after two official invitations to do so in 1767 and again in 1771. In this, they are representative of the determination of the other remaining remnants. The Rev. John Brainerd, missionary to the Indians of New Jersey, writes of regularly ministering to several other Indian communities while still primarily serving those in residence at Brotherton. These communities had rejected becoming "wards of the state" at Brotherton, and were largely ignored by the New Jersey Government, overlooked in official records, and even eventually mostly forgotten by the descendants of those in the westward migration of the main body of Lenape people. However, Rev. John Brainerd records their existence in his journals as late as 1761 and 1762, specifically mentioning his ministry to the Indians still living in central and southern New Jersey at Bordentown, Bridgeton, Cohansey, Juliustown, and Wepink.²² Indians were also still living in Cranbury,²³ Crosswicks and

Moorestown (where two Indian women were murdered in 1766).²⁴ The Christian meetings were becoming an important part of continuing communication between the remnant American Indian communities. Even those who had not converted to Christianity continued a connection to the churches that were becoming a central part of continuing tribal life.

The Brotherton Reservation was disbanded in 1801, afterward the few remaining Brotherton Indians migrated out of the state; yet, some would return to reestablish their connections with those small, little known, tribal communities that had remained.²⁵ On September 23rd, 1823, about a century after the main body of Lenape left New Jersey, the agreement signed in Vernon, New York, between the Muhheconnuck Tribe (which became the Stockbridge Nation of Wisconsin) and the Brotherton Indians who took refuge among them, makes specific reference to the benefits of that agreement being bestowed upon them and any of their “scattered brethren in the state of New Jersey, to them and to their offspring stock and kindred forever....” This agreement provides clear acknowledgement that there were still Indians living in New Jersey after the migration of the Brotherton community. One such continuing community of “scattered brethren,” called “Cohansey Indians” by that time, in the area of Bridgeton in Cumberland County, New Jersey, is made up of Lenape People descended from tribal bands formerly known by various names throughout the colonial period, including “Siconese,” “Sewapois,” “Narraticon,” “Alloways,” “Kechemeches,” and “Tuckahoes” whose ancestors were those remnant southern New Jersey Lenape families that coalesced at the southern “hub” of Indian activity near the Cohansey River. These “Cohansies” were joined by a constant stream of Delaware’s Lenape and Nanticoke remnants that moved across the Delaware Bay into the area.

The determination to stay in the ancestral homeland is also evidenced among the Indians of the Delmarva Peninsula. Beginning in 1698 and continuing through the mid-1700’s, the Chicone, Broad Creek, Indian River, Choptank, and Gingaskin Reservations were established by European Colonial Governments. Chicone, Broad Creek and, eventually, Indian River became centers for Nanticoke Indian tribal activity. As the intended protections of the reservations were continuously broken by the growing non-Native population, many Nanticoke migrated away, moving north into New Jersey’s Lenape remnant communities, or merging with Lenape emigrants moving further west or north. By the late 1700’s, the failed reservation system left a community that was primarily Nanticoke in Indian River Hundred, Sussex County Delaware, with some probable Assateague and

Lenape bloodlines, and possible bloodlines from among other Delmarva remnant tribal communities. There also remained a few "Indian Towns," which were tribal villages not formally defined as reservations. The area that eventually became known as "Cheswold," in Kent County Delaware, became a village of coalescing Lenape and Nanticoke families in the early 1700's.

The events of history have provided interconnected bloodlines between the three continuous American Indian tribal communities in Southern New Jersey and Delaware. Delaware researcher Edward Heite, while commenting on his report, "Mitsawokett to Bloomsbury,"²⁶ stated on August 11, 1998 that, "... the Nanticoke, the New Jersey Lenape, and the Cheswold community of today are genealogically indistinguishable. If you were to list the three communities in 1750, you would find their descendants today are about equally distributed among the three communities. Indeed, they are one and the same extended family. This is important to the argument that the Indians became a self-selecting isolate, and that an infrastructure survived during the period of invisibility."²⁷

In spite of a long history of racial misidentification of Indians remaining along the eastern seaboard,²⁸ with the changing of racial designations from "Indian" to "Mulatto" or "Free Person of Color" after Christian Baptism and the adoption of European names and concepts of land ownership, there are still those who are identified as "Indian" in public documents. Some of those identified as Indians in the historical record prior to 1790, with documented descendants in the interrelated communities, include members of the Ashatama²⁹ and Dunn³⁰ families of New Jersey and the Coursey³¹, Norwood³², Puckham³³, and Siscoe³⁴ families of Delaware. By 1895, public records have added the Cuff, Gould, Murray and Pierce families in New Jersey³⁵ and the Cambridge, Clark, Coker, Cork, Dean, Drain, Dunning, Durham, Harmon, Hansor/Hanzer, Hughes, Jack, Jones, Johnson, Kimmey, LeCount, Morris, Mosely, Ridgeway, Sanders/Saunders, Sockum, Street, Thompson, and Wright families of Delaware³⁶ to the list of identified Indian families living in one or more of the interrelated communities. In the 1946 *Memorandum Concerning the Characteristics of Larger Mixed-Blood Racial Islands of the Eastern United States*³⁷ and subsequently in the 1948 Annual Report of the Smithsonian Institute's section on the *Surviving Indian Groups of the Eastern United States*,³⁸ researcher William Gilbert also adds to the previously documented families, the Bumberry, Burke, Burton, Carney or Corney, Carter, Carver, Cormeans, Davis, Dean, Hansely, Hill, Jackson, Kimmey, Layton, Miller, Morgan, Munce, Munsee, Newton, Reed, Rogers,

Sammons, Seeney, Thomas, and Walker family names to the list of identified Indian families living in one or more of the interrelated communities. Other related Indian families were present within the three communities and appear in later records.

There is some indication that, at least during the latter half of the 18th century, the authority of the old Nanticoke Chiefs was at least passively acknowledged within the Cheswold community³⁹ as the power of the Lenape to the north began to decline in northern Delaware with the main body of the Lenape moving west out of New Jersey, leaving only remnant tribal communities. However, for most of the 19th and early 20th centuries, the three communities operated with an informal type of non-phratry, non-matriarchal “clan” leadership without formal chieftaincies. Respected members of each of the three tribal bands would guide and defend the communities and reinforce values through consensus. The importance of the tribal congregations in maintaining the community identity is demonstrated in the church splits and uprisings over any influx of non-Indian members. The community-clan enforced practice of endogamy was strictly followed, with banishment being a consequence for unapproved marriages. However, marriages between the three communities were approved by the leading elders, who desired that the younger generation marry among “our people.” There was an internal community policing evident among the Nanticoke and Lenape band in the area of Bridgeton, New Jersey, in which firearm wielding men would occasionally patrol the streets, chasing away unapproved “outsiders” lingering too late into the evening. The Cheswold band has its own segregated school in 1877. In 1881, the community leaders of the Indian River band succeed in having the Delaware Legislature pass an act that provides them with exemption from school taxes, after already having provided school classes for their own since the mid 1870’s; in 1903, the legislature formally acknowledges those named in the act, along with their descendants, as Nanticoke Indians.

During the mid to latter part of the 19th century, the term “Moor” was used by outside researchers to refer to those in all three communities, although by the early 20th century, the term remains attached more to the northern bands in Cheswold, Delaware, and Bridgeton, New Jersey, with the Indian River community, now centered around the town of Millsboro, Sussex County, Delaware, being primarily called “Nanticoke.” While the outside academics, government officials, and journalists use “Indian,” “Moor,” and “Nanticoke” almost interchangeably, the communities themselves are documented to have understood that the Millsboro band is primarily Nanticoke, while the Cheswold and

Bridgeton bands are primarily Lenape.⁴⁰ In spite of close family ties between the three bands, approved intermarriages, and fellowship between the tribal churches in each community, there remained cyclical seasons of political tension between the Nanticokes in the Millsboro band,⁴¹ which formed an incorporated tribal association with elected leadership including a restored chieftaincy in the 1920's, and the clan led Moor/Lenape and Moor/Nanticoke-Lenape bands in Cheswold and Bridgeton, respectively. Some students from Delaware are admitted to federally established American Indian Schools,⁴² with exclusive entrance policies.

From the mid 1800's, as some members of the bands move away, many cluster into newly forming Nanticoke – Lenape Indian neighborhoods in the North, Midwest, West, and even Canada. The core families continue their practice of endogamy in these communities through to the latter half of the 20th century, which is clearly displayed in census, marriage, and death records.

The first half of the twentieth century witnessed the rise of legislation providing for separate publicly funded schools for members of the communities in Delaware, apart from both whites and blacks. Seasonal social celebrations and exclusive social clubs arise in Bridgeton and Cheswold, which are only for those identified as “one of us” between the bands. Members of the Cheswold band had a separate racial status (“M” for Moor) on their driver's licenses until the early 1970's when they were reclassified as “Other.”⁴³ Elders within the three communities maintain cultural crafts and wisdom, but will typically not discuss it with “outsiders,” who could bring persecution upon their families. In 1943, a Delaware news article indicates that Perry Cork, called in the article “the last full-blooded Delaware Indian in Kent County,” had passed down a 350-500 year old family corn mortar to his grandson, Perry Hughes. Mr. Hughes, a member of the Cheswold band, is described as having strong Indian features and an awareness of traditional Indian customs and folklore of his family.⁴⁴ In Bridgeton, there is a general distrust of the federal, state, and local government, which results in a secrecy regarding community identity, out of an abiding fear of forced removal or other forms of persecution. These fears were not unfounded, they were born through personal and community experiences and even the legal realities of the day: only since an 1879 U.S. Federal Court decision have publicly identified American Indians been considered “persons within the meaning of the law;” it was not until 1924 that Congress recognized those publicly identified as American Indians as citizens of the United States; and, it was not until 1978 that Congress signed into law the “American Indian

Religious Freedom Act," giving Native Americans the right to practice their religious beliefs.

With the growing awareness of ethnic and racial pride and sense of nationalism spreading among many American "minority" groups in the late fifties and sixties, many American Indians also began to experience a resurgence of pride in their identities. During the era of the 1954 "Brown versus the Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas" Supreme Court National Desegregation Decision, the students of the segregated tribal schools in Delaware were sent to integrated schools within their districts. In 1977, the Nanticoke Indian Association in Millsboro, Delaware, held its first public pow wow since 1936. The new generation of emerging band leaders among the continuing tribal communities in Bridgeton, New Jersey, and Cheswold, Delaware, also became bold in regard to publicly celebrating their Indian identity, and unafraid of potential government reprisals. The zealous caution of the previous generations was replaced with an effort to reorganize from an informal, church based, clan-style tribal band government to having constitutionally elected governing councils with restored tribal chieftaincies.

Tribal Reorganization and Activism in Southern New Jersey

The Lenape and Nanticoke on the New Jersey side of the Delaware Bay incorporated a tribally controlled community benefit organization on August 7, 1978, centered in the area of Bridgeton, New Jersey. So that none of the primarily Lenape or primarily Nanticoke tribal families within the tribal community would be made to feel excluded, and to ensure that all of the ancestors would be honored, the tribal elders urge that the heritage of both of the main ancestral tribes be evident in the name by which the tribal nation would be known to the public. The decision is made in favor of the combined name, "Nanticoke Lenni-Lenape Indians." By the end of the same year, the public activism of this new generation on behalf of the tribe resulted in the awarding of federal funding for Indian Education to the Fairfield Township Schools for the needs of 39 tribal children living in the school district. In 1979, the state recognized the authority of traditional tribal spiritual leaders to solemnize matrimony. In 1982, The New Jersey Senate passed "Concurrent Resolution No. 73," acknowledging the continuing history of the tribal community as a confederation of Nanticoke and Lenape, recognizing the tribe, and calling on the Congress of the United States to federally recognize the Nanticoke Lenni-Lenape and provide the Tribe with benefits reserved for

Indian Tribes. In 1992, the Nanticoke Lenni-Lenape Indians received statutory authorization from the state to substantiate American Indian Ancestry for the purpose of correcting racial misidentification on birth certificates.⁴⁵ In 1995, the same year that the Tribe purchases 28 acres of land for social and sacred use, the State of New Jersey forms the New Jersey Commission on American Indian Affairs and includes the Nanticoke Lenni-Lenape as one of three tribes with permanent seats on the commission, by statute.⁴⁶ In 2000, the United States Census Bureau lists the Nanticoke Lenni-Lenape as a "State Designated American Statistical Area" (SDAISA).⁴⁷ In 2001, Saint John United Methodist Church in Fordville, a tribal congregation, is the only church in New Jersey to receive a designation as an historically Native American Congregation,⁴⁸ which is a designation also bestowed upon the tribal congregations in Cheswold and Millsboro, Delaware.

The Nanticoke Lenni-Lenape Today

The Nanticoke Lenni-Lenape Indian Tribe is governed by an elected nine member tribal council, headed by an elected Chief. Enrolled tribal citizens must document no less than one quarter blood quantum from the historically documented Lenape and Nanticoke tribal families. The Nanticoke Lenni-Lenape operate a tribal center and store in the City of Bridgeton and a Tribal Council House and gathering facility on their sacred tribal grounds. The tribe maintains a 501(c)3 community benefit and development agency, "The Nanticoke Lenni Lenape Indians of New Jersey, Inc." which provides cultural, educational, health, nutritional, and outreach initiatives on behalf of the tribe: summer camps and cultural activities are operated for tribal youth; job training and placement is offered to tribal adults; health screening services, hot meals, and food distributions are provided to tribal seniors. A language recovery initiative is working on reclaiming the language of the ancestors, with tribal drummers already writing songs in Lenape and Nanticoke. An annual public pow wow, bi-annual large tribal gatherings, traditional spiritual ceremonies, quarterly Christian prayer and Bible Study fellowships, seasonal socials, monthly tribal meetings, and community cultural educational presentations and workshops are all conducted. The Nanticoke Lenni-Lenape own and operate a construction management and general contracting company, employing tribal members and the general public.

The Tribe is an active voting member of the Confederation of Sovereign Nanteco-Lenape Tribes, the National Congress of American Indians, and the New Jersey State Commission on American Indian Affairs. The Tribe is a State Designated American Indian Statistical Area with the United States Census Bureau, has worked with the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection. Between 2001 and 2005, the Nanticoke Lenni-Lenape led the successful fight to preserve Black Creek, the site of an ancient Lenape village, in Vernon, New Jersey and continues its environmental preservation initiatives.

Nanticoke Lenni-Lenape artisans have been featured at the New Jersey State Museum. Tribal educators have lectured at area schools, historical societies, universities and, together with the tribal dance group, have made presentations at the Smithsonian Institution's National Museum of the American Indian. Tribal officials have had audience at the White House, with foreign dignitaries and royalty, led in the ceremonial opening of the Embassy of Sweden, and have been the special guests of the President of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

The Nanticoke Lenni-Lenape Indian Tribe is devoted to traditional spiritual values and determined that casino style gaming was incompatible with those values. Tribal law prohibits the establishment or operation of casino style gambling for the Tribe or any of its subsidiaries.

Common Fallacies Addressed

The Fallacy of the "Last Indian"

James Fenimore Cooper's, *Last of the Mohicans*, has left many assuming that there are no Mohicans left. However, the tribe is still alive and well. Errors like this are commonly based upon novels, regional folklore, and often repeated erroneous historical presumptions. Sadly they have a negative impact on the living descendents and continuing tribal communities which, at least in the mind of the greater public, are declared to no longer exist. Two such cases that have direct bearing on the tribal communities discussed in this book are that of Lydia Clark Delaware and "Indian Ann" Ashatama Roberts of New Jersey.

In 1855, Lydia Clark was called upon to testify in court regarding two of her relatives. Interestingly enough, she is considered an expert witness because she is regarded by all present as an authentic Nanticoke Indian. She is described as having "perfect" Indian features, maintaining old Indian customs, and still speaking the Nanticoke language. Her relatives, Levin Sockum and Isaiah (Isaac) Harmon, prominent men in the community, are accused of violating a Delaware law preventing the sale of ammunition to "Negroes" or "mulattos." Neither Sockum nor Harmon assumed that they had violated any law because they were Indian. Both Sockum and Harmon were part of an Indian community in which most of the Indians owned firearms and regularly purchased ammunition. The assumption of many is that Sockum's business success prompted the spiteful envy of the local white community. The issue in the case was whether Harmon was a black man, to determine whether or not Sockum had broken the law by selling him ammunition. Lydia Clark's testimony relates a fanciful and romantic tale, set in the years before the American Revolution, of how the offspring of an Irish woman and an African prince intermarried with the local Nanticoke Indians. Interestingly, while the racially biased court used her testimony to rule against Sockum, it also unintentionally upheld the predominant Indian ancestry of both men. Many years later, the prosecutor in the case, George Fisher, would state that he and others viewed the entire community of interrelated families to be Indians. Lydia Clark died on December 26, 1856. A monument in her honor is erected in 1927 by a local white citizen, with an inscription claiming that she was the "last of the aborigines of the country." Yet, the Nanticoke Indian community, of which she was a part, continues even today. Moreover, the historical record

shows that Lydia Clark was the sister of “Noke” Norwood, a prominent member of the local Indian community, whose well documented relatives continue within the interrelated tribal communities in South Jersey and Delaware to this very day. Ironically, even though an act of the Delaware Legislature would identify some of the state’s continuing Nanticoke families in 1881,⁴⁹ the monument denying the continued existence of this well documented community would remain standing well into the 20th century.⁵⁰

Another case is that of “Indian Ann” Ashatama Roberts. Even though many written histories of New Jersey have indicated that after the major body of the Lenape Indians migrated west in the early 1700’s and the remaining Lenape all moved to the Brotherton Reservation, established in 1758... the historical evidence proves otherwise. The writings of Rev. John Brainerd, missionary to the Indians of New Jersey, show that there were continuing remnant tribal communities throughout the period.⁵¹ In 1801, those in residence at the Brotherton Reservation migrated out of the state. While this was the last major migration of New Jersey’s Indians, it in no way represented the abandoning of the state by all of the original people. Elisha Ashatama, one of the Brotherton Indians, returned to New Jersey.⁵² His daughter, Ann, lived out the rest of her life in New Jersey. Popularly remembered as “Indian Ann,” she died on December 10, 1894. A memorial stone was set up in her honor by the Burlington County Historical Society, proclaiming her the “last of the Delawares.”⁵³ Such a claim is outrageous. Ann Ashatama raised a family in New Jersey. She and her husband, John Roberts, were the parents of seven children.⁵⁴ Many of her descendents still live in New Jersey.⁵⁵

As significant a role that each may have played in the history of their tribal communities, neither Lydia Clark or Ann Ashatama Roberts were the “last” of their tribe in their respective homelands. Without even looking beyond a simple, common sense, examination of their lives, the claim that they were the “last” of their people is easily overturned. However, the fallacy of the “Last Indian” has an emotional stronghold because of the desire of many to be done with the painful history of how indigenous populations were treated. If it is a “thing of the past,” then the burden of current culpability regarding how tribal communities are still being treated is nothing that need be considered. The fallacy also allows scholars and cultural enthusiasts to treat an area’s indigenous culture as a thing of the past and not as a living reality. The authority of a continuing tribal community over the

presentation of its own cultural heritage is easily overlooked and arrogantly disregarded by those who hold to this error.

The “None Left Behind” Fallacy

The “None Left Behind” fallacy is closely related to the fallacy of the “Last Indian,” and is based on many of the same erroneous assumptions. Whenever the claim is made along the eastern seaboard that all of the Indians who once lived in a state migrated to the west and that none were left behind, there is reason for doubt.⁵⁶ From about the early 1700’s, there was the systematic practice of “de-Indianization” in the east. This practice was often carried out by mere administrative reclassification.

By administratively redefining who was “Indian” and, therefore, who could make treaty claims, governments could disentangle themselves from old colonial treaties made with indigenous tribes. In some instances, a single Indian remaining on reserved tribal “treaty” land could block that land’s legal takeover by the increasing non-Indian citizenry. If there was a history of any large migration away from the state by the indigenous tribes, some states began to define what it meant to be legally “Indian” in a way that best suited the political and economic interests of their non-Indian citizens. In the minds of many Europeans, one could neither be “Christian” or “civilized” and still be called an “Indian.” In some states, Indians who converted to Christianity were reclassified as “mulattos” in the eyes of the law and society, which, during that era, was a term referring to a person who was neither white or black, and was used to refer to Indians. On the Delmarva, after the Christian Baptism of the John Puckham, in 1682, his previous Indian identity is reclassified as “mulatto.”⁵⁷ A Delaware law of 1740 implied that an Indian was, among other characteristics, a non-Christian person who depended upon wild meat for sustenance.⁵⁸ This essentially disallowed any Indian farmer, who principally ate pork or beef, from being counted as an Indian within the colony. A 1770 communication reflects a further definition of an Indian, not only as a person subsisting on wild meat, but as a person living far from Delaware, on the frontier.⁵⁹ Evidence of this reclassification appears in public records, as some individuals previously described as “Indian” on muster rolls, suddenly become “Free Persons of Color” in the census records and “Mulattos” in other records. Indians with some amount of non-Indian ancestry, would often be reclassified and no longer “count” as Indians in public records.⁶⁰ Another form of reclassification occurred on plantations in the south, where Indians were

occasionally enslaved alongside Africans, their identities being lost amid slave records and the assumption that accompanied being named in such a document.

There are those who maintain that all of New Jersey's Indians left in the early 1700's. Others have stated that when the residents of the Brotherton Reservation departed in 1801, there were none left behind. In both instances, we have clear evidence (as cited in the previous response to the fallacy of the "Last Indian") that remnant communities remained. The agreement of September 23rd, 1823, between the Muhheconnuck Tribe (Stockbridge Nation of Wisconsin) and the Brotherton Indians who took refuge among them, makes specific reference to the benefits of that agreement being bestowed upon them and any of their "scattered brethren in the state of New Jersey, to them and to their offspring stock and kindred forever..." indicating an awareness of the continuing presence of those Lenape who refused to leave the state.

In many instances, there is sufficient documentary evidence to overturn any assertion of the "None Left Behind" fallacy. Sadly, there is political pressure from non-Indians, and some Indians, to ignore this evidence and continue to perpetuate the fallacy. Scholars who have upheld this error on record, are at risk of negatively impacting their reputation if it is proven that they missed obvious proof of continuing indigenous communities in areas where they previously claimed none existed. Additionally, quite often for emotional, political and economic reasons, there is a desire to perpetuate sole claim to a tribal legacy among Indian groups that descend from those who migrated away from ancient tribal homelands. Because the descendants of the emigrants have frequently had more recent treaty contact with the federal government (because of that migration) they unjustly assume sole claim of the tribal heritage over the remnant communities that stayed in the homeland.

The Fallacy of the "Federal Standard"

Today, many assume that the only "real" Indians are those who are members of federally recognized tribes. The assumption is that if you were really a tribe, then you would be recognized by the federal government as such. Federal recognition indicates that a tribal government has a "government to government" relationship with the United States of America and that the tribe and its citizens are eligible for special federal benefits, privileges, protections, and even federally issued identification cards.

However, there are tribes which gained federal recognition only within the last few years; does that mean they were not “really Indian” prior to that recognition? There are tribes which have lost federal recognition (called “termination”); does that mean that they are no longer “really Indian?” In 2007, there was a bill in Congress to “terminate” the Cherokee Nation of Oklahoma; would its success have meant that the members of that tribe were suddenly no longer “really Indian?” Obviously, an Indian is an Indian whether the federal government has a treaty relationship with their tribe or not. However, even today, there are hundreds of tribes who have applied for such recognition and whose status has been under review for decades. The current concept of tribal federal recognition was developed in the 20th century and shifts with political winds. The truth of the matter is there are many tribes that were federally recognized early on, which would have great difficulty meeting the current federal standards being applied to recent applications for recognition.

What many don't know is that among tribes with no federal recognition, there are about 40 state recognized American Indian Tribes and about 200 additional tribes which also have a continuous community, proven ancestry, and are acknowledged by other tribal governments and sometimes even European governments which had colonies in North America. Many eastern tribes of first contact had a treaty history with colonial governments that were not honored by the newly formed United States. Forced migrations and the “Indian Wars” of the western frontier provided many tribes with a “treaty status” with the United States. This typically meant that Indian Rolls were created and kept by the federal government for those tribes. However, tribal communities of the colonial period that remained in the east often had no contact with the military or federal authorities and were not enumerated in the manner their western cousins were.

Between the Congress, The Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), and the Federal Courts, the modern criteria to determine tribal legitimacy is essentially that a tribe must be able to demonstrate that, since at least the year 1900, it has been a continuous community of descendants from an historical American Indian tribe, or confederation of historical tribes, have an internal history of acknowledging the authority of that community upon its members, and have principally occupied a contiguous geographical area throughout that period.⁶¹ While the criteria seems to be straight forward, getting a successful application through the federal acknowledgement process today typically takes decades of work and costs petitioning tribes millions of dollars and years of heartache. While the Congress and the

courts prefer to allow the BIA to assume responsibility for tribes petitioning for federal acknowledgment, the process has been criticized for being unfairly difficult and unpredictable by the General Accounting Office, the Office of the Inspector General, the Congressional Research Service, as well as by leading scholars. The average successful petitions that once occupied a single note book, now are tens of thousand of pages long. What was initiated as a method to assist federally unrecognized tribes has evolved into an ever-more demanding bureaucratic barrier preventing the recognition of legitimate tribes.

There are many examples of the individual with a single great-great-grandparent listed on an old federal tribal roll, having no other American Indian ancestors since then, not having any current relationship to the continuing tribal community; and yet, if the Indian ancestor's tribe merely uses a "lineal descent" standard for enrollment, that person can be declared a member of a "federally recognized tribe" along with their descendants after them, and receive all of the special benefits and protections reserved for American Indians by the federal government. However, there are non-federally recognized tribes with well documented histories and genealogies, and which have far more stringent membership enrollment requirements than some federally recognized tribes. Moreover, some non-federally recognized tribal communities maintained such a high level of isolation that their endogamy rate for the past 150 years is much higher than many federally recognized tribes. While it is the right of every American Indian Nation to set its own criteria for enrollment, in the face of such disparity, it is unreasonable to use federal recognition as the sole standard of American Indian tribal legitimacy.

The injustice of the fallacy of the "Federal Standard" leaves many legitimate tribes without a voice at the federal level, prohibits their legal possession of eagle feathers (which, given the spiritual significance attributed to such feathers for some tribes, is denial of their religious freedom), denies that their verifiably authentic art and craft work can be sold with an "American Indian Made" label, and leaves them struggling to assert their identity and sovereignty. For those with documented historical proof of their legitimacy, this is truly an atrocity.

The Fallacy of "Giving Sovereignty"

This fallacy is related to the fallacy of the "Federal Standard." This is the erroneous assumption that the federal or

state governments “give” or “grant” sovereignty to American Indian Tribes by recognizing them. However, recognition does not grant sovereignty to tribes. Sovereignty is intrinsic to American Indian Tribes, predating the sovereignty of the United States. According to the Handbook of Federal Indian Law,

Perhaps the most basic principle of all Indian law, supported by a host of decisions hereinafter analyzed, is the principle that those powers which are lawfully vested in an Indian tribe are not in delegated powers granted by express acts of Congress, but rather inherent powers of a limited sovereignty which has never been extinguished. Each Indian tribe begins its relationship with the Federal Government as a sovereign power, recognized as such in treaty and legislation... From the earliest years of the Republic the Indian tribes have been recognized as "distinct, independent, political communities" and, as such, qualified to exercise powers of self-government, not by virtue of any delegation of powers from the Federal Government, but rather by reason of their original tribal sovereignty. Thus treaties and statutes of Congress have been looked to by the courts as limitations upon original tribal powers or, at most, evidences of recognition of such powers, rather than as the direct source of tribal powers.⁶²

It is clear that even United States Federal Indian Policy affirms that external recognition is not the source of tribal sovereignty. Tribal sovereignty is intrinsic.

The “Casino-Monger” Fallacy

The old stereotype of the teepee-dwelling, buckskin clad, Indian on the plains is quickly giving way to a new stereotype of the money hungry, casino owning Indian on land seized from non-Indian neighborhoods. This fallacy presumes that all Indians want casinos and that all tribal efforts are ultimately based around casino development.

There are many tribes that have taken advantage of the opportunities for economic development from casino gaming, using the profit to operate tribal services and provide for their citizens, not unlike many states have done. However, there are

also many tribes that are not interested in developing casinos. Some have passed tribal laws and intertribal pacts banning involvement in casino gaming.⁶³

Sadly, the “Casino-Monger” fallacy has many Americans suspicious of any tribal community promoting its culture or seeking some form of government recognition. Paranoia has motivated the formation of organizations which zealously attack every effort of non-federally recognized tribes to help care for their own. They lobby against any form of government recognition or funding, and undermine the reputation of tribal communities to the larger public. They go out of their way to tie tribal recognition to gaming. Sometimes, these attacks are supported and funded by competing Indian and non-Indian casino interests.

The “Casino-Monger” fallacy unjustifiably paints American Indians with a broad brush. The damage that is done can be devastating to the efforts of poor tribal communities who have no interest in gaming and have even passed laws banning it. Many tribes currently petitioning for federal recognition began their effort long before the passage of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act. Their pursuit of federal acknowledgement has nothing to do with gaming.

The “Instant Indian” Fallacy

Today, there are many self-declared “Indians,” “chiefs” and “medicine men” who can be quite convincing, but are not acknowledged by the larger American Indian communities in the area... and, sometimes, are not even Native. There is a difference between those who are American Indian Enthusiasts and those who are Tribal American Indians. Enthusiasts are primarily non-Natives who have a passion for American Indian culture and history. Sometimes they may claim a recently uncovered sole American Indian ancestor several generations back. Often, enthusiasts will focus, almost exclusively, on the past and have little or no understanding of the dynamic ongoing history of the tribes for which they have so much passion. At best, enthusiasts are merely fervent in their celebration and research of American Indian culture. At worst, they are disrespectful of the living tribal communities and traditions of their area and occasionally fraudulent in their activities, misleading the public in regard to their legitimacy.

There is a difference between an enthusiast group and a legitimate Indian band, tribe or nation (the terms being used interchangeably in this instance and throughout this booklet).

Legitimate tribes, whether they have federal or state recognition (or none at all), are made up of the interrelated descendants of historical tribes, who have maintained some form of a continuous community. If a group cannot meet that standard, it may have Indians in it and may be an authentic American Indian cultural organization, but it should not be considered a tribe and should not promote itself as such.

Appendixes

The Confederation of Sovereign Nentego-Lenape Tribes

The Nanticoke Lenni-Lenape Indian Tribe (headquartered in Bridgeton, New Jersey) and the Lenape Indian Tribe of Delaware (headquartered in Cheswold, Delaware) have formed an intertribal union, “The Confederation of Sovereign Nentego – Lenape Tribes.” The purpose of the new confederation is to promote the common good of our people, to defend our right to govern ourselves under our own laws, to protect and maintain our tribal culture and preserve the legacy of our ancestors. The confederation is an expression of the sovereignty given by the Creator to our tribal nations, a sovereignty that has continued from ancient times to the present. It is also an affirmation of the shared history and common ancestry between our interrelated tribal communities, made up of Lenape and Nanticoke (originally, “Nentego”) families, which have remained in the area of their ancient homeland.

For thousands of years, our tribes, together with their sister nation – The Nanticoke Indian Tribe of Millsboro, Delaware – called the area of the Delaware River and Bay down through to the Chesapeake Bay, “Home.” Our three tribal communities are the modern Lenape and Nanticoke offspring of those 17th, 18th, and 19th Century Lenape Indian communities which history refers to by such names as the Indians of Cohansey Bridge, The Alloways, The Siconese, and The Sewapois... Unami and Unalachtigo families who remained from the Brotherton Reservation in New Jersey, also the Cheswold Indians of Delaware, and those Nanticoke Indians from the Chicone, Broad Creek and Indian River Reservations on the Delmarva Peninsula. Anthropologist and historians from the late 19th and early 20th century called us “Moors” and “Nanticokes.” Over the past several centuries, our tribal communities and tribal families have been documented and/or studied by Brainerd, Fisher, Babcock, Speck, Gilbert, Weslager, Porter, Kraft, Heite, Blume, The Smithsonian Institute, the United States Census Bureau and many others. Our core families include those of documented descent from Lenape and Nanticoke treaty and land grant signers.

Since the early days of Swedish, Dutch and English settlement, almost a half a millennia ago, our Lenape and Nanticoke ancestors intermingled and intermarried in order to survive the swift changes brought by the European incursion into our ancient homeland. While many from our tribes were forced

west and north, eventually settling in the mid-western United States and Ontario Canada, the families that remained gathered into interrelated tribal communities and continued our tradition as “keepers of the land.”

For many years, our people had segregated American Indian churches, social events, and - in Delaware – separate Indian schools. From the mid 1800’s through to the mid 1900’s, it was primarily through several tribal congregations that we were able to preserve our culture and defend our people. Eventually, the tribal leadership moved to establish funded services and programming to benefit tribal citizens and to protect tribal sovereignty for future generations.

Defending and asserting tribal sovereignty is essential to American Indian Tribes. "Tribal sovereignty" refers to the right of American Indian tribes to govern themselves and determine their own future. Attributes of American Indian tribal sovereignty include control of tribal land and the inherent powers to determine their form of government, to define conditions for membership in the nation, to administer justice and enforce laws, to tax and regulate the domestic relations of its members. According to chapter seven of Felix Cohen’s *Federal Indian Law*, “...From the earliest years of the Republic the Indian tribes have been recognized as ‘distinct, independent, political communities’ and, as such, qualified to exercise powers of self-government, not by virtue of any delegation of powers from the Federal Government, but rather by reason of their original tribal sovereignty.” Within the United States, sovereign powers rest with: the federal government, which is sometimes called the “supreme sovereign;” the state governments, which derive their sovereignty from the federal government; and American Indian tribal governments, the sovereignty of which predates both that of the federal and state governments.

This confederation holds the member tribes to require documented descent and a mandatory one quarter blood quantum from the historical core families of the three interrelated tribes as the minimal criteria for tribal enrollment. The confederation also asserts its governing authority by rejecting the promotion of vice as an avenue for economic development. In keeping with the guidance of the almighty Creator, the admonishment of our tribal elders, the standing policies of our tribal leaders and the spiritual legacy left for future generations of our people, our charter requires that the member tribes of this confederation shall not own, manage, operate or sponsor any business which profits from the promotion of vice. This policy specifically bans casino style gambling, the operating of slot machines, the selling of cigarettes,

cigars, alcohol, pornography and federally or state banned substances by the member tribes or their current or future subsidiaries. May this confederation enjoy the favor of the Almighty Creator and honor our ancestors while working to secure the future of our people and our living culture.

Tribal Ban on Gaming

The Nanticoke Lenni-Lenape Tribe stands out as an American Indian Nation that passed tribal law forbidding the Tribe's participation in casino gaming. In keeping with the guidance of the almighty Creator, the admonishment of our tribal elders, the standing policies of our tribal leaders and the spiritual legacy left for future generations of our people, our tribal law requires that the Nanticoke Lenni-Lenape Indian Tribe shall not own, manage, operate or sponsor any business which profits from the promotion of vice. This law applies to the Tribe itself and to all of its current or future subsidiaries. While we affirm the rights of other legitimate tribal governments to determine their own position in regard to the issue, our tribe has exercised its own sovereign right of self-determination by pursuing economic development opportunities which do not involve the promotion of vice.

The tribe's opposition to gaming is the reason that tribal citizens are quick to point out the difference between the historic Nanticoke Lenni-Lenape Tribe and a recently formed smaller group from the same area in southern New Jersey calling itself the "Unalachtigo Band of the Nanticoke Lenni-Lenape Nation," which advocates gaming. By applying nomenclature that implies an official connection with the historic Nanticoke Lenni-Lenape tribal government, the band's name suggests a relationship that is non-existent, benefiting from the implication while still rejecting the duly elected leadership and official policies of the Nanticoke Lenni-Lenape. A disclaimer appears on many of our tribal materials stating that we are NOT AFFILIATED in any way with the "Unalachtigo Band."

Cohanzick –

The Tribal Grounds of the Nanticoke Lenni-Lenape

Reclaiming What Was “Taken Out”⁶⁴

There was a time when our tribal ancestors called all of the land from southern New Jersey and the Delaware River and Bay down through the Delmarva Peninsula to the Chesapeake

Bay, "Ours." Since the first European settlers arrived on our shores in the 16th century, what had been "ours" slowly became "ours no more." Yet, while many left, our ancestors stayed or returned to watch over the land (and one day reclaim it) and honor our ancient ways. On June 21st, 1995, on Westcott Station Road in Fairton, New Jersey, our tribal elders, leaders, and citizens fulfilled the charge that had been passed to them; 28 acres of the land was reclaimed and set aside as "sacred." Once again, we called this portion of our homeland, "ours." On May 19th, 2007, we gathered to dedicate a new tribal meeting house on "our land," thanking the Creator for the sacrifices and perseverance of those who have gone before us. We named our land, "Cohanzick – The Nanticoke Lenni-Lenape Tribal Grounds.

There are many historical references to the "Cohanzick Indians" and the "Indians of Cohansey Bridge," which was later named "Bridgeton." These "Cohansey Indians" are among the ancestors of the Lenape and Nanticoke families which have remained in the area of their ancient homeland and have continued the tribal community from that era to the present day.

The area called "Cohanzick" (with various spellings, including "Gohansik" and "Kohansik") is documented as one of several "hubs" of American Indian activity, incorporating the various tribal villages throughout southern New Jersey along the Delaware Bay, throughout the period of early European contact. The name came to be associated with the creek, and the area around it, memorializing a reference made by the Lenape Chiefs who signed the original land grant, allowing European settlement at the end of the 17th century. History records that Mahoppony, Allaways, Necomis and his mother Necosshehesco, Myhoppony, Shuccotery, Mahawskcy, Mohut, Newsego, Chechenaham, Torucho, and Shacantum appear to have called the area, or at least a portion of it, "at the long land" (variously spelled as "Gunahackink," "Canahockink," and "Conahockink") while also referring to a chief who had lived on its south side. Another similar, but lesser known, Lenape reference to the area from that period is "at the spread-out land" (variously spelled as "Schiphahackink" or "Sepahacking").

Interestingly, "Cohanzick" never appears as a signer of any treaty or land grant. In Lenape, "Cohanzick," later mispronounced as "Cohansey," actually means "that which is taken out." While popular tradition holds that "Cohanzick" was the name of the honored chief of the area mentioned by the deed signers, it is possible that this is actually a reference to the land that was "taken out" of Gunahackink, by the land grant. It is also possible that the actual name of the chief referred to by the deed

signers may be lost to history. The one history recalls as “Chief Cohansey” was a well remembered past “Chief of the Long Land” by the Lenape leaders that signed part of that land away, quite possibly without them actually sharing his real name.

The land that was “taken out” is being reclaimed in our generation. May it be preserved and protected for many generations yet to come!

Friends of the Nanticoke Lenni-Lenape Indians

The Nanticoke Lenni-Lenape are dedicated to educating the general public about their heritage and sharing their history and culture. In 2006, the Tribal Council authorized the creation of the “Friends of the Nanticoke Lenni-Lenape,” which is a membership organization in support of the Tribe for persons not eligible to enroll in the Tribe. “Friends” encourage positive interaction between the Tribe and the non-Native community, and assist in the success of tribal fundraisers, advocate for tribal initiatives, and support tribal projects and activities. Members of the “Friends” tribal auxiliary receive newsletters, fundraising correspondences, and other special information prepared by the Council selected “Friends” leadership, which includes representation from the tribal membership.

More information on the “Friends of the Nanticoke Lenni-Lenape” can be accessed on our tribal outreach and information website at:

www.nanticoke-lenape.info

Tax deductible donations to “Friends” are used at the sole discretion of the tribal government to benefit the Nanticoke Lenni-Lenape. Donations may be written to the tribally controlled non-profit entity, “The Nanticoke Lenni-Lenape Indians of New Jersey, Inc.,” with “Friends” written in the memo line, and sent to:

**The Nanticoke Lenni-Lenape Indians
P.O. Box 544
18 E. Commerce Street
Bridgeton, N.J. 08302**

Chronological Overview of Historical Highlights⁶⁵

*Between the Congress, The Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), and the Federal Courts, the modern federal criteria used to determine tribal legitimacy is essentially that a tribe must be able to demonstrate that, since at least the year 1900, it has been a continuous community of descendants from an historical American Indian tribe, or confederation of historical tribes, have an internal history of acknowledging the authority of that community upon its members, and have principally occupied a contiguous geographical area throughout that period.*⁶⁶

1524 - Giovanni de Verrazano remarked that the shores of the Land of the Lenape were “densely populated.”⁶⁷

1608 – Kuskarawoak Nanticoke encounter Captain John Smith and his men during the latter’s exploration of the Nanticoke River.

1642 – The Nanticoke, Wicomiss, and Susquehannock are declared enemies of the Maryland Colony.⁶⁸

1649-1650 – Colonel Henry Norwood and a contingent of British immigrants are stranded on the Eastern Shore of the Chesapeake and are rescued by local Indians, who were most likely among the antecedents of those who eventually became the Indian River community, open their homes to him and those with him. Colonel Norwood sends his military coat back to the local chief as a gift of thanks. The chief promises to wear the coat for the rest of his life.⁶⁹ By 1758, the Norwood surname is documented among the Nanticoke.

1667 – War between the Wicomiss Indians and the Maryland Colony results in Wicomiss prisoners being sold into slavery in Barbadoes.⁷⁰

1668 - On May 1, the first of five treaties between the Nanticoke people and the Colony of Maryland was signed by Chief Unnacokasimmon. The Nanticoke are described as the head of a confederation of tribes on the Delmarva and have absorbed the surviving Wicomiss.⁷¹

1675 - November 17, John Fenwick “purchases” land for his Quaker colonists from Chief Mahocksey in Salem, New Jersey. records three purchases of lands for the areas now known as Salem and Cumberland Counties in New Jersey. Mosacksa and Forcus creeks, renamed Salem and Old-man’s Crrek, were

granted by chiefs Tospainkey and Henaminkey. The land between Forcus Creek (later referred to as "Game Creek," "Fenwick's River," and now Salem Creek) and the Canahockink Creek (now called "Cohansey") was granted by chiefs Mahoppony, Allaways, Necomis and his mother Necosshehesco, Myhoppony, and Shuccotery. The third purchase was from the Canahockink (now Cohansey), to the Wahatquenack (now Morris) river. The grantors were, "Mahawskycy, Mohut, who styles himself the king, Newsego, Chechenaham, Torucho, and Shacanum." These land grants were completed by 1676.⁷²

1682 – Lenape agree to a Peace Treaty with William Penn

1682 – On the Delmarva Peninsula, John Puckham, identified as an Indian, is baptized and his racial designation is changed to "mulatto." He marries Jone Johnson, also a "mulatto." A George Puckham was among the "Indians" named in the prosecutions of the Winnesocum "conspiracy" of 1742.⁷³ The Puckhams become part of the Cheswold community in Kent County, Delaware, intermarrying with the Durhams.⁷⁴

1684 - Lenape vocabulary compiled in Salem, New Jersey. James Daniel, Jr. of the Alloways Creek Preparative Meeting states, "The white people were few and the natives a multitude."⁷⁵

1695 - The first road laid out in Cumberland county was made from Fairfield to Burlington, New Jersey, and passed through an Indian settlement, a little east of Bridgeton, at a locality at present known as the "Indian Fields."

1698 – October, The Maryland Government set aside the Chicacoan (Chicone / Chiconi) reservation for the Nanticoke. The Puckamee village on the south bank of the Nanticoke River was simultaneously abandoned and claimed by settlers.

1711 – 1,000 acres, was set aside for the people called Indian River Indians by colonial authorities; by 1742, only 400 acres remained in Indian hands.

1711 - On November 3rd, the Broad Creek reservation was set aside by the Maryland legislature for the Nanticoke.

1729/1730 - 1st Goulds, Murrays, and Pierces are known to worship at the "Old Stone Church" in Fairfield Township, New Jersey.

1742 –Incident in which a gathering of Delmarva’s tribes at Winnasocum swamp causes panic among the Colonists. The resulting peace treaty lists member George Puckham, John and Dixon Coursey among the “chiefs” signing the treaty.⁷⁶

1743 - Old Stone Church in Fairfield Township, New Jersey, is destroyed by fire. Indian congregants relocate, the graveyard remains to document their presence.

1748 - European encroachment and hostilities forced many Nanticoke to flee north and east from Maryland into New Jersey and Delaware, west into Oklahoma and also into Canada where the Six Nations offered them a haven.⁷⁷

1758 – The May 22nd Muster roll of John McClughan, in the pay of the Delaware Government, identify Indians Nathan Norwood, Daniel Norwood and James Westcote on the Muster Roll.⁷⁸

1758 - Brotherton Reservation is created on 3,044 acres in Burlington County, New Jersey. In 1801, the reservation is sold and the few in residence on the reservation leave the state, although some would later return.

1760 – Abraham Siscoe is listed as a Nanticoke in a delegation to the Governor of Pennsylvania.⁷⁹

1768 - The Chicacoan, Maryland reservation was declared vacated, but a woman and two children remained at Broad Creek, now in Delaware, continuing the Indian occupation, so that it could not be declared vacant under Maryland law.

1816-1820 – The Gouldtown Church community of Nanticoke and Lenape people was officially established in Cumberland County, New Jersey. Prior to 1819, they worshipped in the Old Stone Church near Fairton. 1819 - They met in Swing’s Meeting House in Herring Row or the Methodist Meeting House. In later years, the meetings were held in the barn of Benjamin Gould the 2nd and ministered by Reverend Reuben Cuff of Salem

1823 - On September 23rd, The agreement between the Muhheconnuck Tribe (Stockbridge Nation of Wisconsin) and the Brotherton Indians, who took refuge among them, makes specific reference to the benefits of that agreement being bestowed upon them and any of their “scattered brethren in the state of New

Jersey, to them and to their offspring stock and kindred forever...” providing evidence of an awareness of remaining Lenape remnant communities in New Jersey.

1827 – 1860 - Between 1790 and 1862, American seamen could protect themselves against impressment by the British by carrying protective papers issued by the federal government. These papers state the date the protective paper was issued and other information including: ages; birth places; and, physical descriptions. They identify the following tribal ancestors as Indian: Nathaniel Clark in 1827; James Hansor in 1831; Elihu Ridgeway in 1846; Benjamin Norwood and John Dean in 1853; Eli Herman (Harmon) in 1854; T. Robinson Hanzar in 1858; Charles Dunning in 1859; Stephen Morris and Charles Harmon in 1860.⁸⁰

1834 - In New Jersey, Lummis School house is used as church and school until the Gouldtown church congregation split and the remaining congregation eventually completed the Trinity Church in 1860/1861, when the Gouldtown Church is called “Trinity” and classified as an African Methodist Episcopal (AME) church since the traveling pastor was then coming out of the Philadelphia AME organization. Many Indians eventually left to go to the forming Fordville congregation, when the “AME” designation was attached, as the church was becoming more non-Indian.

1855 - Levin Sockum and Isaac (Isaiah) Harmon case in Delaware in which prosecution applies the law disallowing “Negroes” to own firearms to two Nanticokes. Lydia Clark, a native speaking respected tribal elder frequently visited by Indians from outside of Delaware, is called a “Nanticoke Indian” by the state in the case. She is later remembered in 1927, by non-Natives who had racial bias against the community, as an authentic “aborigine,”⁸¹ which is supported by the physical description of Lydia Clark by those present during her testimony as a “perfect Indian type.” While her testimony is used by the prosecution against Sockum and Harmon, to show that they had some degree of African ancestry, the state also affirms kinship between Clark, Sockum and Harmon, and also affirms their Nanticoke Ancestry, which was never placed in doubt even by the prosecution. C. A. Weslager later writes in the 1940’s that Lydia Clark, indicated by her own testimony during the case, was the sister of Noke (Noble) Norwood⁸² who is described in 1895 by George Fisher (the prosecutor in the Sockum case) as having been a leader within the Indian community.⁸³

1865 - St. John United Methodist Church (Fordville Church) is built by Jacob and Arian Pierce.

1865 – Practice of endogamy among the Gould and Pierce families in Gouldtown and Piercetown, Cumberland County, New Jersey, is noted by Judge Lucious Q. C. Elmer, who makes mention of the “clannish” isolate community being about 200 years old at that time.⁸⁴

1870 – In the Pennsylvania Census, members of the Harman family, originally from the Delaware tribal community, are identified as Indian in the original record.

1877 – A school exclusively for “Moor” children is built at Moore’s Corner, west of Cheswold on Kenton Road. A second school is also built (possibly 1881) in Cheswold, and a third at Fork Branch.⁸⁵ During this time, “Moor,” “Nanticoke,” and “Indian” are used interchangeably by various sources to describe the Kent and Sussex County tribal community members.

1875 - William LaCount, a boot maker, died in Brooklyn. He was described as an Indian in the death record. His parents were Joseph and Mary LaCount, who had lived in Philadelphia, but were originally from Kent County, Delaware.

1880 - William Cambridge, his wife Mary Dean, and their daughter Josephine, were identified in the 1880 census as "Indian" living in Camden, New Jersey. Mary's father was Jesse Dean of Cheswold, Delaware.

1881 – Delaware Legislatures lists representative of the Indian River community in a school tax exemption act due to “special” status of the racial group. Specific names listed in the act are: Whittington Johnson, William A. Johnson, Samuel B. Norwood, George L. Norwood, Robert W. Norwood, Elisha Wright, Return Wright, Selema Wright, Nicholas Wright, James H. Kimmey, Robert Clark, Thomas H. Clark, Myers B. Clark, Isaac Harmon, John Harmon, James H. Clark, William R. Clark, Ann Johnson, Robert B. Johnson, John Thompson, Theodore Harmon, Stephen M. Norwood, John Harmon, Mitchell Harmon, Gardiner Draine, David P. Street, David R. Street, David Wright, George W. Clark, Elias C. Clark, William Clark.⁸⁶

1888 - According to J. Thomas Scharf, the Moors recognized themselves, and were recognized by their neighbors, as a distinct

ethnic group at least as early as a century ago. Scharf described them as having settled in nearby Little Creek [now Kenton] Hundred in about 1710, and remarked that they had owned better than a thousand acres of land among them. The Durham family was among these early settlers.⁸⁷

1892 – May 19th article entitled *Kent County Moors* appears in the “The Times of Philadelphia,” with the subtitle “*A Curious Delaware Community And Its History: Leni Lenapes Of To-Day.*” John Sanders (b. 1811) of the Cheswold Community is interviewed. In the follow excerpts from the article, he indicates that the commonly used term “Moor” is misleading. Sanders states, “We are Indians, and we belong to a branch of the great Delaware Nation, which used to hold all the country from New York to Cape Charles. Down in Sussex county, on the backbone ridge of the Peninsula, the head waters of two rivers rise close together--one of them, the Nanticoke River, flows west into Chesapeake Bay, and Indian River, the other, flows east and empties into the ocean; and it was at the place where these two rivers rise that our clan had its chief seat, and it is still the centre for our people. When this part of the country was first settled by the white men most of the Indians were either killed or driven away to the West and South, but some of our people clung to the soil; they settled down, adopted many of the ways of the white men, and lived in peace and friendship with their despoilers. In time they adopted the names of their white neighbors, and the principal names in our tribe now are Harmon, Norwood, Saunders, Street, Ridgway, Jack, Mosely, Durham and Hughes--all unmistakably of English derivation. They settled all over the country in squads in the same way... I was born in 1811, not two miles from here. My father, while a boy, was bound out to a man named Jefferson, who brought him up here from Sussex, so that I claim kindred with the old families down there. He settled here and lived here all his life; so did I, except some years that I spent out West, mostly in Indiana. At that time there was quite a large colony of Indians living along the Wabash River, near Peru, Indiana, and they were much lighter in complexion than our people here... We older ones are pure-blooded, but the younger generations have got badly mixed. Most of us belong to the Methodist Episcopal Church and we have our own church buildings and government. Little Union Church, near here, has members of all races and colors, but our own Manship Chapel doesn't admit any but our own people. Others may come as often as they choose and are quite welcome and a good many do come, but no strangers are admitted to membership or can have any voice in the management. A number of years ago the Methodist

Conference succeeded in taking one of our churches from us, down in Sussex, but our people immediately built another for themselves and connected themselves with the Methodist Protestants. That is why we want no strangers to join our church here; that occurrence was a lesson to us. A few years ago the conference cited us for trial because we refused to admit the black people to membership, but we proved to them that it had always been the custom for whites and blacks to have separate places of worship, and that we, as not being either, had always had our own churches, though in the old days we always had white men to preach to us... they quietly dropped the whole thing and didn't allow it to really come to trial. Ever since then we have gone on our own way quietly, and nobody has said a word to trouble us... My father and mother and all my foreparents were Indians. There are not many of the pure blood about here now, though there used to be a great many. It is strange how people have forgotten about us. Sixty years ago everyone knew who and what we were; there never was any question about it... In my young days we were called 'planters.' We belonged to the Delaware Tribe of Indians, but I don't know what was the name of our clan, probably nobody does now. But I know that our last chief was buried somewhere in the neighborhood of Millsborough, in Sussex County, and I have heard that when they were building the railroad from Lewestown down to Snow Hill, in Maryland, they had to dig through the place where he was buried, so they took up what was left of his bones and buried them somewhere else. He must have died more that a hundred years ago, for we have had no chief when my father was a boy."

1895 – On June 15th, George P. Fisher's article on the *So-Called Moors of Delaware* is published in the "Millsboro Herald." He cites personal knowledge of the Kent and Sussex County communities, specifically mentioning Noke (Noble) Norwood, Lydia Clark, Isaac Harmon, Levin Sockum and Cornelius Hansor. Fisher also indicates that Chief Justice Thomas Clayton was convinced of the Indian origins of the so-called "Moors." The social isolate tendencies of the community are discussed, including separate churches.

1895 – "So-Called Moors Farmers of Delaware" article appears in the NY Times, with the subtitle, *A Race of Mixed Indian and African Blood*. The article identifies both the Kent and Sussex County communities as mixed Indian isolates and specifically mentions Noke (Noble) Norwood, Lydia Clark, Isaac Harmon, and Levin Sockum.

1896 - Smyrna Press, (Del.) Times, on January 1, 1896 publishes an article that was either a reprint or based upon an 1895 article in the Philadelphia Press. It identifies the Cheswold community and suggests that the most reasonable reason for the "Moor" designation is due to the former name of the area in which they lived being "Moortown" and not because of any North African racial admixture. The article indicates that the Cheswold isolate community is, "... now in an interesting stage of development. They have a church and school, manage their own affairs and are looked upon as the most industrious citizens of the place." There is also mention of another community in the "lower part of the state," probably referencing Millsboro. Cornelius Ridgeway is described as "the patriarch of the colony" at Cheswold and member of the School Board for the separate Moor school. He recounts an incident when the community ejected a "negro" teacher from their school in an attempt to maintain separate status. He also speaks of the practice of endogamy. Levin Sockum, Issac Harmon and Lydia Clark are also mentioned as members of the race.

1897 – James Mooney, of the Bureau of American Ethnology of the Smithsonian Institute writes to a "Mr. Thurman" on June 10th and July 29th regarding isolated Indian communities along the Eastern Seaboard, which he believes are of Native American origin. Listed among these Indian groups are the "Moors" of Delaware in each letter. He appears to use the name to refer to both Kent and Sussex County Delaware communities.

1899 – William H. Babcock in *American Anthropologist*, identifies and describes Cheswold and Millsboro Indian Communities and references the southern New Jersey "party."⁸⁸

1903 – Delaware Legislature on March 20th, in Chapter 470 entitled "Miscellaneous," identifies all named in the previous 1881 act, and their descendants after them, as "Nanticoke Indians," and provides for legal designation of that identity for the purpose of "migrating."

1908 – M. R. Harrington, curator of the Southwest Museum in Los Angeles, collects a corn sheller made from a log, splint baskets, and an eel pot from the Cheswold community which are placed in the possession of the Museum of the American Indian, Heye Foundation, New York City along with specimens from Indian River.⁸⁹

1912 – *American Anthropologist* includes a report from *The Museum Journal* of the University of Pennsylvania regarding the work of Speck and Wallis among the Nanticokes, identifying the isolate communities in Millsboro and Cheswold, Delaware as Indian.

1915 – The Museum of the American Indian, Heye Foundation of New York publishes *The Nanticoke Community of Delaware* by Frank G. Speck. The work describes Speck's visit to "several communities" of descendants of Nanticoke Indians in Delaware. He writes, "These people, who occasionally have been reported in papers and journals, form two bands, the nuclear band living in Indian River Hundred, Sussex county, the other supposedly and offshoot, residing at Cheswold, Kent county. The members of the bands together are roughly estimated to number about 700. These people form self-recognized communities, with their own schools and churches, and possess a decidedly endogamous tendency... The style themselves variously 'Nanticokes,' 'Moors' and 'Indians' (p.2)." He continues by stating that, "Although the Moors or Nanticokes were included with the 'colored people' during slave days, none of them were ever held as slaves. They claimed the right to carry firearms, and in the local court forty or fifty years ago one of their number won a case, arising from the ownership of firearms, by proving himself to be a 'native Indian without a drop of slave blood in his veins' (p.4)." "... Regarding tribal identity and history, a few interesting fragments of tradition survive among the people. The Nanticoke are said to have inhabited the coast and inlets no farther north than Indian river [sic]. Inland, however, they ranged westward across Chesapeake bay [sic]. Evidently the present remaining descendants of the tribe at Indian river [sic] were the nucleus of those who stayed in Delaware after the general break-up of national life, before 1748. The country north of the Indian River district, according to the surviving tradition, was neutral ground between the Nanticoke and the Delawares proper, who, the former assert, were not always on the best of terms with the Nanticoke of Indian river [sic]. This would make the ancestry of the Cheswold branch of the Indian remnant in Delaware not fundamentally Nanticoke, but Delaware. Of course it should be remembered that intermarriage and removals have been frequent between the two bands, so that now, to all intents, they are practically the same... (p.8)"

1921 – As the State of Delaware upheld school segregation between whites and blacks, another class was recognized by the

following exemption, "The State Board of Education may establish schools for the children of people called Moors. No white or colored child shall be permitted to attend such a school without the permission of the board of Trustees of said school and of the State Board of Education."⁹⁰

1923 - David Harmon, Lenape elder of Cape May, said in 1923, that before Europeans came, they lived in New Jersey and then moved to Chesapeake Bay, always wanted to come back and eventually they did.⁹¹

1924 – Some of the members of the New Jersey's Lenape and Nanticoke community are forcibly removed to western reservations, although some later return. This account is attested by many tribal elders.

1930 – Delaware Census, original records in which the census field worker identified Sussex County tribal families as "Nanticoke," "Mixed," or "Indian" were crossed out and replaced with the classification "African" or "Negro" when it is filed with the field office. A clear example of continued racial reclassification and the perpetuation of a policy of eastern de-Indianization.

1935 – Delaware Revised Code (2631, Section 9) equates "Moors" as "Indians" and commits to providing funding for school teachers for them, separate from "White" Schools and "Colored" Schools.

1943 – September 27, A Delaware news article⁹² highlights C. A. Weslager's uncovering a 350-500 year old Delaware Indian corn mortar in the possession of Perry Hughes, a member of the Cheswold "Moor" community, having had the mortar passed down to him from the family line of his maternal grandfather, Perry Cork - who is called "the last full blooded Delaware Indians to live in Kent County." The article states that "Mr. Hughes is strongly Indian-like in complexion and feature, and is well informed on Indian custom and folklore which are part of his family traditions."

1943 – The University of Pennsylvania Press publishes *Delaware's Forgotten Folk – The Story of the Moors & Nanticokes* by C. A. Weslager. Speaking of the Delmarva Peninsula's history, he states, "... we find that the Indians who departed after 1742 left behind them a number of folk who had formed an indissoluble attachment to their ancestral homes. They refused to leave despite white subterfuge and the pleas of their departing relatives"

(p.62)... “There is not the slightest reason to dispute the oral tradition that the nucleus of the present Cheswold mixed-blood settlement was composed of Durham, Dean, and Munce descendants who had mixed with Delaware Indians, by formal or common-law marriage... Apart from the Durhams, Deans, and Munces, many of the present Cheswold mixed-blood families are not native of Cheswold but trace their origins to Indian River Hundred in Sussex County. Of their Indian background there can be no question, although the ancestral tribal connections were presumably not with the Delaware Nation, Members of the Harmon, Johnson, Hansely (Hansor), and other families broke away from the southern Delaware Nanticoke community and moved to the village at Cheswold” (p.136)... “Another part of the Cheswold mixed-blood population originated in Maryland along the Eastern Shore of the Chesapeake. They, too, lay justifiable claim to Indian forbears of Nanticoke, Choptank, or Delaware affiliation. Among the leading families whose ancestors came from Maryland are the Morgans, Seeneys, and Carters” (p.138)... “Among the mixed-blood Nanticokees now living in Indian River Hundred, the following names are the most prominent: Harmon, Clark, Burton, Street, Norwood, Wright, Hansor, Mosely, Coursey, Jackson, Drain, Davis, Reed, Johnson, Ridgeway, and, until recently, Sockum. This list does not exhaust the names of all families, but includes the old ones” (p.76)... “Generally speaking, a Moor marries a Moor and raises his children within the band. Sometimes a Cheswold Moor marries a Milford Moor; often one of the Indian River Nanticokees marries one of the Cheswold people; the Moors of Bridgeton, New Jersey – an offshoot of the Delaware group – also marry the Delaware Moors. The conservatives of the community approve of such matings, having decreed that their children should espouse people of their own ‘color’” (p.142). Orphans were claimed by the community, “...friends and relatives of the orphaned Moors took the children into their own homes before they became a public charge” (p.145-146)... “In the present Delaware mixed-blood colonies, the Indian descendants live together and generally intermarry, preserving the social traditions of their ancestors” (p.157).

1945 – Nanticoke children are permitted by the by the Department of the Interior to attend Haskell Institute in Lawrence, Kansas, which is a school exclusively for American Indians of at least ¼ blood. 30 Delaware Nanticokees attend over a 15 year period. The list of students had such surnames as Clark, Carney, Harmon, Jackson, Johnson, Norwood, Street, and Wright. In 1970, Haskell Institute became Haskell Junior College. Between 1970 and 1980,

C. A. Weslager reports that at least four additional Nanticokes attended the school.⁹³

1946 – William H. Gilbert in *Social Forces*,⁹⁴ Identifies Bridgeton, Cheswold, and Millsboro communities as “mixed blood” Indian isolate groups, describes social dynamics and lists family names from Delaware. From the Cheswold Community, he identifies the following families: Carney / Corney; Carter; Carver; Coker; Dean; Durham; Hansley or Hansor; Hughes; Morgan; Moseley; Munce; Reed; Ridgeway; Sammon and Seeny. From the Millsboro Community, he identifies the following families: Bumberry; Burke; Burton; Clarke; Cormeans; Coursey; Davis; Drain; Hansor; Harmon; Hill; Jackson; Johnson; Kimmey; Layton; Miller; Morris; Moseley; Newton; Norwood; Reed; Ridegway; Rogers; Sockum; Street; Thomas; Thompson; Walker; Wright.

1948 – In *Surviving Indian Groups of the Eastern United States*, which is included in the “Annual Report of the Smithsonian Institute” provided to the Library of Congress, William H. Gilbert cites the Bridgeton, Cheswold and Millsboro communities on the map of Eastern Indian communities. He summarizes the Bridgeton Community in the New Jersey section, indicating a “Moor” colony and a “Gouldtown” group, but includes their details along with the Cheswold and Millsboro communities in the section on Delaware, seeing them as interrelated. He sites separate schools and churches in both Delaware Communities. Cheswold family names listed are: Carney; Carver; Coker; Dean; Durham; Hansely; Hughes; Morgan; Moseley; Munsee; Reed; Ridgeway; Sammons; Seeney. He indicates that some of the names are shared in the Millsboro Community. He sites two groups in Sussex, the “Harmony Group -” which does not practice extreme isolation, and the “Nanticoke Indian” group - which appears to maintain more isolation and incorporated in 1921 as the Nanticoke Indian Association. The chief Nanticoke family names are listed as: Bumberry; Burke; Burton; Clark; Cormeans; Coursey; Davis; Drain; Hansor; Harmon; Hill; Jackson; Johnson; Kimmey; Layton; Norwood; Reed; Ridgeway; Rogers; Sockum; Street; Thomas; Thompson; Walker; Wright.

1950's and 60's - The Cumberland County, New Jersey, area known as Piercetown officially becomes part of Gouldtown. New housing projects built in Gouldtown brought a significant number of non-Indian people into the area. The shift in make-up of Gouldtown also brings shift in church and the schools. Records indicate that St. John United Methodist Church was primarily made

up of Nanticoke and Lenape descendants until this time. The 1960's brought influx of non-Indian people into the Fordville Church congregation. Colonial Riders Motorcycle Club in Bridgeton and the Just Us Club in Cheswold are in active among within the tribal communities.

1953 - The Association of American Geographers Annals Vol. 43 (June 1953) pp 138-55 publishes *A Geographical Analysis of White-Negro-Indian Racial Mixtures in the Eastern United States* by Edward T. Price of Los Angeles State College. The article provides a map that shows the geographic locations for the Bridgeton and Cheswold "Moor" communities and the Millsboro "Nanticoke" community.

1959 – The Journal-Every Evening, Wilmington, Del. (13 Aug 1959, p 23) publishes an article entitled, *Moor Says His People Started 'Big Thursday,'* by Joseph T. Doyle. Wilson S. Davis, identified as a "Delaware Moor," cites that his people started the "Big Thursday" picnic celebration, recalling a gathering of 1500 "Moors" from Bridgeton and Cheswold in 1934. The article sites the folklore of Spanish Moor admixture to local Indians (Delaware and Nanticoke) several hundred years ago, producing the modern "Delaware Moors."

1967 – The Peninsula Spotlight Morning News, Wilmington, Del. (4 Sep 1967) publishes an article entitled, *Train Whistle Recalls Cheswold Of Past* by Deedie Kramer, of the "Dover Bureau." The article is a general musing on the history of Cheswold and mentions the common belief that the Cheswold "Moors" are of Delaware Indian descent.

1972 - Delaware Today's January issue (p. 10) published an article by Neil Fitzgerald entitled, *Delaware's Forgotten Minority - The Moors*. The main interview is with "Mr. Durham" of Cheswold who recalls social events between the Brigdeton, Cheswold and Millsboro communities. The article indicates that the Cheswold community members had a "M" for "Moor" on their driver's licenses from the 1950's through to the 1970's, when many were changed by the state to "Other." Families cited include Durham, Sammons, Ridgway, and Coker.

1970 - 1972 - Many Nanticoke and Lenape people become less involved with the Saint John UM Church in Fordville, New Jersey, because they felt it was being taken over by non-Indians. They begin the reorganization process Tribal members began meeting

informally in homes to talk about reorganizing the Tribe separate from the church based tribal “clan” government that had been practiced for over 150 years. In 1974 The Tribe began meeting informally at the Greenwich Fire hall, and continue to meet there until a center is acquired.

1978 - April 22, A general meeting was held at the Greenwich, New Jersey, Fire Hall. The purpose of the meeting was to establish whether or not the people want to form a tribally controlled corporation. At that time, five board members were chosen for the new organization

1978 - June 16, Delaware and New Jersey tribal members attend the Regional Meeting of the Census Bureau and the Mid-Atlantic American Indian Groups in Arlington, Virginia. Objective was to make a positive change in the 1980 census for East Coast Indians.

1978 - July 22, The name “Nanticoke Lenni-Lenape Indians of New Jersey” was suggested and unanimously approved by the membership for the tribally controlled corporation.

1978 - August 7, Formal reorganization when the people incorporated as the “Nanticoke Lenni-Lenape Indians of New Jersey” first official occasion where both Nanticoke and Lenni-Lenape tribal names were joined together.

1978 – Nanticoke Lenni-Lenape provide cultural programs to local New Jersey schools. The purpose was to help revise the curriculum and eliminate stereotyping of Indian children and to increase public awareness of the tribe.

1978 – The Nanticoke Lenni-Lenape Tribe approaches Gouldtown School about asking for Federal Title IV Indian Education program funding. Thirty-nine students were identified in Fairfield Township School as Indian. This school was chosen by the tribe to be the place to initiate the Title IV program, because it had the greatest number of Indian children attending.

1979 - Tribal Center is established on East Commerce St. in Bridgeton, New Jersey.

1979 - October 20, Letter received by the Nanticoke Lenni-Lenape from the United States Department of Interior informing the tribe of it's right to petition for federal acknowledgment.

1980 - August 26, Dr. C. A. Weslager visited the Nanticoke Lenni-Lenape Indian Center to interview people for his book *The Nanticoke, Past and Present*.

1980 – Noted Delaware Historian C. A. Weslager provides a taped review of his notes from 1941-1943 regarding his study of the Cheswold Moors to the Nanticoke Lenni-Lenape of Bridgeton. He states at the outset, “I should say that many of these so called Moors were aware of Indian ancestry... My own conclusion after, very careful study, was that practically all of them had Indian antecedents... some of them were descended from the Lenape or Delawares while others had Nanticoke Indian background, their parents or other relatives having moved to Cheswold from the Nanticoke Indian community in Indian River Hundred in Sussex County.” He remarks on the prevalence of Indian features in the community and the general assumption that the grandparents of the present community were mostly “pure-bloods.”

1982 – December 16, Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 73 passed, granting State Recognition for the Nanticoke Lenni-Lenape and calls on the United State Congress to recognize the tribe.

1983 – The University of Delaware Press publishes *The Nanticoke Indians Past and Present* by C. A. Weslager. While primarily focusing on the Indian River / Millsboro Delaware community, he provides overall history which includes information about the historically interrelated and continuing Cheswold and Bridgeton communities. Weslager asserts that not all Lenape families left New Jersey with the westward migration of 1744 or even after the disbanding of the Brotherton Reservation in Burlington County in 1801. “Lenape families who had chosen not to live on the Brotherton Reservation still lived in various parts of New Jersey, where they continued to live as squatters. The Indians survived by raising corn and vegetable patches, selling brooms and baskets, and working for white families as domestics or hired hands... A few of the Lenape families living in the environs of Bridgeton on Cohanse Creek continued to be aware of their Indianism” (p.251). He states that around the antebellum period, “A time came when some of the Nanticoke descendants from Indian River Hundred, Delaware, and a number of the so-called Moor families (Lenape descendants) from the environs of Cheswold, Delaware, decided to emigrate to southern New Jersey... The people who settled in New Jersey, the Nanticokes from Indian River Hundred and the

Moors from Cheswold, intermarried with New Jersey Lenape descendants” (p.252-253). He says specifically that a generation arose among the Bridgeton community that resisted the racism present in the larger community, especially in the educational system, “The realization dawned on them that no matter what white people called them (Moors, yellow people, mulattoes, and so on), their ancestors were Lenapes, Nanticokes, or both. Despite accusations of racial admixture, which occurred among practically all the eastern Indian tribes during the colonial period, members of the new and enlightened generation were fully aware that their native roots went deep into American soil, and ethnically they were Indian... They, too, were motivated by ethnicity, a quest for status, a desire to preserve their roots, and especially to build a defense against doubts being expressed about their Indian background. Some were parents with children in New Jersey schools who demanded that their children be accorded their rights. Some of the parents were compelled to visit the schools to insist that the teachers classify their children as Indians, not colored” (254-255)... Weslager sees a poetic justice in the activity of the Bridgeton community, according to ancient tradition, “...the Nanticokes had originally been part of the Lenape tribal family. After the Lenapes reached the Atlantic Coast, the subdivision that became known as the Nanticokes separated from the main body and went farther south to live in the Chesapeake Bay region. Although some anthropologists question this interpretation, the New Jersey organization has in recent years brought together descendants of the two tribes in the same area where they alleged to have separated prior to the arrival of Europeans in the New World” ... “Some family names of the present Lenape descendants whose ancestors occupied the southern area of New Jersey are Cuff, Coombs, Custis, Bard, Gould, Green, Hughes, Jones, Loatman, Lloyd, Munson, Murray, Pierce, Saunders, Thompson, and Ward. Members of the organization whose ancestor came from the state of Delaware bear such family names as Beckett, Carney, Carter, Clark, Coker, Coward, Davis, Dean, Durham, Harmon, Jackson, Johnson, Miller, Morgan, Mosely, Munce, Pritchett, Reed, Ridgeway, Robinson, Sammons, Seeneey, Street, Thompson, and Wright...”(p.256).

1986 – Herbert C. Kraft, called by some “one of the foremost authorities on the Lenape in New Jersey,” asserts that while there are many groups remaining in the Lenape homeland claiming Lenape heritage, Nanticoke Lenni-Lenape origins are more fully documented. He cites the documented migration of Nanticokes into New Jersey in the mid 19th century with an increase of

migration into Salem and Cumberland counties around the turn of the 20th century. He reasserts these claims in his book, *The Lenape or Delaware Indian Heritage: 10,000 BC to AD*, published in 2000.⁹⁵

1988 - April 14, Sweden's King Carl XVI Gustaf and Queen Silvia visited the Nanticoke Lenni-Lenape Indian Village in the Bridgeton Park in Bridgeton, New Jersey.

1991 – April, Nanticoke Lenni-Lenape Tribal leader Dick Gilbert spoke before United Nations 2nd International Cultures Conference

1992 - January 3, Nanticoke Lenni-Lenape submit Letter of Intent to the BIA, Branch of Acknowledgment and Research (BAR) to submit petition for Federal Recognition, which furthers the effort begun in the 1980's with the New Jersey Legislature calling on the United State Congress to formally recognize the tribe.

1992 - the Nanticoke Lenni-Lenape Indians received statutory authorization from the state to substantiate American Indian Ancestry for the purpose of correcting birth certificates (N.J.S.:8-49).

1994 – Forks Branch area near Cheswold is studied by Delaware Historians and Archaeologists and determined to have been an Indian enclave related to the current day Cheswold Community.⁹⁶

1995 - June 21, The Nanticoke Lenni-Lenape Tribe purchases land on Westcott-Station Road in Fairton, New Jersey. The land was purchased with funds raised by tribal citizens specifically for land purchase. Fundraisers were conducted over a ten-year period to acquire the land.

1995 - The New Jersey Commission on American Indian Affairs was created by New Jersey Public Law 1995 c. 295. Representatives from the Nanticoke Lenni-Lenape tribe have held seats on this Commission continuously since its formation.

1996 - Edward F. Heite and Cara L. Blume complete the Bloomsbury Report, which identifies an area near Cheswold as a site of Indian activity related to the families in the Cheswold community. It also states that the modern members of the Lenape in Cheswold and the Nanticoke of Millsboro are of common bloodlines from the same general Indian stock.⁹⁷

1996 - March 16, Resolution passed by Tribal membership to other non-federally recognized Native American Tribes, as plaintiff in legal action, requesting that these Tribe be permitted to possess Eagle Feathers for their religious practices.

2000 – The United States Census Bureau lists Cumberland County, New Jersey, as a Nanticoke Lenni-Lenape American Indian Statistical Area.

2001 - "Lenape Then and Now" symposium, Vineland, New Jersey, October 20 host Delaware researcher Edward F. Heite who lectures on *The Invisible Indians of New Jersey and Delaware*. He states, "Throughout three centuries Native American families knew who they were. They stuck together. They intermarried. The three bands of people in Indian River, Cheswold, and Cumberland County, composed a single population within which people routinely circulated. They also maintained regular contact with other Native American communities. In the 1820s, for example, a young man from Cheswold went out to Peru, Indiana, to live a while with the Lenape emigrants out there."

2001 – November, Saint John United Methodist Church of Fordville is designated an historically Native American Church by Greater N.J. Annual Conference of the United Methodist Church.

2002 - August, Lenape Summer Youth Camp, held on tribal grounds in Fairton, New Jersey. Youth from the Nanticoke Lenni-Lenape Tribe, members of the Moravian Band and the Munsee Delaware from Canada attended.

2006 – October, Nanticoke Lenni-Lenape representatives are invited participate in two days of celebrations at the inauguration of the new Swedish Embassy in Washington, DC

2006 – The National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution, publishes *We Have A Story To Tell: The Native Peoples of the Chesapeake Region*, edited by Mark Hirsch, Co-authored by Gabrielle Tayac, Ph.D. and Edwin Schupman. The book is a guide for high school teachers and includes the history of the Indian River Community and acknowledges the Bridgeton Community.

2007 – The Bridgeton, Cheswold, and Indian River Communities were invited guests to the opening reception celebration of the People of the Chesapeake permanent display at the National

Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution. The Nanticoke Lenni-Lenape of Bridgeton, New Jersey were featured at the ceremony, doing several traditional dances.

Selected Bibliography

- Babcock, William H. *The Nanticoke Indians of Indian River, Delaware*.
"American Anthropologists, New Series," Vol. 1, No. 2. Apr., 1899
- Dowd, Gregory Evans. *The Indians of New Jersey*, New Jersey History
Series 3. Trenton, New Jersey: New Jersey Historical
Commission, 2001 ed.
- Cohen, Felix *Handbook of Federal Indian Law*. Washington, DC: United
States Government Printing Office, 1945 ed. Database available
online from URL= <http://thorpe.ou.edu/cohen/7cohen122.pdf>
- Fitzgerald, Neil. *Delaware's Forgotten Minority - The Moors.*, "Delaware
Today" January 1972 issue, 10
- Flemming, George D. *Brotherton*. Medford, NJ: Plexus Publishing, 2005
- Gilbert, Jr., William Harlen. *Social Forces*, Vol. 2, No. 4. University of
North Carolina Press, May 1946
- Gilbert, William H. *Surviving Indian Groups of the Eastern United States*.
"Annual Report of the Smithsonian Institute" provided to the
Library of Congress, 1948
- Harper, Robert W. Ph.D. *Friends and Indians in South Jersey*. The
Historical Collections Of The, State Of New Jersey written by
John W. Barber And Henry Howe. New York: S. Tuttle, 1844
- Heckwelder, John. *History Manners and Customs of the Indian Nations
Who Once Inhabited Pennsylvania and the Neighboring States*.
Philadelphia, PA: Historical Society of Pennsylvania, ed. 1876.
- Heite, Edward F. and Cara Lee Blume. *A Community on McKee Road*,
"Delaware Department of Transportation Archaeology Series No.
109." Prepared by Heite Consulting. Camden, Delaware 1994
- Heite, Edward F. and Cara Lee Blume. *Mitsawokett to Bloomsbury:
Archaeology and History of an Unrecognized Indigenous
Community in Central Delaware*. "Delaware Department of
Transportation Archaeology Series No. 154." Prepared by Heite
Consulting. Camden, Delaware 1998. Available online from URL
= <http://www.mitsawokett.com/Bloomsbury/BloomsburyIndex.htm>
- Heite, Edward F. and Louise Heite. *Delaware's Invisible Indians, parts 1 &
2*. Database Online URL=
<http://www.heite.org/Invis.indians1.html> and
<http://www.heite.org/Invis.indians2.html>.

- Hodge, Frederick Web, editor. *Handbook of American Indians North of Mexico, Volumes 1 & 2*, "Smithsonian Institute Bureau of American Ethnology," Bulletin 30. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1907
- Kraft, Herbert C. *The Lenape-Delaware Indian Heritage: 10,000 B.C. – A.D. 2000*. Shamong, NJ: Lenape Books, 2001.
- Macdonald, Betty Harrington. *Further response to Delaware Moors (Vol 5 No 4)*. Delaware Genealogical Society Journal 1992
- Marye, William B. *The Wiccomiss Indians of Maryland, Part II*, in "American Antiquity." Washington, DC: Society for American Archaeology, ed. January, 1939
- Penn, William. *William Penn's Own Account of the Lenni Lenape or Delaware Indians*, edited by Albert Cook Meyers. Moorestown, NJ: Middle Atlantic Press, 1970 ed.
- Porter, Frank W. III. *The Nanticoke*. New York, New Haven, London: Chelsea House Publishers, 1987
- Rountree Helen C. and Thomas E. Davidson. *Eastern Shore Indians of Virginia and Maryland*. Charlottesville and London: University of Virginia Press, 1997
- Salem Quarterly Meeting History Committee. *The Quakers Salem Quarterly Meeting Southern New Jersey 1675-1990*, Pennsville, NJ: Associated Printers, Inc., 1991. Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 91-61227
- Scharf, Thomas. *A History of Maryland From The Earliest Period to the Present Day, Vol. 1*. Baltimore, MD: John B. Piet, 1879
- Speck, Frank G. *The Nanticoke Community of Delaware*. New York: The Museum of the American Indian, Heye Foundation, 1915
- Speck, Frank G. *The Nanticoke and Conoy Indians*. Wilmington, Delaware: The Historical Society of Delaware, 1927
- Steward, William A.M. and Rev. Theophilus G. Steward, D.D. *Gouldtown: A Very Remarkable Settlement of Ancient Date*. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincotte Company, 1913.
- Tayac, Gabrielle Ph.D. and Edwin Schupman. *We Have A Story To Tell: The Native Peoples of the Chesapeake Region*. Edited by Mark Hirsch. Washington, DC: The National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution, 2006

- Wacker, Peter O. *Land and People: A Cultural Geography of PreIndustrial New Jersey*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1975
- Weslager, C. A. *Delaware's Forgotten Folk: The Story of the Moors and Nanticokes*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1943
- Weslager, C. A. *The Nanticoke Indians Past and Present*. Newark, DE: The University of Delaware Press, 1983
- Zeisberger, David. *David Zeisberger's History of the Northern American Indians*, edited by Archer Butler Hubert and William Nathaniel Schwarz. Lewisburg, PA: Wennawoods Publishing, 1999

Endnotes

-
- ¹ New Jersey State Senate Concurrent Resolution Number 73 of 1982
- ² New Jersey Public Law 1995 c.295; New Jersey Statutes 52:16A-53 et. seq.
- ³ *Montoya v. United States*, 280 U.S. 261, 21 S.Ct. 358, 45 L.Ed. 521 (1901)
- ⁴ *Handbook of American Indians North of Mexico, Vol. 1*, edited by Frederick Web Hodge, "Smithsonian Institute Bureau of American Ethnology" Bulletin 30 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1907) 385
- ⁵ John Heckwelder, *History Manners and Customs of the Indian Nations Who Once Inhabited Pennsylvania and the Neighboring States* (Philadelphia, PA: Historical Society of Pennsylvania, ed. 1876) xxvi
- ⁶ Herbert C. Kraft, *The Lenape-Delaware Indian Heritage: 10,000 B.C. – A.D. 2000* (Shamong, NJ: Lenape Books, 2001) 249
- ⁷ David Zeisberger, *David Zeisberger's History of the Northern American Indians*, edited by Archer Butler Hubert and William Nathaniel Schwarz (Lewisburg, PA: Wennawoods Publishing, 1999), 128
- ⁸ Gregory Evans Dowd, *The Indians of New Jersey*, New Jersey History Series 3 (Trenton, New Jersey: New Jersey Historical Commission, 2001 ed.) 68
- ⁹ Gregory Evans Dowd, *The Indians of New Jersey*, New Jersey History Series 3 (Trenton, New Jersey: New Jersey Historical Commission, 2001 ed.) 39
- ¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 41
- ¹¹ The relationship between the Lenape and the Susquehannock was marked by periods of war with times of civil trade.

¹² Gregory Evans Dowd, *The Indians of New Jersey*, New Jersey History Series 3 (Trenton, New Jersey: New Jersey Historical Commission, 2001 ed.) 42

¹³ *Ibid.*, 43

¹⁴ William Penn, *William Penn's Own Account of the Lenni Lenape or Delaware Indians*, edited by Albert Cook Meyers (Moorestown, NJ: Middle Atlantic Press, 1970 ed.), 8, 38, 39

¹⁵ *Handbook of American Indians North of Mexico, Vol. 2*, edited by Frederick Web Hodge, "Smithsonian Institute Bureau of American Ethnology," Bulletin 30 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1907) 25

¹⁶ Recorded in at least two prominent sources: John Heckwelder, *History Manners and Customs of the Indian Nations Who Once Inhabited Pennsylvania and the Neighboring States* (Philadelphia, PA: Historical Society of Pennsylvania, ed. 1876) 90; and, J. Thomas Scharf, *A History of Maryland From The Earliest Period to the Present Day, Vol. 1* (John B. Piet: Baltimore, MD, 1879) 89

¹⁷ C. A. Weslager, *Delaware's Forgotten Folk: The Story of the Moors and Nanticokes* (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1943) 42

¹⁸ John Heckwelder, *History Manners and Customs of the Indian Nations Who Once Inhabited Pennsylvania and the Neighboring States* (Philadelphia, PA: Historical Society of Pennsylvania, ed. 1876) 92

¹⁹ William B. Marye, *The Wiccomiss Indians of Maryland, Part II*, in "American Antiquity" (Washington, DC: Society for American Archaeology, ed. January 1939) 51

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 52

²¹ Peter O. Wacker, *Land and People: A Cultural Geography of PreIndustrial New Jersey* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1975), 60

²² George D. Flemming, *Brotherton* (Medford, NJ: Plexus Publishing, 2005), 55-58

²³ Gregory Evans Dowd, *The Indians of New Jersey*, New Jersey History Series 3 (Trenton, New Jersey: New Jersey Historical Commission, 2001 ed.), 58

²⁴ This is by no means intended to be an exhaustive list. There is evidence to show other small Indian remnant communities were in existence, which also incorporated migrating Native American families from outside of the colony of New Jersey. These groups were largely going unnoticed because of assimilation, misidentification, or remoteness.

²⁵ George D. Flemming, *Brotherton* (Medford, NJ: Plexus Publishing, 2005), 111-128

²⁶ Edward F. Heite and Cara L. Blume, Mitsawokett to Bloomsbury: Archaeology and History of an Unrecognized Indigenous Community in Central Delaware (Cameden, Delaware: Heite Consulting) Available online from URL =

<http://www.mitsawokett.com/Bloomsbury/BloomsburyIndex.htm>

²⁷ Available online from URL = <http://www.mitsawokett.com/Puckham.htm>

²⁸ Helen C. Rountree and Thomas E. Davidson, *Eastern Shore Indians of Virginia and Maryland*, (Charlottesville and London: University of Virginia

Press, 1997) 199-202; and, *Mulatto Classification of Indian Families*, report submitted by Stacey Ricketts on September 10, 2006, Available online from URL = <http://www.mitsawokett.com/Mulatto%20Classification%20of%20Indian%20Families.htm>

²⁹ George D. Flemming, *Brotherton* (Medford, NJ: Plexus Publishing, 2005), 111-128

³⁰ Salem Quarterly Meeting History Committee, *The Quakers Salem Quarterly Meeting Southern New Jersey 1675-1990*, Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 91-61227 (Pennsville, NJ: Associated Printers, Inc., 1991), 217. "Accarous" one of several 1675 Fenwick deed signers, ancestor of the Dunn/Pierce line

³¹ C. A. Weslager, *Delaware's Forgotten Folk: The Story of the Moors and Nanticokes* (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1943) 40-58

³² Edward F. Heite and Louise Heite, *Delaware's Invisible Indians, parts 1 & 2*, Available Online at URL= <http://www.heite.org/Invis.indians1.html> and <http://www.heite.org/Invis.indians2.html>...citing the May 22, 1758 Muster roll of John McClughan, in the pay of the Delaware Government.

³³ C. A. Weslager, *Delaware's Forgotten Folk: The Story of the Moors and Nanticokes*. 58

³⁴ Edward F. Heite and Louise Heite, *Delaware's Invisible Indians*. ... Abraham Siscoe is listed as a Nanticoke in a 1760 delegation to the Governor of Pennsylvania.

³⁵ Part of the History of the Indian congregants that originally formed the original Gouldtown Church community (c. 1816) in Cumberland County, NJ, which eventually formed the St. John UM Church of Fordville, NJ, to preserve and tribal identity and control. St. John UM Church of Fordville, NJ, is recognized as a historically Native American Church.

³⁶ Families represented in one or more of five types of public documents: 1) Identified as Indian between 1827-1860 on Seamen's Protection Papers, cited by Betty Harrington Macdonald, *Further response to Delaware Moors (Vol 5 No 4)*. Delaware Genealogical Society Journal 1992 6(3):63-64; 2) Persons named in the 1855 case identifying the "Moors" and "Nanticoke" as Indian "mixed bloods," and subsequent related articles... cited by C. A. Weslager, *Delaware's Forgotten Folk*, p.38 and Frank W. Porter III, *The Nanticoke*, p.63; 3) Listed in *An Act to exempt certain persons from the operation of Chapter 48 of Volume 15 of the Laws of Delaware, and to enable them to establish schools for their children in Sussex County*, Passed at Dover March 10, 1881; 4) The 1875 Brooklyn, NY, death certificate of William LaCount, a boot maker, in which he is listed as "Indian" and his are Joseph and Mary LaCount originally from Kent County, Delaware; The 1880 Census record of William Cambridge, his wife Mary Dean, and their daughter Josephine, in which they are identified "Indian" living in Camden, New Jersey. Mary's father was Jesse Dean of Cheswold, Delaware.

³⁷ William Harlen Gilbert, Jr. *Memorandum Concerning the Characteristics of Larger Mixed-Blood Racial Islands of the Eastern United States*, "Social Forces," Vol.24, No.4 (University of North Carolina Press, 1946) 445

³⁸ William H. Gilbert, *Surviving Indian Groups of the Eastern United States*, "Annual Report of the Smithsonian Institute" provided to the Library of Congress, 1948

³⁹ *Kent County Moors: A Curious Delaware Community And Its History*, "The Times of Philadelphia," May 19, 1892. Interview of John Sanders (b. 1811)

⁴⁰ C. A. Weslager, *Delaware's Forgotten Folk: The Story of the Moors and Nanticokes*, 128

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 128

⁴² C. A. Weslager. *The Nanticoke Indians Past and Present* (Newark, DE: The University of Delaware Press, 1983) 266-267

⁴³ Neil Fitzgerald, *Delaware's Forgotten Minority - The Moors*, in "Delaware Today" January 1972 issue, 10

⁴⁴ Available online from

URL=<http://www.mitsawokett.com/HughesPerry&CornMortar.htm>

⁴⁵ New Jersey Statutes: 8-49 of 1992

⁴⁶ New Jersey Public Law 1995 c. 295; New Jersey Statutes 52:16A-53 et. seq

⁴⁷ Defined by the US Census Bureau for the 2000 Census as: "A statistical entity for state recognized American Indian tribes that do not have a state recognized reservation. SDAISAs are identified and delineated for the Census Bureau by a designated state official. They generally encompass a compact and contiguous area that contains a concentration of individuals who identify with a state recognized American Indian tribe and in which there is structured or organized tribal activity."

⁴⁸ Resolution of the Board of Global Ministries, Commission on Native American Ministries, United Methodist Church, 2001

⁴⁹ *An Act to exempt certain persons from the operation of Chapter 48 of Volume 15 of the Laws of Delaware, and to enable them to establish schools for their children in Sussex County*, Passed at Dover March 10, 1881

⁵⁰ The information in the entire section on Lydia Norwood Clark, Levin Sockum, Isaiah (Isaac) Harmon, and Noke Norwood is documented in: C. A. Weslager, *Delaware's Forgotten Folk*, p.35-38, 89; C. A. Weslager, *The Nanticoke Indians Past and Present*, 209-213; Frank W. Porter III, *The Nanticoke*, p.61-63; George P. Fisher, *So-Called Moors of Delaware*, "Millsboro Herald," June 15, 1895

⁵¹ George D. Flemming, *Brotherton* (Medford, NJ: Plexus Publishing, 2005) 55-58

⁵² *Ibid.*, 112

⁵³ *Ibid.*, 119

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 112-128

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 127-128; and, *The Genealogical Records of the Nanticoke Lenni-Lenape Indians*, (Bridgeton, New Jersey)

⁵⁶ Helen C. Rountree and Thomas E. Davidson, *Eastern Shore Indians of Virginia and Maryland*, (Charlottesville and London: University of Virginia Press, 1997) 199-202

⁵⁷ Edward F. Heite and Louise Heite, *Delaware's Invisible Indians, parts 1 & 2*, Available Online at URL= <http://www.heite.org/Invis.indians1.html>

and <http://www.heite.org/Invis.indians2.html>; and, *Mulatto Classification of Indian Families*, report submitted by Stacey Ricketts on September 10, 2006, Available online from URL = <http://www.mitsawokett.com/Mulatto%20Classification%20of%20Indian%20Families.htm>

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, The law is recorded from *13 George II Chapter LXXIV*

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, Cited from the Minutes of the Delaware Legislature 1770, 270

⁶⁰ Gabrielle Tayac, Ph.D., Edwin Schupman, *We Have A Story To Tell: The Native Peoples of the Chesapeake Region*, Edited by Mark Hirsch (Washington, DC: The National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution, 2006), 18-19

⁶¹ 25 C.F.R. Part 83; and, *Montoya v. United States*, 280 U.S. 261, 21 S.Ct. 358, 45 L.Ed. 521 (1901)

⁶² Felix Cohen, *Handbook of Federal Indian Law*, (Washington, DC: United States Government Printing Office, 1945 ed.) Database available online from URL= <http://thorpe.ou.edu/cohen/7cohen122.pdf>

⁶³ Such is the case for the Nanticoke Lenni-Lenape Indian Tribe of New Jersey, which banned casino gaming by tribal law... and the Confederation of Sovereign Nentego-Lenape Tribes, which incorporated a ban on gaming into its charter. The Confederation is a union of the Nanticoke Lenni-Lenape Indian Tribe of New Jersey and the Lenape Indian Tribe of Delaware.

⁶⁴ Many thanks are owed to the noted linguist and Algonquinist, Ray Whritenour, whose work in preserving the Lenape Language was instrumental in preparing this section.

⁶⁵ A debt of thanks is owed to Tina Pierce Fragoso for providing a significant amount of the chronological data in this section.

⁶⁶ 25 C.F.R. Part 83; and, *Montoya v. United States*, 280 U.S. 261, 21 S.Ct. 358, 45 L.Ed. 521 (1901)

⁶⁷ Gregory Evans Dowd, *The Indians of New Jersey*, from "New Jersey History Series 3" (Trenton, New Jersey: New Jersey Historical Commission, 2001 ed.) 68

⁶⁸ William B. Marye, *The Wiccomiss Indians of Maryland, Part II*, *American Antiquity* January 1939 (Washington, DC: Society for American Archaeology 1939), 51

⁶⁹ Col. Henry Norwood, "A Voyage To Virginia," Creation of machine-readable version by Paul Grady (Charlottesville, Virginia: Virginia Center for Digital History, 2000 ed.); and, C. A. Weslager, *Delaware's Forgotten Folk: The Story of the Moors and Nanticokes* (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1943) 28-29

⁷⁰ William B. Marye, *The Wiccomiss Indians of Maryland, Part II*, 52

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 53-54

⁷² Robert W. Harper, Ph.D., *Friends and Indians in South Jersey*. The Historical Collections Of The, State Of New Jersey written by John W. Barber And Henry Howe (New York: S. Tuttle, 1844), 1, Forward V

⁷³ C. A. Weslager, *Delaware's Forgotten Folk: The Story of the Moors and Nanticokes* (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1943) 58

⁷⁴ A Lecture by Edward F. Heite, *The Invisible Indians of New Jersey and Delaware*, presented at the "Lenape Then and Now" symposium,

Vineland, New Jersey, October 20, 2001. Database Online available at URL=<http://www.mitsawokett.com/LenapeThenAndNow.htm>

⁷⁵ Salem Quarterly Meeting History Committee, *The Quakers Salem Quarterly Meeting Southern New Jersey 1675-1990*, Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 91-61227

(Pennsville, NJ: Associated Printers, Inc., 1991), 218

⁷⁶ C. A. Weslager, *Delaware's Forgotten Folk: The Story of the Moors and Nanticokes* (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1943), 40-58

⁷⁷ Frank G. Speck, *The Nanticoke and Conoy Indians* (Wilmington, Delaware: The Historical Society of Delaware, 1927), 7-8.

⁷⁸ Edward F. Heite and Louise Heite, *Delaware's Invisible Indians, parts 1 & 2*, Available Online at URL= <http://www.heite.org/Invis.indians1.html> and <http://www.heite.org/Invis.indians2.html>.

⁷⁹ Ibid.

⁸⁰ Betty Harrington Macdonald, *Further response to Delaware Moors (Vol 5 No 4)*. Delaware Genealogical Society Journal 1992 6(3):63-64. Cited by Edward F. Heite and Louise Heite, *Delaware's Invisible Indians, parts 1 & 2*, Available Online at URL= <http://www.heite.org/Invis.indians1.html> and <http://www.heite.org/Invis.indians2.html>.

⁸¹ C. A. Weslager, *Delaware's Forgotten Folk: The Story of the Moors and Nanticokes* (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1943), 38; and, Frank W. Porter III, *The Nanticoke* (New York, New Haven, London: Chelsea House Publishers, 1987), 63

⁸² C. A. Weslager, *Delaware's Forgotten Folk*, 35, 89

⁸³ George P. Fisher, *So-Called Moors of Delaware*, "Millsboro Herald" (Millsboro, DE) June 15, 1895

⁸⁴ William Steward, A.M. and Rev. Theophilus G. Steward, D.D., *Gouldtown: A Very Remarkable Settlement of Ancient Date* (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincotte Company, 1913) 9-11

⁸⁵ C. A. Weslager, *Delaware's Forgotten Folk: The Story of the Moors and Nanticokes* (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1943), 146

⁸⁶ An Act to exempt certain persons from the operation of Chapter 48 of Volume 15 of the Laws of Delaware, and to enable them to establish schools for their children in Sussex County, Passed at Dover March 10, 1881

⁸⁷ J. Thomas Scharf, *A History of Maryland From The Earliest Period to the Present Day*, v. 2, (Baltimore, MD: John B. Piet, 1879), 1124.

⁸⁸ William H. Babcock, *The Nanticoke Indians of Indian River, Delaware*, "American Anthropologists, New Series," Vol. 1, No. 2. (apr., 1899), 277-282.

⁸⁹ C.A. Weslager, *Delaware's Forgotten Folk*, 129

⁹⁰ Ibid., 120

⁹¹ C. A. Weslager, *Nanticoke Indians Past and Present* (Newark, DE: University of Delaware Press, 1983), 254

⁹² Available online from

URL=<http://www.mitsawokett.com/HughesPerry&CornMortar.htm>

-
- ⁹³ C. A. Weslager, *Nanticoke Indians Past and Present* (Newark, DE: University of Delaware Press, 1983), Appendix B
- ⁹⁴ William Harlen Gilbert, Jr., *Social Forces*, Vol. 2, No. 4 (University of North Carolina Press, May 1946), 445
- ⁹⁵ Kraft, Herbert C., *The Lenape-Delaware Indian Heritage: 10,000 B.C. - A.D. 2000* (Shamong, NJ: Lenape Books, 2001), 544
- ⁹⁶ Edward F. Heite and Cara Lee Blume, *A Community on McKee Road*, Prepared by Heite Consulting, "Delaware Department of Transportation Archaeology Series No. 109" (Camden, Delaware 1994)
- ⁹⁷ Edward F. Heite and Cara L. Blume, *Mitsawokett to Bloomsbury: Archaeology and History of an Unrecognized Indigenous Community in Central Delaware*. Prepared by Heite Consulting, "Delaware Department of Transportation Archaeology Series No. 154" (Camden, Delaware 1998) Available online from URL = <http://www.mitsawokett.com/Bloomsbury/BloomsburyIndex.htm>