

Chapter three

The scholarly sisterhood

In the nineteen-forties, William B Hesseltine and Louis B Kaplan from the University of Wisconsin, undertook a three-part statistical study of the American history profession. Their first report opened with a general consideration of the history profession including an overview of *its* history from the first award at Harvard in 1873 up to 1935, the final year covered in their report.¹ Their focus then shifted to a utilitarian consideration of post-doctoral employment and publication statistics for the years 1921–35 including the question of the research-versus-teaching debate, which had long vexed the profession. Six months later Hesseltine and Kaplan complemented this report with a second, entitled ‘Negro Doctors of Philosophy in History’, and the following year completed the set with ‘Women Doctors of Philosophy in History’.² In the third panel of this triptych, Hesseltine and Kaplan portrayed women struggling against the odds. Although the report celebrated ‘increased opportunities’ for the education of women as a manifestation of the nineteenth-century ‘revolution in higher education in the United States’, it also showed that this increase had been painfully slow.³

Annie Abel was not mentioned by name in Hesseltine and Kaplan’s tables, but she was counted among only thirty-one American women who were awarded history doctorates in the two decades to 1910. In the same period, almost sixty times as many men—nearly eighteen hundred—were given the same award. In 1893, Kate Asaphine Everest Levi, an historian of German settlement in the Midwest and a student of Frederick Jackson Turner at the University of Wisconsin, became the first woman in the United States to be awarded a history PhD. By 1935, Abel’s exact contemporary Nellie Neilson (1873–1947) had become the first female president of the American Historical Association (AHA), and although Hesseltine and Kaplan

rightly heralded this latter achievement in their report, they failed to comment on the fact that this milestone in gender equality had taken fifty years to achieve.⁴

Their third report followed the same pattern as the first and, after a brief historical introduction, also considered the teaching-versus-research conundrum and the post-doctoral employment of women. Hesseltine and Kaplan concluded their discussion with the observation that:

The list of distinguished women scholars in history is not long; the record of the average woman who persevered in academic study until she attained the doctorate is not impressive. She has seldom held high or responsible positions in the teaching profession, and she has not proved a productive scholar ... Women who took the Ph.D. in history hold poorer positions, are more likely to be unemployed and are less likely to do research than men. Moreover, the historical profession awards less recognition to its women members.⁵

They finally suggested that perhaps the only amelioration for this rather sad state of affairs might lie in further employment opportunities created by the recent United States involvement in the Second World War. As the historian Jacqueline Goggin has noted, although Hesseltine and Kaplan's report clearly delineated the lower status of women *vis-à-vis* men in the profession, the researchers 'did not attempt ... to identify the *causes* of women's unequal standing in the historical profession'.⁶

In fact, long before it became a professional academic discipline, American women had been involved in the project of writing their nation's history. As early as 1784, Hannah Adams (1755–1831)—the first woman in the United States who sought to support herself through her writing—published an ecclesiastical history entitled *Alphabetical Compendium of the Various Sects*; some twenty years later, Mercy Otis Warren's (1728–1814) account of the American Revolution was published.⁷ In 1850, following upon her three-volume *Women of the American Revolution* (1848), Elizabeth Ellet (1812–1877) anticipated the 'new history' by some fifty years when she published *A Domestic History of the American Revolution*, in which she sought to portray the social, rather than the political, conditions of that time. In the seventy years preceding the Civil War at least twenty women published history textbooks and throughout the nineteenth century women 'embraced their roles as the custodians of national history'; nevertheless, they gained a reputation not as historians but rather as 'dutiful educators of children'.⁸ Following the Civil War, and at precisely that moment when women were being employed in ever increasing numbers as teachers, history became a compulsory topic in elementary schools

nationwide. Not only did women take their historical sensibility from the home to the school, but outside of these institutions tens of thousands of women across the country also made up the rank and file of local preservationist groups.⁹

As the century progressed, a rise in female readership produced a concomitant rise in female authorship and, in an age that regarded history as a branch of literature, women historians often began their careers ‘with literary rather than historical work’.¹⁰ Like their male counterparts of the time who, adhering to the Whig interpretation of history, concentrated on explicating the deeds of ‘great men’, female historians established their own tradition of historical biography that related the stories of ‘great women’.¹¹ Sarah Knowles Bolton (1841–1916), for example, followed her *Lives of Poor Boys Who Became Famous* (1885) with a similar *Lives of Girls* (1886) both of which sold more than fifty thousand copies. Works such as *History of the City of New York* (1881) and *Wall Street History* (1883) by Martha J Lamb (1826–1893) established her credentials as an historian to be appointed editor of the popular *Magazine of American History*, a position that she held until her death.

Frances Victor (1826–1902) began her writing career as a writer of dime novels under the pseudonym of Florence Fane, but became interested in the history of Oregon when she moved there in the 1860s. For twelve years she worked as an archivist and research assistant for the amateur San Francisco historian Hubert Howe Bancroft (1832–1918) who was then engaged in producing a monumental *History of the Pacific States* (1890) in twenty-eight volumes. Victor did nearly half of all the work; nevertheless, the set was published—to critical acclaim—solely under Bancroft’s name. Like Abel, Victor took an interest in Indian–white relations and in 1890 was invited by the state legislature to write a local history, which resulted in *The Early Wars of Oregon* (1894). Although her work was cited by a specialist such as Edward Gaylord Bourne, outside of the Oregon history community Francis Victor remained largely unsung.¹²

Although they never gained the recognition afforded their male counterparts, gentlemen amateurs such as George Bancroft or Francis Parkman, nineteenth-century women played a central, if often unheralded, role in United States historical practice. As one scholar would have it, for the female historian of the nineteenth century, ‘history as a product of her thoughts and actions affirmed her worth as an agent of public discourse’ and yet, as Hesseltine and Kaplan’s report demonstrated, such

affirmation would be hard-won for women in the academic profession of history as it emerged after the Civil War.¹³

Although from early in the nineteenth century there had existed a few small private seminaries that catered for women's higher learning, it was Oberlin College in Ohio that, in 1837, became the first seat of higher learning in the United States to admit women. This was not for their own sake as scholars but 'ostensibly to provide ministers with intelligent, cultivated, and thoroughly schooled wives'.¹⁴ Admission to higher education became part of the century-long momentum for women's social and political emancipation, but it was the exigencies of the Civil War that really prised open the doors of academe to them: with so many men enlisting, there simply were not enough male students to sustain many of the colleges.

By the 1870s, women-only colleges had become a feature in the eastern states, often connected to existing men-only institutions. The most notable of these became known as the Seven Sisters—the Ivy League of women's higher education in the United States comprising: Barnard and Vassar in New York; Bryn Mawr in Pennsylvania; and Mount Holyoke, Radcliffe, Wellesley and Smith in Massachusetts.¹⁵ Although Matthew Vassar (1792–1868) held that a woman 'had the same intellectual constitution as a man', the need to maintain a gender differential was demonstrated in the program of the college that he founded in 1861, and was especially 'adapted to their needs in life'.¹⁶

Out in the West, the new land-grant universities—originally created under the Morrill Act of 1862 to develop agriculture and the mechanic arts—often lacked a secure endowment base and so 'were far more vulnerable to the pressure to admit women'.¹⁷ Staffing shortages in the state school systems further increased this pressure so that by 1890 coeducation was a well-established feature of western education.¹⁸ By the turn of the century, on campuses from California to Kansas and from Minnesota to Texas, women nearly equalled or actually outnumbered men.¹⁹ But there was residual resistance to this trend, and as late as 1904 the psychologist and former president of Clark University in Massachusetts, G Stanley Hall, could write that:

Coeducation harms girls by assimilating them to boys' ways and work and robbing them of their sense of feminine character ... It harms boys by feminizing them when they need to be working off their brute animal element. Boys are eager for specialized knowledge, while girls are not suited to it.²⁰

Graduate schools first began admitting women in 1868 but only as ‘special students’ and, with a few exceptions, for more than twenty years women were not granted degrees.²¹ One such exception was Helen Magill (1853–1944) who, at Boston University in 1877, became the first American woman to be awarded a PhD. While it continued to refuse women entry into its under-graduate college, Yale University at New Haven, Connecticut, only began admitting women to its graduate school in the early 1890s and awarded its first female doctorate in 1894.²² Soon after gaining admission with a Bulkley Fellowship in 1903, Abel found her name mentioned in a newspaper article that proclaimed: ‘The life of a ‘co-ed’ at New Haven is not a bed of roses’.²³ What Abel had to say at the time on the question of coeducation is not recorded, but more than thirty years later she was to recall this incident:

I had a very disagreeable experience in the matter of newspaper notoriety years ago, at the time I was awarded the Berkley Fellowship [*sic*] in History at Yale. It had never been given to a woman before and the newspapers made much of the fact to my extreme discomfiture and disgust. I have had ever since an extreme aversion to the sight of my name on the page of a newspaper.²⁴

Between 1890 and 1918 the number of women graduates across all disciplines in the United States, Abel among them, increased from ten per cent to forty-one per cent. Yet, within the academy women in general, not only had to combat or submit to a gender bias, would-be female historians in particular, had to further struggle for acceptance by a heavily gendered profession.²⁵ Women found themselves confronting:

many difficulties as they attempted to gain scholarly credibility and respect from male historians. The intellectual and social isolation imposed by sexual discrimination was a powerful deterrent to sustained scholarly and professional activity.²⁶

What made it particularly difficult for women in history departments was the prevailing cult of science with its central principle of objectivity, which required on the part of scholars an emotional distancing from the topic at hand. Such distancing was believed by nineteenth-century men simply to be beyond the capabilities of women who, by their very nature, were deemed as being emotionally subjective creatures, well suited to the hearth and home but not really capable of grappling with the cold, hard facts of science.

The feminist historiographer Bonnie G Smith argued that the very adoption of Rankean maxims and methods further gendered the discipline and subordinated

women to the status of amateur.²⁷ Certainly, as the age of patrician amateurs was passing, the adoption of scientific principles combined with the establishment of the profession—in effect, an almost exclusively male club—resulted in a transvaluation of the word ‘amateur’ by which it became a way of minimalising women’s input into the discipline, rather than one of honouring the former male silverbacks of the trade. Smith also argued that within the academy, the adoption of the seminar method with its emphasis on archival research gave rise to a ‘brotherhood’ or ‘republic’ that:

yielded distinctive ways of imagining field-specific tasks, including highly gendered fantasies of historical work, that enticed people into and shaped the profession.²⁸

The seminar—and Smith stressed that word’s relation to the masculine ‘semen’—had ‘a commitment to “manly work”’; in other words, it was *definitively* exclusive of women. Ultimately, it ‘converged the attractively progressive concept of male citizenship’ to produce “‘men” with specific prerogatives and communal solidarity’.²⁹

Although women were often trained by highly respected male historians, these men ‘did little collectively to reduce the discrimination women faced in their quest to be treated as equals’.³⁰ The New England historian and president of Cornell University Charles Kendall Adams (1835–1902) thought that women students might sit in on the reading of seminar papers, but thought it improper for them to engage in seminar work. On the other hand, Moses Coit Tyler—Abel’s professor at Cornell—was a strong supporter of female education and believed that the purpose of the study of history was to produce good citizens.³¹ Even the language of male historians often betrayed gender discrimination. In 1913, when Abel was a professor at the Woman’s College of Baltimore, the Stanford University historian Ephraim D Adams (1865–1930) wrote to her recommending his student Mary Wilhelmine Williams, whom he described as ‘very capable ... not especially attractive in appearance, yet not unattractive in any special sense’.³² Such remarks would never have been made about a male student and, sadly, Abel’s response is not recorded.

Women also had to overcome the normative, incipient sexism within the discipline’s peak professional body, the AHA. In the association’s early days, it was considered that the presence of women at its meetings would inhibit the men’s smoking and use of coarse language and so segregated events were organised—tea for the ladies and smokers for the men.³³ The association even created a Committee

On Social Entertainment Of The Ladies to cater for their presumed different needs and not until 1917 were women ‘permitted to attend the smoker for the first time’.³⁴ Between 1895 and 1940 women constituted between fifteen and twenty per cent of the membership of the AHA, a percentage that was neither reflected in the papers presented at its annual meetings, nor in the numbers that served on its governing bodies and committees. Annual meetings were usually attended by more than a hundred women—not only historians but also the ‘wives of male historians, female high school teachers and ... members of patriotic societies such as the Colonial Dames and the Daughters of the American Revolution’.³⁵ Although it was usual for at least one paper by a woman to be presented at the annual meeting, in some years there were no women at all listed on the program. Abel joined the AHA in 1903 and remained a lifelong member, serving on several committees such as the General Committee (1915), Historical Manuscripts Commission (1921) and the Committee on Programme for the Fortieth Annual Meeting (1925).³⁶ As a member of this last body, Abel once wrote to the chairman, William Dodd—then professor of history at the University of Chicago—mentioning nearly a dozen women who had been ‘approached on the subject of appropriate papers’ for the forthcoming meeting, although of the sixty papers presented only five were by women.³⁷

Not only were women subordinate in the discipline’s professional association, they were also marginalised in its publications. Of the nearly seven hundred articles published in the *AHR* in its first forty years, only twenty-one (or three percent) were authored by women, and between 1914 and 1940 a similar percentage of female scholarship was represented in the pages of the *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* (*MVHR*).³⁸ Even when they were published, reviews of women’s works were often relegated to the ‘minor notices’ pages of the professional journals and then reviewed anonymously.³⁹ Overall, it was male historians who ‘served as gatekeepers for the profession’, and those women who did engage with it were expected to subjugate themselves to a man’s world.⁴⁰

But despite all the gender discrimination, a handful of women did manage to make successful careers in the history profession, and many of these were also pioneers in their chosen fields. In 1890, at the newly established University of Chicago, William Rainey Harper successfully lured the Michigan-trained historian Alice Freeman Palmer (1855–1902) out of her retirement (through marriage) to serve

as assistant professor of history and dean of women. In 1881, Palmer had founded the organisation that was to become the American Association of University Women (AAUW) and some forty years later Abel was awarded a travelling scholarship that had been established in the name of the AAUW's founder. Although she never gained a PhD, Katherine Coman (1857–1915) was nonetheless appointed professor of history at Wellesley College in the 1890s and, at the turn of the century, demonstrated her pioneering work in economic history as one of the first contributors to the *Economic History Review*.

Ellen Churchill Semple (1863–1932) gained an MA from Vassar before travelling to Germany to study what was termed 'anthropo-geography' under Friedrich Ratzel (1844–1904). Although women were not permitted to attend lectures, Semple sat in an adjacent room, listened through an open door and thereby became one of Ratzel's pre-eminent students. In 1903 she published *American History and its Geographic Conditions* in which, like Frederick Jackson Turner, she maintained an all-too-simple linkage between geography and history. Whereas Turner attempted to explain America in terms of the frontier, Semple attempted to explain the Civil War in terms of topography. According to Semple, the northern temperate forests had given rise to an agriculture that was unsuited to chattel-slavery, whereas the hot, humid South had been more suitable for the labour-intensive cropping systems that made slavery economically tenable. At the Madison, Wisconsin, meeting of the AHA in December 1907 (the same meeting at which Abel was awarded the Justin Winsor prize) Semple's ideas provoked a vigorous debate and she came under attack from George Burr of Cornell.⁴¹ Nevertheless, her approach, like that of Turner's, was a new and exciting concept and marked her as a pioneer in the environmental interpretation of history.

Before the end of the nineteenth century, Eleanor Louisa Lord (b. 1866) was already a seasoned scholar and author. Following her graduation with a master's degree from Smith College in 1890, she became an instructor in history there for four years. She was then awarded a European fellowship by the Woman's Educational Association of Boston and studied at Newnham College, Cambridge, England, during the academic year 1894–95. Upon her return to the United States, Lord was appointed Fellow in History at Bryn Mawr College before moving to the Woman's College of Baltimore (later to be renamed Goucher College). In 1898 she published

Industrial Experiments in the British Colonies of North America, a work that considered the system of procurement of naval supplies, for merchant shipping and the Royal Navy, during the eighteenth century.⁴² In a reflection of the Rankean standards of the time, the Columbia history professor Herbert Levi Osgood (1855–1918) gave it a positive review, noting that:

Miss Lord has taken the system as it was and, so far as the subject demanded, has sought to show how it worked. This is the only scientific course, the only method which will lead to positive results.⁴³

Lord later supported Abel's application for a position at Goucher and soon after Abel joined that college in 1908, they collaborated on a single minor work and Abel would eventually become professor of history at Smith College, Lord's *alma mater*. Over the years the two women certainly maintained a degree of contact and Lord's help was acknowledged in the preface to Abel's 1932 edition of *Chardon's Journal*.

Like many successful academic women of the period, Eva Louise Phelps Kellogg (1862–1942) taught school before going to university. She entered the University of Wisconsin in 1895 and continued with graduate studies in American history under the guidance of Frederick Jackson Turner. She spent a year in Europe studying at the Sorbonne and the London School of Economics before receiving her PhD back at Wisconsin in 1901. In 1903, and three years before Abel, Kellogg became the first woman to win the Justin Winsor prize, with her thesis *The American Colonial Charter; a study of its relation to English administration, chiefly after 1688*.⁴⁴ For a decade, she worked with the eminent historian of North American exploration Reuben G Thwaites (1853–1913) in the editing and publishing of some forty volumes of documents from the Wisconsin Historical Society's collection. Following Thwaites' death in 1913, Kellogg herself published several works on the history of Wisconsin and the Old Northwest and in 1930 became the first woman to be elected to the presidency of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association. As an authority on exploration narratives, she was invited to consider an edition of Truteau's 1795 *Journal*, the first part of which was published in the *AHR* in 1914 and which was to become the subject of one of Abel's papers published in 1921.⁴⁵ Kellogg also reviewed Abel's 1939 edition of *Tabeau's Narrative*.

In 1883, at the age of thirty, Lucy Maynard Salmon (1853–1927) earned an MA in history at the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor and then taught at the Indiana State Normal School (subsequently Indiana State University) in Terre Haute for three

years. She was awarded a one-year graduate fellowship to Bryn Mawr where she studied American history and in 1887 moved to Vassar to become the first history teacher at that college; two years later she was appointed full professor. In her historical study *Domestic Service* (1897) she pioneered the use of statistical tables and sought to broaden the range of historical informants beyond the narrow confines of the official archives so beloved by Ranke. At Vassar, she:

ran her seminars in such an idiosyncratic way that, though held in high esteem, they were called ‘Miss Salmon’s Laundry Lists’. Instead of having her students study state documents, she ‘threw’ onto the seminar table stacks of laundry lists, piles of train schedules, cookbooks, architectural designs for housing, and other artefacts of everyday life.⁴⁶

In this way Salmon sought to feminise the seminar, present history in the domestic tradition of Elizabeth Ellet and, by revealing the lives of ordinary folk, to tear the seminar away from the ‘History is Past Politics’ slogan that the pre-eminent American disciple of Ranke, Herbert Baxter Adams, had emblazoned over the door of his own seminary at Johns Hopkins. In 1896 Salmon was appointed to the AHA’s Committee of Seven, which had been established ‘to consider the subject of history in the secondary schools and to draw up a scheme of college entrance requirements in history’.⁴⁷ In 1903 Salmon was a co-founder and first president of the Association of History Teachers of the Middle States and Maryland, in which Abel was an active member, and she also encouraged Abel to submit articles to the *AHR*. In 1900 Salmon was appointed to the AHA’s General Committee on which she served for many years and in 1905, arguing that social segregation inhibited women professionally, called for the Committee on Social Entertainment of the Ladies to be abolished.⁴⁸ In 1915 she became the first female member of the AHA’s Executive Council, but although she continued to suffer from discrimination—its meetings were often held at exclusively male clubs—Salmon had broken the mould and for the next twenty-five years women did serve on the council.⁴⁹

Viola Florence Barnes (1885–1979) gained a Bachelor of Music from the University of Nebraska in 1906. After a brief period as a piano teacher, she returned to the university to complete work for an MA in 1910 and then went to Yale University where she was awarded a PhD in 1919. Her first book, *The Dominion of New England* (1923), became a standard history of the colonial period and she later held the chair of history at Mount Holyoke College, 1939–42. In 1930 Barnes was a co-founder of a national sorority and lobby group, the Berkshire Conference of

Women Historians; by this time Abel had retired from teaching and did not become involved with this group.

Lucy Elizabeth Textor obtained her BA from the University of Michigan in 1894 before moving to Leland Stanford Junior University where she wrote what was quite possibly the very first academic work on Indian–white relations. Entitled ‘Official Relations between the United States and the Sioux Indians’ this was Textor’s masters’ thesis, which was published in 1896 and had been included in the bibliography of Abel’s doctoral thesis.⁵⁰ Textor moved on to Yale where, just prior to Abel, she completed her PhD (in 1904), which was a study of an émigré community in Canada.⁵¹ She later developed an interest in Eastern European affairs, became professor of Slavonic history at Vassar, was among the first American scholars to visit the Soviet Union and served on the advisory editorial board of the *Russian Review*. Textor was also active in the AHA and in 1927 was elected to its Committee on Nominations.⁵²

Rachel Caroline Eaton (1869–1938) was probably the only Indian woman historian to be published in the first decades of the twentieth century. A descendant of a survivor of the Cherokee Trail of Tears, her *John Ross and the Cherokee Indians* was first published in 1914 and in the following year was reviewed by Abel in the *AHR*. Educated at tribal schools and the Cherokee Female Seminary in Tahlequah, Oklahoma, Eaton was accepted into the University of Chicago where she became the first female Oklahoma Indian to receive a doctorate.⁵³ Like Abel she became an educator and in 1918 was appointed dean of women at Trinity University in Waxahachie, Texas. Eaton later returned to her native Oklahoma where she became a county superintendent of public instruction.

These women were Annie Abel’s peers and like their sisters on the settlement frontier, each of them was a pioneer who struggled on the academic frontier and extended the scope of the discipline. Yet they not only had to grapple with the new possibilities presented by the reorientation of history as a profession, they also had to struggle against the prejudices engendered by that very reorientation. Most female academic historians had difficulty finding employment commensurate with their training and many of them ended up working in ‘high schools, libraries and archives, and women’s colleges’.⁵⁴ Although most been trained at coeducational colleges they

were rarely employed by these institutions, except out West; even Ranke's grand-daughter Caroline, when seeking employment in the 1920s was 'advised to confine her search to women's colleges'.⁵⁵

As one of only thirty-one women of her era in the entire United States to have earned a doctorate in history, Annie Abel joined an elite band of professional, women historians who were, nonetheless, obliged to adhere to the male-dominated norms of the profession. Although she found herself in a situation where the position of women was securely subordinate, she was also one of the 'few exceptional achievers [who] did not threaten the system and [whose] achievement gained salience over their womanhood'.⁵⁶ Indeed, she not only found a job in the academy, but also embarked upon what was to become a very successful academic career.⁵⁷

After graduating from Yale in 1905, Abel first gained employment as an instructor in history at Wells College, a women's institution in Aurora, New York. This was a minor posting and the workload was heavy. It involved teaching courses in general modern history, the history of France, political and social history of the United States (colonial & national), constitutional and institutional history of the United States, and 'Medieval Institutions, a course in historical criticism and research'.⁵⁸ This heavy schedule denied Abel the opportunities that she sought for furthering her own research and it would appear that she was not very happy at Wells for by March 1906 she was already looking for another job. 'The experiences of each day increase my desire to get out of this isolated community', she wrote to Bourne, her mentor at Yale.⁵⁹ In the same letter, she mentioned that she had been twice interviewed by President Hazen of Smith College and was waiting hopefully for a reply. 'He didn't exactly say there would be a vacancy but promised to write me if he had anything to offer', she wrote.⁶⁰ She was able to report, however, that she had received 'a letter of inquiry from Dr [Eleanor Louisa] Lord of 'The Woman's College [of Baltimore] and Abel expressed her gratitude to Bourne for his kindness in recommending her to Lord. She also reported to Bourne that she had received a letter from *AHR* editor J Franklin Jameson in which 'Miss Salmon wished him to encourage me to submit some article' and that in this regard Abel 'was trying to do a little research work at Cornell'; but Abel's first article for the *AHR* would not appear for another four years.⁶¹

A month later, following a visit from her other Yale mentor, GB Adams, Abel wrote to Bourne again:

Since I told you of my determination to resign this position at Wells College unless I was accorded the associate professorship and an increase of salary, I wish to say that as far as such matters are concerned everything has been satisfactory settled [*sic*] ... President Ward gave in at once when he saw I was determined to resign. Even now I am not disposed to stay if I get anything better.⁶²

She went on to say that, despite ‘Dr. Lord being strong for me’, she did not think much of her chances of getting the Baltimore position since the Woman’s College president, Dr Goucher, had his own candidate and besides it seemed uncertain that an additional position would even be created. Abel also reported that in anticipation of a forthcoming resignation at Smith College she had written once more to Hazen, but that she had not heard from him. ‘I would put in an application for Mr. Robinson’s [position] but I don’t think it would be of any use because I know they want a man’.⁶³

Despite these gloomy prognoses, by the new academic year of 1906 Abel *had* secured a job at The Woman’s College of Baltimore (which changed its name to Goucher College in 1910) but once again as a lowly instructor in history. The college was founded as a Methodist endowment in 1885 and soon established close links with the nearby Johns Hopkins University (JHU). By early in the new century Goucher had established a good reputation for itself and, sometimes referred to as the ‘eighth sister’, was ranked just outside the top tier of women’s colleges; so for Abel this posting was indeed a step up from Wells. She was described as:

Tall and plain, a careful scholar, but painfully shy. Her lectures tended towards dull formality, yet she was warm and witty with small groups of students. Paradoxically, Dr. Abel made friends easily, and if she had a hobby it was the movies, which she thoroughly enjoyed.⁶⁴

In 1908, within only two years of her initial appointment, she was elevated to associate professor but it was a year that would for her have been tinged with sadness at the death of her friend and mentor Edward Gaylord Bourne in February.

Baltimore was also sufficiently close to Washington—only a short train ride away—to allow Abel reasonably easy access to the archives of the Office of Indian Affairs (OIA) with which she had become so familiar in writing her doctoral thesis. So in 1907, at Bourne’s suggestion and with her youngest sister Lucy’s help, she began to investigate and transcribe the files on the California Indian Missions, but she was unable to find a publisher and nothing came of this work. Nonetheless, the

OIA archives would not only continue to provide her with the primary source material for almost all of her published work for the rest of her writing life, her familiarity with them would also give her credibility as an expert historical witness. Throughout her written work Abel often expressed sympathy for the plight of the Indians and outrage at the white man's perfidy, but not once did she ever evince the slightest hint of a reformist agenda *vis-à-vis* Indians. Unlike the 'amateur', Helen Hunt Jackson, it would perhaps ill-behave a professional historian like Abel, trained in the objectivist, Rankean tradition, to even attempt to employ historical studies for the benefit of such an agenda.

Yet, when called upon, it appears that Abel was prepared to employ her expertise to help Indians. In 1910, FW Mondell the Chairman of the House of Representatives Committee on the Public Lands received a petition from Richard C Adams (1864–1921), an attorney who was lobbying on behalf of the Delaware, or Lenni Lenape, tribe. A Lenape himself, Adams had actively sought to preserve the vanishing culture and traditions of his people both through his legal representation and through his writing.⁶⁵ Four years earlier he had published *The Delawares: A Brief History* (1906), which he had dedicated:

To the memory of my ancestor, Captain White Eyes, whose ambition it was that the Delawares and their confederated bands should be consolidated and become the fourteenth State in the Union, and to my Delaware brethren in the United States this sketch is affectionately dedicated. Richard Adams, Delaware Indian.⁶⁶

In his 1910 petition Adams carefully considered each of the objections—raised in an earlier report by the secretary of the interior to the Public Lands Committee—to a Bill that sought recognition of the military service consistently rendered by the Delawares to the United States for over a century. Attached to Adams' petition were two short histories outlining this service, the first of which—covering the period from the Revolutionary War to the Civil War—was unquestionably written by Adams himself. The second history was a little more extensive and covered the period from the American Revolution up to the Peking Boxer Rebellion of 1900; it contained the phrase 'the Delawares [provided] incalculable aid to the Commanders of *our* army', indicating that it was written by a non-Indian.⁶⁷ It ended, somewhat disappointingly for the researcher, 'Respectfully submitted'—but without a signature.

Quoting from reliable eyewitness authorities such as Heckewelder and Manypenny with whose work Abel was already very familiar, and buttressed with copious references from *American State Papers*, this second attachment was written in Abel's inimitable style:

Proof of the wisdom of Washington's action in this matter is evident to anyone who has had the privilege of reading the very interesting diary which colonel Morgan kept of his life among the Indians and especially the description that he gives of the character of the Delawares and their relations to the Government in these early days.⁶⁸

This is typically Abel's voice; the sentence is a little unwieldy and a little pompous—a professional historian addressing her peers—and that a manuscript copy of this second history is to be found in the Abel archives leads to the reasonable conclusion that she was indeed the author. A letter she received a few years later from her research assistant, Hamblin, provides further evidence of the probability that she was employed as an expert witness in Indian affairs. This letter concerned the legalities of certain land grants to Indians then living in Iowa and the telling sentence reads: 'There is no question in my mind that later you will be supeoned [*sic*] as an expert on historical matters and maps'.⁶⁹

Indeed, the year 1910 proved something of a watershed for Abel. By this time she was well established in the profession and in that year had further enhanced her reputation with the publication of a full-length article in the *AHR*, as well as a book review in the prestigious literary journal *The Dial*. It was time for her to take a holiday. Her first overseas trip since arriving in America twenty-five years previously, centred on a visit to Scotland to trace her own roots in the 'beautiful Earldom of Garioch' and her father's home town of Inverurie. Whether, as seems likely, she also visited the sites of her English childhood is not known.⁷⁰ Upon her return to the United States later that year, she not only resumed her duties at Goucher but also began to study 'a course in Gothic under Professor Hermann Collitz' (1855–1935) at the nearby Johns Hopkins University.⁷¹ This was consistent with her historical training because, before being adopted by Ranke, it was in the field of philology that the seminar method had been developed at German universities. The study of a Teutonic language would also have been consistent with the institutional lineage to which she subscribed. How well she did in these studies is not recorded, it is never mentioned in her surviving correspondence and Teutonic philology certainly failed to inform any of her published work.

She was able to study at Johns Hopkins—so becoming a fellow-by-courtesy of that institution—by the expedient of teaching the coeducational college courses for teachers at a time when Goucher catered solely for women and Johns Hopkins catered solely for men. In 1912 she alternated a course in American history, ‘covering the period of the Civil War and Reconstruction’ with medieval history, a topic that ‘confined itself to characteristic institutions and to great movements’.⁷² The following year the American history topic was dropped, and in 1914—by which time, over at Goucher, Abel had been promoted to full professor and head of history—she taught ‘a course of lectures in the history of the Renaissance and Reformation’.⁷³

Throughout this period and beyond, Abel kept up a friendly correspondence with her professor’s wife, Klara Hechtenberg Collitz (1863–1944). More than just an honorary ‘Frau Professor’, Klara Collitz was an accomplished scholar in her own right who had graduated with a First from Oxford, where she had later taught. The surviving letters, written between 1909 and 1918, were not very revealing of academic matters, however, and dealt mainly with incidental items of a personal nature—the visit of friends, invitations to tea or to a concert. In July 1914, while Abel was visiting her family in Aberdeen, Washington, and enjoying herself ‘by the seashore and in the shadow of the mountains’, she wrote to Collitz thanking her for the message of congratulation upon her promotion at Goucher:

The full professorship and headship of a department, although long wished for, came finally as a great surprise. I had no idea that such an announcement was to be made on Commencement Day.⁷⁴

As if, together with her teaching load at Goucher and Johns Hopkins, these new responsibilities were not enough, Abel also became somewhat reluctantly involved with the local Equal Suffrage League, for in October 1915 she again wrote to Klara Collitz:

I do hope you are going to lend me your moral support in the Baltimore College Equal Suffrage League this winter ... I have been put in as president and am not at all pleased with the added responsibility. My life is already too full of duties.⁷⁵

College women were prominent in the suffragist struggle and for many, their academic robes became the political parade uniform of choice.⁷⁶ What additional duties Abel’s presidency entailed is not recorded, but it is certain that at this time women were not encouraged to write about women’s history for that might have

challenged the norms of scientific objectivity. When a publishing company wrote to *AHR* editor, J Franklin Jameson, in 1916 seeking a recommendation for someone to write a history of the women's suffrage movement, he recommended a man. Jameson added that 'he knew of no one else who was interested in the topic, except Annie Heloise Abel ... and was not confident "of her ability to take an entirely broad view of the subject"' .⁷⁷

A natural corollary of the Rankean influence on the American history profession was a central concern for the preservation of historical documents. This issue was raised at the AHA meeting held in 1893 at the Columbia World's Fair in Chicago, (where Frederick Jackson Turner had first expounded his frontier thesis) when Ellen Hardin Walworth (1832–1915) also presented a paper. An enthusiast for historical preservation, Walworth had eight years previously co-founded the influential Daughters of the American Revolution, a highly patriotic society, many of whose members had an ear in Washington—namely their husband's. In Walworth's paper 'The Value of a National Archives to a Nation's Life and Progress' she expressed the standard Rankean opinion that 'archives hold the evidence of facts'.⁷⁸ For a polity that, perhaps more than any other, derived its national identity from its foundation documents, the storage of the United States official papers was woeful compared with the situation in Europe. From as early as 1800 onwards the nation's records had suffered the effects of fire, acts of war and bureaucratic ineptitude, but mostly from a lack of suitable storage space. Thus the call for the establishment of a national archive building, or a 'Hall of Records', became an early and central enthusiasm for the AHA and the particular *cri de cœur* of J Franklin Jameson, who was not only the longstanding editor of the *AHR* but also director of the Bureau of Historical Research at the Carnegie Institution and widely 'recognized as the "dean" of the historical profession'.⁷⁹

In 1906, a student of Frederick Jackson Turner, Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, who had himself taught history at Harvard, introduced the first Bill to address the archive storage issue into Congress, but despite support in principle, nothing came of it. Six years later, President Taft again had to bring the need for a 'Hall of Archives' to the attention of Congress because 'nothing had been done towards its

construction'.⁸⁰ In a leading article in the *AHR* of the same year, Waldo Gifford Leland decried the fact that:

No government on earth has expended larger sums of money for the purchase of historical papers ... or made more lavish appropriations for the publication of historical documents ... than that of the United States; and no government has more signally failed in the fundamental and far more imperative duty of preserving and rendering accessible to the student the first and foremost of all the sources of the nation's history.⁸¹

Leland went on to describe the terrible condition, not only of the archives themselves, but also of the storage facilities across every department of government. The election in 1912 of President Woodrow Wilson, who held a PhD in social science, might have brought some immediate hope for the national archives building scheme, but the issue was effectively delayed by the Great War and other matters until 1926.

Throughout her writing career, Abel herself seldom missed an opportunity to decry the state of archive preservation at the Indian Office and in April 1913 the *AHR* announced that:

Dr. Annie H. Abel ... has recently been appointed to superintend the classification of the Old Files in the Indian Office and to prepare historical material for publication. The first work is to be connected with the history of the Southwest, later, documents dealing with the second Seminole War, and with the history of the Northwest will be edited.⁸²

Although this announcement made no mention of it, Abel later rather grandly claimed that her appointment was made 'under Executive Order of President Wilson'.⁸³ Wilson was known for his sympathies towards Indians and, in a 1913 statement that bears comparison with the sentiments of Andrew Jackson expressed nearly eighty years before, declared:

The Great White Father now calls you his brothers, not his children, because you have shown in your education and in your settled ways of life staunch, manly, worthy qualities of sound character.⁸⁴

Given her familiarity with the OIA archives, Abel was undoubtedly the best person for the job and the appointment of a woman to the post was perhaps not unusual for the president who, only five years later, would introduce the nineteenth amendment to the Constitution, which gave American women the vote. Nonetheless, no evidence has yet been found to corroborate Abel's claim.⁸⁵

Abel was also involved with the Association of History Teachers of the Middle States and Maryland, whose first president was Lucy Salmon. In 1915, her last year at Goucher, Abel spoke at the association's Baltimore conference where, in the final session, she railed against the inherent sentimentality of the popular celebration of history which, she felt, was detrimental to its close study. This was reported in a ten column-inch, local newspaper article headlined: 'Would Teach Truth About Revolution: history teachers ask that sentimental ideas be wiped out'. The article went on to quote Abel's speech:

It is amazing to find the same old spectacular, romantic ideas about the Revolutionary War and its causes. But so long as we have school boards that insist upon the observance of Boston Massacre days, Peggy Stewart days and the like, just to give the children something to celebrate, just so long will the erroneous ideas persist.

American children should be made to understand that their forefathers did not have legal right on their side in the revolution against England. A good deal of the bad teaching is due to the fact that the teachers themselves are ignorant. Why, I have had students come to me who had never read the Declaration of Independence. And I was as much ashamed of their teachers as I was of them.

It is important that children should be taught the truth. Give them the facts and let it stand at that. I don't believe in letting up on George III; he deserved all the criticism he received. The American attitude did not have the support of legal theory, but it was progressive and it was right for the future development of the country.⁸⁶

There were six other speakers that day, including a professor from Princeton, but doubtless none had anything as interesting or as provocative to say since the article did not record their contributions to the meeting.

Although the professorship at Goucher was certainly a significant step up in her career, Abel's next posting was a professorship at one of the Seven Sisters, Smith College at Northampton, Massachusetts, in 1915.⁸⁷ Opened in 1875 following a bequest of nearly half a million dollars, when Abel joined the faculty, Smith had a student population of about two thousand. Here Abel taught several courses in American history from 'The age of discovery' to 'The development of the far western region of the United States', as well as courses in both English history and British colonial history.⁸⁸ Sometime in 1918, Smith College considered instituting an honours system in history and Abel was given the job of writing to colleges across the nation to seek their advice. Between November and the following February, she received replies from historians in over twenty American universities and colleges, offering their views on the topic. The replies were varied, some approved of the

honours system whereas others would not consider it, but what is striking is that the letters addressed Abel as a professional equal. Despite the normative gender inequalities of the day, the tone of these letters revealed no hint of a patronising attitude or of sexual prejudice from her male respondents.⁸⁹

In 1920, at the age of forty-seven, Abel had reached the pinnacle of her academic career. Having studied at three of the country's top universities: Cornell, Yale and Johns Hopkins, she now held the chair of history at one of the country's most prestigious women's colleges. Although no-one had yet taken up the baton, she had almost single-handedly pioneered the new historical field of United States Indian policy; she had published books and papers; she had edited rare manuscripts and was well advanced in the publication of her major work, the three-volume *Slaveholding Indians*, a history of the Civil War in the Indian Territory. She had been active in various parts of the history profession and fought for the place of women within that profession, but she had also gained the respect of her, predominantly male, academic peers. She had certainly come a long way from a Kansas prairie town.

In January 1921, during what appears to have been an altercation with a male member of staff at Smith College, Abel let slip that she had applied for 'the whole of next year as a sabbatical', and that she was willing to alternate some courses within the history department. She wrote to the college president, William Neilson, not just to apologise for this apparent indiscretion, but also to emphasise the indispensability of her work:

I hope you will believe that my intentions were of the best. I do not like even the appearance of double-dealing and it seemed only right since Mr. Kimball was discussing the work for next year that I should reveal the stage at which my plans had arrived. From a very personal view, moreover I gained; for without intending it, Mr Kimball admitted that my courses were valuable, too valuable to be dropped for an entire year.⁹⁰

With her sabbatical looming, Neilson wrote to Abel a couple of months later suggesting that, 'on the mere chance of having any interest in spending a year in London', she might be amenable to a staff exchange appointment with a certain Miss Adam from Bedford College.⁹¹ Although he resiled from pressuring Abel in any way to accept this appointment, Neilson suggested that such an arrangement would give her 'about half time for research and a salary which would about cover your living

expenses there'.⁹² Abel replied, again reminding Neilson of the worth of her own endeavours:

My plans for next year are already made and will not admit of the addition of so heavy a schedule ... I am to be in England for several months, but shall need practically all my time for research ...

In my opinion Miss Adams [*sic*] would be an excellent person for some of the History work at Smith and I am sorry if my inability to take her place with its full schedule and its low wage is to prove an insuperable obstacle to her coming.⁹³

For the duration of her upcoming sabbatical Abel's courses were bracketed, meaning that they were to be resumed upon her return. But her plans were to alter dramatically; she did not on this occasion make it to London and she never did return to Smith.

With such a busy teaching schedule, extra-curricula activity and additional study during these early post-doctoral years, it is remarkable that Abel found the time to research and write and yet, although her output was not prodigious, her works from this period were not lacking in historiographical significance. She published a few articles on the history of Indian–white relations, including an important essay on Indians in the Civil War that was to be a prelude to her major work. She edited and published an archive of correspondence from the frontier and established the provenance of a map once used by America's most famous explorers, Lewis and Clark, and also began to review the works of other historians.

Abel's first post-doctoral publication continued the theme of her doctoral thesis and was a monograph, entitled *Proposals for an Indian State 1778–1878*, first read as a paper at the Madison, New York, meeting of the AHA in December 1907. A précis was included in the report on that meeting in the *AHR* early the following year and the paper was published in full in the association's *Annual Report*.⁹⁴ Her story began, as it were, at the end. The elevation of Oklahoma from a territory to a state in 1906, marked the definite abandonment of the idea of an Indian state that had been advocated for more than a hundred years.⁹⁵ Oklahoma Territory had itself only come into existence as recently as 1891 and before that the area had been designated as Indian Territory. Originally applied to the country set aside by the Indian Intercourse Act of 1834, Indian Territory once encompassed all the land west of the Mississippi that lay north and east of the Red River and northward to the Dakotas; it was further delimited, however, in 1854 by the creation of the Kansas and Nebraska Territories.⁹⁶

Although diminished, the Indian Territory represented the last possible chance for the establishment of a permanent, independent refuge for the remnants of those Indian tribes forced westward by white expansion. Oklahoma's statehood removed that possibility forever.

Abel traced the origin of the idea of a separate Indian state to the 1778 Treaty of Fort Pitt. Negotiated by the young United States with the Delawares, this treaty intimated that friendly tribes 'might, with the approval of Congress, enter the Confederacy and form a State, of which the Delawares should be the head'. That this idea was never enacted was, according to Abel, 'very probably because the Indians had no adequate conception of its significance'.⁹⁷ Although the Treaty of Hopewell—made with the Cherokees seven years later—provided for tribal congressional representation, Abel contended that it 'would not necessarily have elevated them as a community to statehood'. This latter treaty did, however, imply the granting of United States citizenship for individuals and was reminiscent, she suggested, of the proposed state of Franklin.⁹⁸ In 1787, in response to Georgian territorial expansion, the Creek chief Alexander McGillivray proposed a land exchange. 'Presumably,' wrote Abel, 'McGillivray had in mind an Indian State', though it is hard to see upon what grounds she made this assumption. He was of mixed Scots and Creek heritage and therefore, in Abel's eyes, perhaps more amenable to the constructs of civilisation. In any case, nothing came of his proposal.⁹⁹

Abel located these various schemes of proto-statehood within the meta-narrative of North American conquest when the nascent United States and various European colonial powers were vying for control of the continent's resources and each were seeking allies among the various Indian nations. A guarantee of Indian sovereignty was central to such alliances, and this was particularly true:

during the Revolutionary and Confederacy eras and during the critical period that followed, when Spain, France and Great Britain, taking advantage of the weakness of the United States were independently intriguing for control of the Mississippi Valley.¹⁰⁰

Jefferson's successful negotiation of the 1804 Louisiana Purchase brought that critical period to a close and made vast tracts of land available to the United States beyond the Mississippi–Missouri river system. As Abel had explicated in great detail in her doctoral thesis, it was to this area, by a process of land exchange, that Indians

could now be permanently removed from the expanding white settlement.

Nevertheless, she here conceded that:

It is very doubtful whether, in thus providing a home for the Indians, Jefferson had in mind an Indian Territory of such a character as would develop into an Indian State. He spoke of a temporary asylum only; yet he had the opportunity to plan a great State since the objections that stood in the way of any such edifice within the chartered limits of the old Thirteen did not hold in the West.¹⁰¹

Jefferson's own removal plans came to nought, but by 1824 troubles in Georgia once again brought the 'Indian problem' to the fore and the removal idea was revived as part of the political agenda. Although it was never explicitly outlined, from a reconstruction of the documentary evidence, Abel concluded that what was newly proposed was 'the formation of tribal districts with a civil administration in each and the *union* of the *whole* in prospect'.¹⁰² Statehood, however, was never specifically mentioned, although she did footnote the remarks of Vice President John C Calhoun, who spoke in Congress of uniting 'the several tribes under a simple but enlightened system of government, and laws formed on the principles of our own ...'¹⁰³ As in her doctoral thesis, Abel credited the Reverend Jedidiah Morse as the likely source of this idea and again cited from his 1821 report which was more explicit than Calhoun's suggestion:

Let this territory be reserved *exclusively* for Indians ... in due time to be admitted to all the privileges common to other territories and States in the Union ...¹⁰⁴

Abel also cited various other proposals raised in Congress which were also explicit in stating that the Indian country 'was to be "of the same kind and regulated by the same rules" as other "Territories of the U.S"'.¹⁰⁵ Needless to say, such proposals never got near to being passed. In 1825, James Barbour, secretary of war under President John Quincy Adams, proposed individual rather than tribal Indian removal, combined with 'the establishment of a great territorial government west of the Mississippi'.¹⁰⁶ As with such previous proposals, the House of Representatives again failed to act.

When the organisation of an Indian territory came under further consideration in 1827, 'one resolution that unmistakably pointed toward an Indian State came from ... Mitchell of Tennessee'. As Abel pointed out, usually such proposals were opposed by Southern senators, who were normally 'too anxious for prompt removal to care to dillydally with the details of a government system'.¹⁰⁷ However, the whole

matter was further complicated that year by the 4 July declaration of an independent Cherokee republic. By this means the tribe hoped to thwart white encroachment on their land but in actuality, it hastened their removal.¹⁰⁸

With the Jackson presidency, Indian removal became law in the infamous 1830 Bill of that name, and Abel left us in no doubt about her feelings on the matter. Far from any colonising project that would lead to Indian statehood, she declared the Bill to be ‘legislation ill advised, ill considered, and incomplete’. In effect, the policy simply took the Indians away from the expanding white hegemony and dumped them beyond the great river system. As Abel noted, in their original south-eastern homeland, the Cherokees ‘had already adopted Anglo-Saxon institutions and all the tribes might [have been] induced to do the same’.¹⁰⁹ She insisted that removal was, for the Cherokees, not only a human tragedy but:

as far as entrance to the American Union was concerned, this leading tribe of Indians was no farther advanced in 1835 than it had been in 1785 ... Fifty years showed absolutely no progress in the matter of political concessions.¹¹⁰

Even the Reverend JF Schermerhorn—chief negotiator of the fraudulent treaty of New Echota by which the Cherokees were removed and for whom Abel held no brief—claimed in 1841 that ‘he would never have worked so hard for removal had he not honestly believed that territorial organization would come with its completion’.¹¹¹

Over the next few years, the chaotic situation west of the Mississippi created by tribal removal led to the introduction of a series of congressional Bills, all of which failed. As Abel suggested:

The title of these several bills—the preservation of the Indians and the protection of the western frontier—offers a possible clue to the underlying motive of the government. The motley crowd of Indians, predisposed, by reason of their being advanced each to a different stage of civilization, to quarrel among themselves, were a menace to the peace of adjoining States. Many of them, being enraged at the grievous wrong that had been done to them, were suspected of plotting revenge. Remember, these were the years when the Texas question was beginning to be agitated. Should war with Mexico come on this or any other pretext, the Indian might find his opportunity. Closer military supervision, therefore, under pretence of giving training in republican self-government, was deemed the wisest course. Strange to say, certain army men, consulted as to ways of fortifying the frontier, declaimed against the organization of the Indian Territory on the ground that the tribes would realize the force of the old saying, ‘In union there is strength’.¹¹²

The Reverend Isaac McCoy (1784–1846), missionary to the Indians and an advocate of Indian statehood, submitted these congressional proposals to the tribes and even

‘so far anticipated matters as to lay off a federal district ... which was to be the seat of the future Indian government’.¹¹³ Until the Civil War, the Cherokee, Chickasaw, Choctaw, Creek and Seminole tribes managed to achieve a level of self-government within the confines of their western exile in the Indian Territory. But, following the war, in 1866 the United States government sought to impose a territorial organisation on them because individual members or factions had allied with the Confederacy. Although they agreed to meet in a general council, these tribes later resisted this imposition, and Abel cited from their 1874 memorial to President Grant:

We do hereby most solemnly and emphatically declare that the articles of the treaties of 1866, do not authorize the formation by Congress of a Territorial government of the United States over the Indians of the Indian Territory. On the contrary the agreements on our part in assenting to the establishment of said council was entered into for the very purpose of obviating the alleged necessity of such a Territorial government ... We held that that country was exclusively an Indian country, as contradistinguished from a Territory of the United States, and we treated upon that basis.¹¹⁴

Three years previously, and with the continental railroads effectively destroying any distance between the whites and the Indians, Grant had proposed that in the country between Kansas and Texas a territory be established as a ‘means of collecting most of the Indians now between the Missouri and the Pacific and South of the British possessions into one Territory or State’.¹¹⁵ Yet, as Abel stated, this was never really envisaged by Grant or anyone else as an exclusively Indian state and the United States destiny became further manifest when, in 1891, Indian Territory became Oklahoma Territory. As Abel concluded, ‘the spasmodic efforts of a hundred years had failed’.¹¹⁶

Although this was a distillation of much of the material already covered in her PhD thesis, Abel’s monograph was very focussed and consistent with its title. Francis Paul Prucha, the highly respected authority on American Indian policy, later described this study as ‘a model of intensive research in Indian Office and Congressional records [and] has remained the standard work on the subject’.¹¹⁷ In essence, Abel’s monograph was a piece of intellectual history—the history of an idea, formed but vaguely in the minds of certain white men, that never came to fruition. Here Indians made even less appearance on the page than in her doctoral thesis, except as objects of various United States policy considerations, and her summary dismissal of the Delawares contradicts Richard Adams’ claim concerning his tribe’s early aspirations for statehood. The removal policy itself mitigated against

the formation of an autonomous Indian political entity and although the former south-eastern tribes were well developed on the path to self-government, their involvement with the Confederacy put paid to any such ideas. But even had the Civil War not occurred, given the white man's proven rapacity for land, it is doubtful that Oklahoma would have ever become an Indian state.

Abel's next historical publication was in fact a tourist brochure. *A Brief Guide to the Points of Historical Interest in Baltimore City* (1908) had been commissioned by the Association of History Teachers of Maryland, but proved to be little more than a curio in her career as an historian.¹¹⁸ By this time Abel was an associate professor at Baltimore Woman's College and this small work was a joint venture with her friend Eleanor Louise Lord who had supported Abel in her application for that position. The guide was indeed brief—only twelve pages and a map—and a rather wooden account of what the authors considered were the points of historical interest in the town, and it was to be their only collaborative effort. Although there was no explicit indication, it appears to have been an introductory brochure for out-of-town students and faculty of Johns Hopkins University and the Woman's College.

In their introductory remarks, Abel and Lord made reference to Baltimore's distinction as a monumental city, a reputation that it owed chiefly to the statue of George Washington—depicted in 'Father of his Country' mode—located at the centre of Mt Vernon Place in the very heart of the city. They also noted that the city boasted 'the first monument dedicated to the memory of Columbus in the New World' and that a monument to Francis Scott Key, author of 'Star Spangled Banner', was being planned.¹¹⁹ The guide itself comprised a list of some fifty-eight points of historical interest which included nine inns or hotels evenly balanced against an equal number of religious establishments. The most curious and obscure entry was that for Moale House, whose sole claim to fame as a city landmark was that it had once been the residence of the daughter of Ellin North who, it was claimed, was the 'first white girl born in Baltimore' and whose descendants were still in occupation.¹²⁰

Almost all the places listed in the booklet were of parochial interest only, though it did include Barnum's Hotel, which had rated a commendation in Charles Dickens' *American Notes* (1842) as 'the most comfortable of all the hotels of which I had experience in the United States'.¹²¹ Also of slightly more universal interest was the

gravesite (at the city's Washington University Hospital) of Edgar Allan Poe who had died in Baltimore in October 1849. In that regard, an illustration of the old courthouse (on page five) bears an eerie resemblance to that famous Gothic pile of Poe's imagination—Baltimore's very own *House of Ussher*. And the old courthouse did indeed fall since, as the guide noted, it became the site of a monument commemorating the Battle of North Point, fought during the War of 1812.

Having successfully brought to publication three of her own works, Abel now sought to critique the historical works of others. In an early and unpublished attempt at such critique, she had reviewed *England and America 1763–1783: the history of a reaction* by Mary AM Marks. Abel's neatly handwritten, nine-page review listed a great many defects in the book, particularly in the minutiae of the references (some of which Abel claimed were simply wrong), the omission of any reference to more recent scholarship (particularly Eleanor Lord's work on British industrialism in the New World) and other bibliographical shortcomings. Nevertheless, after eight full pages of tedious nit-picking, Abel then made the remarkable and somewhat contradictory claim that the book 'was one of the most important historical works of the season' and that the author's 'excellent grasp of her subject ... will ultimately more than balance many minor defects'.¹²² Despite this belated praise, one gets very little sense from Abel's critique of what Marks' book was actually *about*. Having submitted this review to the Chicago literary journal *The Dial* in late 1907, Abel received a rejection letter from the editor Francis Fisher Browne (1843–1913) who castigated her, saying:

It seems to me that the notice is too much a catalogue of defects—a list of defects and errors, of great value to the author or publishers for correction in a future edition, but not especially interesting—in fact rather bewildering—to the average cultivated reader (who is not at all a scholarly expert) ...¹²³

Despite this early set-back, Abel's first published book review—a critique of *The Cherokee Indians* by Thomas Valentine Parker—appeared a year later in the *AHR* of October 1908.¹²⁴ As a history of an Indian tribe by an academic, the reviewed work was unusual for its time and it was perhaps natural for the *AHR* editors to turn to Abel, as one of the very few scholars in the field, for a critique. Importantly, it provided the first piece of published evidence for Abel's own continuing interest in Indian policy and began:

Although in the history of a nation *no subject is of more abiding interest than the treatment of a subject race*, very little is authoritatively known of the political relations that have existed between the United States government and the various tribes of Indians.¹²⁵

Here Abel not only revealed the underlying intellectual reason for her own historical pursuits, she was also either being politely deferential or somewhat disingenuous, since she herself had published two books on the very topic of which very little was authoritatively known. She considered the work to be ‘on the whole ... worthy of very favorable comment’, but went on to criticise Parker for ignoring the close ties of the Cherokees with those other Indian nations (Chickasaw, Choctaw, Creek and Seminole, although she did not here name them) who were collectively known as the Five Civilised Tribes. Furthermore, she criticised Parker’s reliance on printed official sources, implying that he had been somewhat derelict in his research by not—unlike herself—spending years scouring the archives for unpublished sources. Abel’s review ended, however, with the declaration that Parker’s book was itself ‘a fair illustration of what ought to be done for every Indian tribe within the limits of the United States’.¹²⁶

In 1910, four years after first being prompted to do so by her colleagues, Abel published her first essay in the *AHR*, ‘The Indians in the Civil War’.¹²⁷ Here she expanded on the theme—first introduced in her work on the Kansas reservations—of connecting Indian removal with the great internecine conflict and began:

No state in the Union was more prompt and vigorous in taking issue on the question of secession than were the larger and more civilized of those Indian tribes that had been removed ... west of the Mississippi.¹²⁸

Although she did here make mention of the smaller tribes of translocated Indians, Abel’s essay mainly considered the Civil War experience of the ‘five great slave-holding tribes’ located in southern Kansas and Indian Territory.¹²⁹ These were the Cherokee, Chickasaw, Choctaw, Creek, and Seminole—originally from the south-east—who, because of the degree of their acculturation to the ways of the white people including the adoption of chattel-slavery, had been designated as the Five Civilised Tribes.¹³⁰

Abel noted that as early as February 1861 the Choctaw tribe had committed itself unequivocally to the pro-slavery cause; meanwhile, the other tribes had decided

‘simply to do nothing, to keep quiet and to comply with our Treaties’.¹³¹ This was a reflection of the views of the influential John Ross, principal chief of the Cherokees, who believed that a war between the states was not the business of the Indians and that, despite pressure from Southern politicians, friendly neutrality was by far the best course for weathering the coming conflict. Such a position was, however, a difficult one to maintain. Because of the exigencies of the war, Union troops stationed in the Indian Territory had been withdrawn to the east and, because many of the Indian agents were themselves Southerners, they now worked for secession among the tribes.¹³² As Abel noted:

The South seems from the first to have appreciated the importance of the Indian Territory as a possible storehouse for provisions, as a highway to and from Texas, and ... as a base for securing Colorado Territory and the new state of Kansas.¹³³

In May, the Confederate government appointed Brigadier General Benjamin McCulloch as military commander of the Indian Territory, part of whose brief was to raise two Indian regiments. He had intended to establish his headquarters in Cherokee country in the north of the Indian Territory but, with Ross’ stance of strict neutrality, McCulloch began instead to muster his forces at Fort Smith, just over the border in western Arkansas. At the same time, Douglas H Cooper—previously the federal but now the Confederate agent to the Choctaws and Chickasaws—was instructed to raise a mounted regiment from among those tribes. Similar forces were to be raised from among disaffected Cherokees, Creeks and Seminoles. Then, continued Abel:

A most interesting figure appeared upon the scene in the person of Albert Pike ... [who] in his own day, was known as a great friend of the Indians, his poetic sensibilities having been deeply stirred by a consciousness of the great injustice that had been done them ever since the first coming of the white man.¹³⁴

Having volunteered his services to the Confederacy, Pike was commissioned to negotiate treaties of friendship with the tribes of the Indian Territory. He failed to move the Cherokees from their position of neutrality but with the other tribes he had some success, though at the price of tribal factionalisation in which, Abel claimed, ‘usually the half-breeds constituted the disloyal faction and the full-blooded Indians the loyal’.¹³⁵ In May 1861, the Chickasaws ‘declared outright for the Confederacy’ and Abel quoted from that declaration’s remarkably prescient preamble:

whereas our geographical position, our social and domestic institutions, our feelings and sympathies, all attach us to our Southern friends, against whom is

about to be waged a war of subjugation or extermination, of conquest and confiscation—a war which, if we can judge from the political partisans of the Lincoln Government, will surpass the French Revolution in scenes of blood and that of San Domingo in atrocious horrors.¹³⁶

Cooper and McCulloch had little difficulty raising their Indian regiments and employed one such force to keep an eye on the as-yet neutral Cherokees. Meanwhile, in Kansas, Senator James Lane was calling on the Union to regain the Indian Territory and rally the loyal Indians.¹³⁷ By July, Pike had completed his round of treaty negotiations in each of which he had ‘solemnly stipulated that under no circumstances should Indian soldiers be taken beyond the limits of the Indian Territory’.¹³⁸ With the build-up of forces on both sides, in August the Cherokees abandoned their position of neutrality and came out on the side of the Confederacy. Abel repeated her claim that the Confederacy found its strongest support among the half-breeds, but expanded upon it with the gloss that they ‘were naturally the more intelligent body in an Indian community [and] also, to its shame be it said, the more unprincipled’.¹³⁹

With the outbreak of war, longstanding intratribal factionalism had intensified and found expression in the formation of secret warrior societies: ‘the half-breeds, or secessionists, joined the “Knights of the Golden Circle”’; the full bloods ... organised the society of the “Pins”’.¹⁴⁰ The latter took their name, according to Abel, from the habit of disguising their meetings as games of bowls.¹⁴¹ The pro-Unionist Pins were well represented among the Creeks and this faction was lead by Opothleyohola, the chief who had resisted the fraudulent Treaty of Indian Springs of 1825 that had ultimately led to the tribe losing their Alabama lands.¹⁴² During the bitterly cold winter of 1861, these Creeks were harassed by Cooper’s Choctaw and Chickasaw regiment, together with reinforcements of secessionist Creek and Seminole allies. After three attacks, Opothleyohola, along with some six thousand followers, was pushed north into Kansas. Abel continued:

Certain it is that the support of Indian refugees ... became ... a most burdensome tax upon the federal government [and] ... their very hardships and necessities afforded to agents and politicians a rare opportunity for speculation.¹⁴³

The Confederates launched an attack on Missouri and for three days in early April 1862, engaged Union forces at Pea Ridge where Indians fought on both sides in traditional fashion, using ‘war-paint, feathers, arrows and tomahawks’, the last doing ‘gruesome work among the dead and wounded’.¹⁴⁴ According to Abel, ‘it would seem

from the documents that General Pike with the main body of the Indians rendered only a very second-rate service' whereas the Cherokees under John Drew and Stand Watie were most efficient.¹⁴⁵ But McCulloch was killed and Pea Ridge was a defeat for the Confederates, who then withdrew from Missouri. Pike and his Indians took refuge in the Indian Territory and General Hindman, McCulloch's replacement, again sought to employ them against the Union forces that were advancing southward into Arkansas. This request was contrary to Pike's solemn treaty stipulation that the Indians would only be employed militarily within the Indian Territory and although he had broken his own word by taking Indians into Missouri in the first place, resistance to Hindman's order developed into a contretemps that would eventually lead to Pike's resignation.¹⁴⁶

By June, Lane was leading an expeditionary force southward, with the intention of opening the way for the refugees in Kansas 'to return to their homes and protect them there'.¹⁴⁷ On 3 July 1862, at Locust Grove—just north of Tahlequah, the Cherokee capital—the expedition engaged with a Confederate force consisting of both Watie's and Drew's men together with a battalion of Missourians. Not only were the Confederates again defeated, but Drew's entire regiment deserted, while at the same time the Cherokee Pins 'rose in rebellion, committed some horrid excesses, and compelled Ross again to declare neutrality'.¹⁴⁸ Soon after, Ross went over to the Union carrying the contents of Cherokee treasury and valuable papers.¹⁴⁹ In July, the disagreement between Hindman and Pike came to a head, with the latter resigning and openly declaring to the Five Tribes that by taking the Indian troops out of their own country and leaving it 'exposed to a merciless horde of jayhawkers', their cause had been betrayed by the Confederacy.¹⁵⁰ After arresting Pike, Cooper took over as leader of the rebel Indian forces.

Lane's expeditionary force, which included three Indian regiments, was likewise not immune from trouble in the ranks since among the advanced guard, 'the white troops were disgusted at the mere thought of being associated with Indians'. Nevertheless, several times throughout the summer and autumn of 1862, the Union forces successfully engaged with Cooper's Indians who were now reported as having deserted in large numbers.¹⁵¹ Throughout the following year the Confederates fared no better and were so consistently defeated in various engagements that by September 1863 a Union general could declare: 'All Arkansas and the Indian country

west of it are virtually in our possession'.¹⁵² By March of the following year, the Choctaws were prepared to take advantage of President Lincoln's recent amnesty proclamation. This, according to Abel, caused outrage from one Union colonel:

the federal government now had a good opportunity to reduce the great Indian domains to mere reserves and to open the surplus land to settlement. It was an opportunity, he argued, that the nation could not afford to lose.¹⁵³

Little did the colonel realise how just how prescient he was in his outburst. But the war in the West had run its course and in September 1865 a provisional peace treaty between the United States government and the Indian nations was concluded at Fort Smith. As Abel concluded:

The effect of the war upon the great tribes had been most disastrous ... The Indians lost ground financially, socially, and morally that it had taken them half a century to gain; and, for years and years, it was a sad picture of charred dwellings, broken fences, unstocked homesteads, and woe-begone people that presented itself to the white squatters who thronged into the Indian Territory during the Reconstruction Period ... Thus, whether or not the Indians were to blame for their participation in a quarrel which in a sense did not concern them, they paid very dearly for their interference.¹⁵⁴

Despite the tragedy of the removals, the Five Civilised Tribes had shown great resilience and in the West had successfully reorganised their social and political systems. Yet deep cultural fissures remained and these were exposed as gaping, bloody wounds by the Civil War, which—as in much of America—even divided families. The split between the Union and the Confederacy polarised the tribes of the Indian Territory between those who either sought, or believed to be inevitable, a greater acculturation with white society, and those who wished to maintain a more traditional distance. The former embraced the alliance sought by the Confederacy, whereas the traditionalists sought neutrality but were then forced to choose sides. As in her previous work, the portrait of Indians that Abel painted was vague, but here it was coloured by the racial theories to which she was heir. In Abel's account, the tribal split was conflated with a political and racial construct by which the traditionalists became loyal 'full bloods' and those who opposed them, rebel 'half-breeds'.

Needless to say this simplistic dichotomy does not hold and is perhaps best illustrated by the example of John Ross. He was only partly Cherokee, owned slaves, dressed like a Victorian gentleman and lived in house that would not have been out

of place on the set of *Gone with the Wind*. Yet he was the leader of the traditionalist, ‘full blood’ faction within the tribe and, although he desperately sought neutrality, once the Indian Territory became an area of strategic importance to the Confederacy and abandoned by the Union, Ross had little choice but to side with the South. When the winds of war changed, so did Ross and he escaped to the North (with the contents of the Cherokee treasury) and spent the rest of his days in Philadelphia with a huge entourage and living on the government purse. Yet it was the ‘half-breeds’ who Abel considered to be more perfidious. This essay was both a prelude to, and a précis of, Abel’s major work the *Slaveholding Indians* trilogy in which this notion of racial dichotomy would be developed more fully.

By ignoring the combatants from other tribes and more importantly, the effect the Civil War had on the entire Indian population across the United States, ‘The Indians in the Civil War’ hardly fulfils the promise of its title. Abel was certainly as aware of the service rendered by the Delawares to the Union side as she was of the Sioux uprising of 1862, which was a direct consequence of the Civil War. In this work Abel chose to concentrate solely on the major tribes of the Indian Territory and, to be fair, she did lay out the limits of her paper in its opening paragraph. As in her previous work, what was most lacking here was an Indian voice, silenced by its virtual non-appearance in the archives. She would, however, continue to employ the generalised designation of ‘the Indian’ in the titles of each volume of the trilogy that would emerge from this essay.

Despite its rejection of her earlier effort, in March 1910 *The Dial* did publish a book review by Abel. Under the title of *A New Narrative of the American Revolution*, she considered volumes five and six of Elroy McKendree Avery’s *A History of the United States and Its People*.¹⁵⁵ Covering the late colonial and revolutionary periods 1764–87, these volumes, wrote Abel, ‘furnish, on the whole, a really excellent account of the contest between Great Britain and her thirteen Atlantic seaboard colonies’.¹⁵⁶ Nevertheless, she found them ‘in certain respects ... a trifle disappointing’ since they failed to stress the ‘civil-war nature of the struggle’ and the effects of those events in British colonies outside of North America. She also felt that these volumes reflected the populist ‘new history’:

Moreover, they ignore the great subject of parliamentary development in England, place undue weight upon such controverted matters as the projected introduction of

episcopacy into New England, and quite frequently lose sight of salient facts and principles in an unworthy attempt to bring places, incidents, and persons, obscure and unimportant into strong relief. This last-mentioned feature is all the more deplorable because, unfortunately for our national dignity, there is already too much of that sort of thing in America—too much of a tendency to exaggerate, for purely family reasons, the little doings of little men.¹⁵⁷

Abel went on to decry the inclusion among the illustrations of ‘things intrinsically valueless and foolishly expensive ... coats-of-arms [and] pictures of buildings now easily accessible to view on the souvenir post-card’. She was particularly vituperative about the coats-of-arms:

We have thirteen of them in these two volumes. Now heraldic devices of all sorts belong to mediævalism. They have no place in American history. They are radically un-American, and the ideas underlying them are opposed to everything that is fundamental, and even sacred, in the origin of this government. Especially do they seem out of place in a history of the American revolution, in a book that, in grandiloquent phrase, tells the story of a supreme struggle for individualism. Family pride in heroic deed, in intellectual achievement, or in nobility of character is one thing; that in priority of emigration or of descent, in the face of uncertain and incomplete records, to say nothing of fraud and of distrait of knighthood, is quite another.¹⁵⁸

Despite all this criticism of the text, Abel praised its appended bibliographies as ‘full and well-selected’ and concluded that:

Altogether, [Mr. Avery] has given us a highly creditable piece of historical work; and we can frankly say that the points for adverse criticism ... are almost obscured by the very number and magnitude of those deserving commendation.¹⁵⁹

John Ross and the Cherokee Indians (1914) by Rachel Caroline Eaton was, as Abel noted in her *AHR* review that appeared the following year, ‘practically the first truly historical Indian biography that has been produced’.¹⁶⁰ As previously noted, Eaton was herself of Cherokee ancestry—her grandmother had been forcibly removed westward on the infamous Trail of Tears in 1832—and she was the first Indian to graduate from the University of Oklahoma with a PhD, of which this work formed her doctoral thesis. For what she otherwise considered a ‘very readable, reliable narrative’, Abel expended an entire paragraph of her short, three-paragraph review on the vagaries of the Indian Office filing system. This was because she found Eaton’s Indian Office references to be ‘always rather vague’ but, having been recently employed as historian at the OIA, Abel perhaps now considered herself an expert in these matters. Abel also thought that Eaton had been ill served by her publisher, since the work contained typographical errors and was ‘entirely destitute

of an index, which would have greatly enhanced its value as a library reference book'.¹⁶¹ Yet, beyond the closing remark that Eaton's work shed 'much needed light upon certain government policies', as with Abel's previous critique, one gets very little sense of what the reviewed work was actually about.

The result of Abel's tenure as historian to the OIA was the publication of *The Official Correspondence of James S. Calhoun, while Indian Agent at Santa Fe and Superintendent of Indian Affairs in New Mexico*.¹⁶² As Abel outlined in her introduction, the OIA had been transferred, at some time before 1910, from the old post office building in Washington to the pension building. Because of lack of storage space, much of the archival material was therefore deposited in the basement where it was 'exposed to furnace heat and dirt and to danger of destruction by fire'.¹⁶³ Under the Indian Appropriation Act of 1910, \$5,000 had been allocated for 'the classification and indexing of the files ... and preparing historical data from records therein'.¹⁶⁴ This was a huge task, and the money would only be available for one fiscal year, at the end of which the work would have to be held in abeyance. More money was forthcoming under the Appropriation Act of 1912, but by the following spring the OIA still had not complied with an important part of the Act, 'namely the publication of historical data'. Abel explained that although further monies would not be available until the fiscal year 1913–14, 'it was under such circumstance as these that the project for editing the Calhoun correspondence had its inception'.¹⁶⁵

As Abel further suggested, *any* set of papers from the OIA archives might have been chosen for publication, but the time for the completion of the project was relatively short and so was the Calhoun correspondence. She continued:

Moreover, it was hoped and confidently expected that papers, issuing from the great southwest right after the Mexican War [1846–48], could not fail to contain matters of historical interest and prove to the world the exceedingly great value of records in the Indian Office, the preservation of which would of itself justify, in large measure, the erection of a national Hall of Records.¹⁶⁶

Having explained the genesis of the work, Abel then proffered a brief biography of James S Calhoun (d. 1852) and made special note of his somewhat contested familial relationship to John C Calhoun (1782–1850), secretary of war under Monroe, vice president to both J Quincy Adams and Andrew Jackson and an architect of early Indian policy. On differing accounts, James might have been John's brother, his

half-brother or his first cousin but whatever the case, according to Abel, James Calhoun's fame 'rests upon his own life work ... he needs no reflected glory'.¹⁶⁷ She described him as a 'stanch Whig', who had served in the Mexican War as a captain and was a professed admirer of Zachary Taylor (1784–1850). When Taylor became president in 1849, James Calhoun was appointed United States Indian agent at Santa Fé though, as Abel pointed out, he had:

no especial fitness for the position except the moderate familiarity with the region where his duties were to lie; but he proved himself a thoroughly capable and honest official. Not a single scandal, not a single suspicion of peculation tarnished his record and, in his time, at least, that was a singularly rare experience in the United States Indian service.¹⁶⁸

Abel went on to complain that Calhoun 'had practically nothing to say about the remarkable Indian civilization of the southwest' and that his letters were 'strangely lacking in references to scenery, to archaeological remains, to interesting Indian customs or to evidences of previous Spanish occupation'.¹⁶⁹ This is a curious comment on Abel's part, since she herself never evinced any interest in such things where Indians were concerned. She also remarked upon the lack of references in the correspondence to the more general administrative plans for New Mexico, believing that Calhoun had 'most certainly' been sent on some secret government agenda, one that would be revealed, 'very probably in the *confidential* files of Interior, War or State department'.¹⁷⁰ Whatever Calhoun's real mission, by the spring of 1852 he became very ill and left New Mexico in June. He died early the following month in Missouri, en route to his Georgia home.

Yet what was most extraordinary about this potted biography was that Abel made no mention whatsoever of Calhoun's appointment on 3 March 1851 as the first civilian governor of the Territory of New Mexico. Indeed, the superintendency of Indian Affairs referred to in the title of the book was contingent on this gubernatorial appointment. A clue as to why she might have made such a blatant omission lay in a historical notice that appeared in the *AHR* in 1913, announcing the forthcoming publication of the *Correspondence* and that the work was to be:

In two parts, part I, comprising the correspondence as first Indian agent of the United States at Santa Fé, 1849–1851, and part II, his correspondence as first territorial governor of New Mexico and *ex-officio* superintendent of Indian affairs, 1851–1852.¹⁷¹

The second projected volume never saw the light of day, presumably because the financial and temporal restraints referred to by Abel in her introduction, were too great. In June 1915 the Government Printing Office published the one and only volume, which (despite the *AHR* announcement) contained the Calhoun letters covering the period from April 1849 to May 1852, together with supporting correspondence between various government officials pertaining to New Mexico and Calhoun's role there. It came as a handsomely bound edition with a rear pocket that contained three beautifully lithographed 1850s War Department maps of New Mexico, one of which had the proposed Santa Fé county lines sketched in by Calhoun. Also included in the pocket was a barely legible 1849 sketch-map, in Calhoun's own hand, suggesting sites for the various Indian agencies. Uncharacteristically for Abel, there were very few footnotes to the text, providing only either file references or brief biographical details.

After James Calhoun's departure from Santa Fé in 1852, John Greiner (1811–1871) temporarily took over as Indian superintendent and so to complement the Calhoun project, in 1916 Abel published *The Journal of John Greiner*—which appeared not in a deluxe, bound volume, but as an article in Santa Fé's own more modest history journal.¹⁷² All that Abel wrote was a short introduction, mainly about Calhoun and Greiner, which concluded with this summary:

Concerning the subject matter of the journal, there is not much to say. It speaks for itself, but makes no large revelations. The six months were uneventful months and Greiner had little to relate beyond the almost daily Indian visits. The red men came to him on very trivial pretexts most of the time; their real need was usually food and to get that they would travel a long distance. Greiner had some slight interest in ethnology, but he did not indulge himself in reflections upon it. Only once in a while did he make even cursory information gained a matter of record. And yet his journal is not without interest. To say the least, it fills a historical gap. And it does add to our knowledge of Indian conditions and relations under Mexican management. Something, too, can be read between the lines.¹⁷³

The journal itself covered the period from April through September 1852 and its publication was indeed a fulfilment of the Rankean imperative: the bare facts of history, as recorded in what amounted to an official report, simply telling it as it was. What Abel could read between the lines is difficult to assess, for her summary was completely accurate—the journal was indeed a mundane collection of daily details, interesting for a scholar of the area or the period but not particularly revealing in any

broad historical sense. Abel's own footnotes added little and solely comprised references to other authorities, the elucidation of Indian terms and other ethnographic details.

Abel's next published work appeared in 1916 in the recently established *Geographical Review*, although the article was in fact a wonderful piece of historical, rather than geographical, scholarship and concerned the rediscovery of a map.¹⁷⁴

On January 13th 1804, an American President of Welsh ancestry, Thomas Jefferson, despatched a letter to another Welsh-American, Meriwether Lewis, containing a map of the Upper Missouri valley. The map had been prepared by a third Welsh-American, John Evans.¹⁷⁵

Towards the end of the eighteenth century, John Evans (1770–1799) left his home in North Wales in search of a legend that had appeared in print during the sixteenth century.¹⁷⁶ This legend told of Madoc, a Welsh prince who, in 1170, had sailed across the Atlantic in a coracle, and thereby predated the Columbian discovery of America by some three hundred years. Furthermore, it was held that this Madoc had joined a tribe of Indians thus giving rise to the Madogwys, or Welsh Indians. Inspired by a Welsh nationalist revival, it was in search of this tribe that John Evans arrived in Baltimore in 1792. Two years later, as an agent for the Missouri Company, Evans travelled up the great river system and encountered the tribe known as the Mandans who he believed to be the descendants of the Welsh Indians. As part of his brief as a trader, Evans was instructed to draw a map of his journey and it was this map that Jefferson passed on to Meriwether Lewis and William Clark, the captains of the president's famous Corps of Discovery. After the successful return of the expedition in 1806, the map subsequently disappeared.¹⁷⁷

In her article *A New Lewis and Clark Map* Abel first noted that despite the president's insistence that complete records of the expedition be kept, 'Jefferson's purpose failed of logical fulfillment' since such records were never gathered together and published. 'On the contrary,' wrote Abel, they had become widely scattered, and some of them 'have never to this day been traced'.¹⁷⁸ She went on to mention the recent discovery of some of these records, such as the Whitehouse diary published by the eminent exploration historian Reuben G Thwaites in 1905 and the Ordway narrative published in 1914 by his successor at the Wisconsin Historical Society, Milo M Quaipe.¹⁷⁹ She found it surprising, nonetheless, that the files of the Indian

Office (with which she herself was so familiar) had not been considered as a source for such records, especially since ‘Clark was for so large a part of his life in direct connection with that office’ and that:

The particular way in which the Indian Office is already proved to be a repository of Lewis and Clark data is in its possession of a manuscript map that has recently come to light among its archives. This map, upon examination, reveals itself to be of such a character that it seems safe to contend that it must assuredly have constituted a very useful portion of the original Lewis and Clark equipment and is certainly not a thing heretofore noted by either collectors or editors.¹⁸⁰

She recorded that the map had been discovered by a certain HM Hamblin MD, a clerk in the mails and files division of the OIA, under the ‘Accounts’ file of the central superintendency.¹⁸¹ It was found in a bundle of a dozen various maps and rough sketches (listed by Abel in a footnote) ranging in date from 1798 to about 1840 and marked ‘Retained/ Central Superin^y/ Maps &c of Indian Country/?’.¹⁸² Abel noted that the significance of the word ‘retained’ lay in the fact that Clark had intimated ‘certain possessory rights in the data’, thereby implying that the map had not accidentally arrived at the OIA, but had been placed there for safekeeping.¹⁸³

In order to establish the map’s provenance, Abel first posited a set of questions as to its use on the Lewis and Clark expedition, which she then sought to answer. These questions addressed such issues as when and by whom it was made, and both its geographical and historical value.¹⁸⁴ The map certainly covered the first part of the Corps of Discovery’s journey up the Missouri River, from its starting point at St Charles as far as the Mandan villages, and also bore the endorsement ‘For Captⁿ William Clark or Captⁿ Meriwether Lewis’.¹⁸⁵ The map’s details were at variance with the expedition journals such that it could not have been derivative of them; as Abel wrote, ‘the differences are of such a nature that they attest the fact the map antedates all the written records’.¹⁸⁶ As to whether the map could have been made *during* the expedition, she suggested that:

The paper is too thin and the chirography too regular and too elegant, the lines of writing, as a rule, too uniformly parallel to warrant the supposition that the map was made ... under the rough conditions incident to travel.¹⁸⁷

Furthermore, the names on the map appeared first in French, followed by their English equivalents and yet, as Abel pointed out, Lewis and Clark ‘were Americans using the English language as their native tongue [who] could have had no reason for jotting down, first hand and systematically, the French name for even tiny creeks’.¹⁸⁸

As to whether the map was made by them *after* the voyage of discovery, Abel noted that ‘map and journals differ too much in terminology ... ever to have been the work of the same mind or minds’.¹⁸⁹

Having determined that the map was indeed made before the expedition set out, Abel then turned to its proper authorship and considered James Mackay (1761–1822) and John Evans each of whom, in their capacity as agents of the Missouri Company, were believed to have prepared a map (or maps) illustrative of that particular part of the Missouri River region that they had individually explored.¹⁹⁰ The Missouri Company, ‘having for its object the establishment of trade relations with the great tribes of the Upper Missouri’, was established in 1794 and had sent various expeditions upriver from the company headquarters at St Louis. In 1795, their trader Jean Baptiste Truteau reached villages of the people known as the Arikaras and later that same year Mackay reached the villages of the Omaha; the following year Evans reached further north to the Mandan villages, situated in what is now North Dakota. Although there are references to a Mackay map in the Lewis and Clark journals, the evidence for an Evans map is found not only in the journals but also from Jefferson’s January 1804 letter to Lewis, which Abel cited:

‘I now inclose you a map of the Missouri as far as the Mandans ... it is said to be very accurate having been done by a M^r Evans by order of the Spanish government ...’¹⁹¹

Furthermore, Abel cited another authority as claiming that a *third* map drawn by another explorer, Perrin du Lac, was ‘substantially the same as the Mackay map’ but because, as shown by Abel’s comparative table, the one discovered in the Indian Office differed considerably in nomenclature from the Perrin du Lac map, it could therefore *not* be the Mackay map.¹⁹²

Thus for Abel, the ‘most satisfactory conclusion’ was that the map discovered by Hamblin was indeed the Evans map alluded to by Jefferson. She does concede, however, that it could have been a composite of maps from both the Mackay and Evans expeditions that Jefferson had had ‘copied with particular reference to the needs of Lewis and Clark’.¹⁹³ Regardless of its precise provenance, however, she considered the map to be ‘the most detailed primary source for geographical knowledge of the Missouri River country that has yet been forthcoming’.¹⁹⁴ The following year Abel gave a talk on the map and its discovery to students at Mount Holyoke College, but this was not the end of Abel’s historical investigations into the

history of early explorations, for the names of Truteau, Mackay and a third explorer, Regis Loisel, would appear in her later work.¹⁹⁵

In October 1915 the history department at Smith launched its *Smith College Studies in History*, a journal aimed ‘primarily to afford a medium for the publication of studies in History and Government’.¹⁹⁶ The fourth issue, dated July 1916, comprised two quite disparate articles. In a reflection of Jameson’s remark on the writing of women’s history, the first paper—*Women’s Suffrage in New Jersey, 1790–1807*—was contributed by a man, Edward Raymond Turner; the second, *The Cherokee Negotiations of 1822 and 1833*, was written by the new history professor at the college, Annie Heloise Abel. In fact Abel’s article consisted of twenty-five short and, uncharacteristically, barely footnoted documents from the OIA Cherokee Agency Papers, to which she wrote only four short paragraphs of introduction.

Abel contended that the significance of the papers lay their being the first strong evidence of how far the State of Georgia was prepared to pressure the United States government ‘in order to force a compliance with [Georgia’s] interpretation of the *Compact of 1802*’.¹⁹⁷ As she had demonstrated at length in her dissertation, it was this pressure that finally brought about the expulsion of the Indians from the territory east of the Mississippi. These documents were a further demonstration of just how much the government’s selection of agents and commissioners came to subserve the interests of Georgia, and the determination of Cherokee leaders not to cede any more land to the white people. The last two documents show that William McIntosh, the minor Creek chief who was later executed for fraudulently selling his own people’s land, was also involved in corruption during these Cherokee negotiations.

What is notable about these last three works is that they set the pattern for the rest of Abel’s publishing career. Apart from her major work, the *Slaveholding Indians* trilogy, on which she was working at this time, all her subsequent publications would not be original works but editions of documents that she considered to be of historic significance. By sheer stint of scholarship, this daughter of an immigrant to the Midwest had breached the walls of the eastern academic brotherhood and—having been awarded a doctorate and having produced histories that were well-regarded by the norms of the profession’s own scientific methodology—she had done it on *their* terms. Against highly gendered odds, she

had determinedly struggled up the career ladder to become an associate professor at an eminent tertiary institution. Indeed, what located Abel very precisely within the academic milieu of the time was the:

fascination in the late nineteenth century with archives, inscriptions, manuscripts, and other primary evidence [which] inspired the first flush of maternalist and matriarchal investigation. This new interest in sources and methods, from women based in universities, fortified the male historical tradition.¹⁹⁸

Notes

- ¹ William B Hesseltine & Louis B Kaplan, 'Doctors of Philosophy in History: a statistical study' *AHR*, XLVII, 4, July 1942, pp. 765–800.
- ² William B Hesseltine & Louis B Kaplan, 'Negro Doctors of Philosophy in History', *Negro History Bulletin*, VI, December 1942, pp. 59–67; 'Women Doctors of Philosophy in History: a series of comparisons', *Journal of Higher Education*, XIV, 5, 1943, pp. 254–9.
- ³ Hesseltine & Kaplan, 'Women Doctors of Philosophy in History', op cit., p. 254.
- ⁴ It would take another forty-two years for another woman, Natalie Zemon Davis, to be elected to the presidency of the AHA.
- ⁵ Hesseltine & Kaplan, 'Women Doctors of Philosophy in History', op. cit., p. 259.
- ⁶ Jacqueline Goggin, 'Challenging Sexual Discrimination in the Historical Profession: women historians and the American Historical Association, 1890–1940', *AHR*, LXXXVII, 3, June 1992, p. 771. Emphasis added.
- ⁷ Because of the religious liberalism she expressed in this work, Adams was 'drawn into a protracted conflict ... with the religious conservative Jedidiah Morse'; Kathryn Kish Sklar, 'American Female Historians in Context 1770–1930', *Feminist Studies*, III, 1–2, 1975, p. 174. Morse was the author of the Indian settlement plan that Abel wrote of in *Indian Consolidation*; see chapter two. Mercy Otis Warren, *The History of the Rise, Progress, and Termination of the American Revolution*, Manning & Loring, Boston, 1805.
- ⁸ Julie Des Jardins, *Women and the Historical Enterprise in America Gender, race and the politics of memory, 1880–1945*, University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, 2003, pp. 1–2.
- ⁹ *ibid.*, pp. 2–3.
- ¹⁰ Kathryn Kish Sklar, op. cit., p. 176.
- ¹¹ For a list of such biographies by women historians, see Bonnie G Smith, 'The Contribution of Women to Modern Historiography in Great Britain, France and the United States, 1750–1940', *AHR*, LXXXIX, 3, June 1984, p. 714, fn. 16.
- ¹² Des Jardins, op. cit., p. 27.
- ¹³ *ibid.*, p. 2.
- ¹⁴ Patricia Albjerg Graham, 'Expansion and Exclusion: a history of women in American higher education', *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, III, 4, 1978, p. 764.
- ¹⁵ For example, Barnard was connected with Columbia, Radcliffe with Harvard, and Evelyn with Princeton.
- ¹⁶ Cited in Nancy Woloch, *Women and the American Experience*, Alfred A Knopf, New York, 1984, p. 278.
- ¹⁷ Rosenberg, Rosalind, *Beyond Separate Spheres, intellectual roots of modern feminism*, Yale University Press, New Haven & London, 1982, p. 30.
- ¹⁸ *ibid.*, p. 31.
- ¹⁹ *ibid.*, p. 44.
- ²⁰ G Stanley Hall, *Adolescence: its psychology and its relations to physiology, anthropology, sociology, sex, crime, religion, and education*, Appleton, New York, 1904; cited in *ibid.*, p. 42.
- ²¹ Margaret Rossiter, 'Doctorates for Women, 1868–1907', *History of Education Quarterly*, XXII, 2, Summer 1982, p. 159.
- ²² *ibid.*, p. 164.
- ²³ Cited in Harry Kelsey, 'A Dedication to the Memory of Annie Heloise Abel-Henderson 1873–1947', *Arizona and the West*, XV, 1, Spring 1973, p. 1.
- ²⁴ Annie Heloise Abel-Henderson to Dr EO Holland, President, Washington State College, April 1939; WSU MASC 1/1. Neither Kelsey nor Abel identified the newspaper.
- ²⁵ William H Chafe, *The Paradox of Change, American women in the 20th century*, Oxford University Press, New York, 1991, p. 99. Despite this enormous increase in female graduates, Chafe notes that at the end of the 1920s there were only 60 female certified public accountants and only 151 female dentists in the entire United States.

-
- ²⁶ Goggin, op. cit., p. 771.
- ²⁷ Bonnie G Smith, *The Gender of History: men, women, and historical practice*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1998, p. 100.
- ²⁸ *ibid.*, p. 103.
- ²⁹ *ibid.*, p. 114. Smith failed to mention that the word ‘seminary’ also applied to female institutions.
- ³⁰ Goggin, op. cit., p. 772.
- ³¹ Bert James Loewenberg, *American History in American Thought, Christopher Columbus to Henry Adams*, New York, Simon & Schuster, 1972, p. 479.
- ³² Ephraim D Adams to Annie Heloise Abel, 26 December 1913; Department of History Archives, Stanford University.
- ³³ Goggin, op. cit., p. 787.
- ³⁴ *ibid.*, p. 788. Goggin also notes that while the women historians from women’s colleges were demanding full equality, those from the coeducational colleges actually craved the exclusive, professional, female company that was denied them on their own campuses.
- ³⁵ *ibid.*, p. 786.
- ³⁶ ‘The Meeting of the American Historical Association in Chicago’, *AHR*, XX, 3, April 1915, p. 527; ‘The Meeting of the American Historical Association at Washington’, *AHR*, XXVI, 3, April 1921, p. 437; ‘The Meeting of the American Historical Association at Richmond’, *AHR*, XXX, 3, April 1925, p. 476.
- ³⁷ Abel to Dodd, March 20, 1925, William Dodd Papers, United States Library of Congress, container 22. ‘Report of the American Historical Association Meeting at Ann Arbor’, *AHR*, XXXI, 3, April 1926, pp. 415–42.
- ³⁸ Goggin, op. cit., pp. 780–1. Goggin also pointed out that women’s contributions to the *Journal of Negro History* for this period represented about nine per cent of the published articles. One such contributor was Annie Abel; see below, chapter five.
- ³⁹ This was certainly true of the first volume of Abel’s *Slaveholding Indians*; see below, chapter four.
- ⁴⁰ Goggin op. cit., p. 780.
- ⁴¹ ‘The Meeting of the American Historical Association at Madison’, *AHR*, XIII, 3, April 1908, pp. 435–6.
- ⁴² Eleanor Louisa Lord, *Industrial Experiments in the British Colonies of North America*, The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, 1898.
- ⁴³ Herbert Levi Osgood, review of *ibid.*, *AHR*, IV, 2, January 1899, p. 366.
- ⁴⁴ ‘The Meeting of the American Historical Association at New Orleans’, *AHR*, IX, 3, April 1904, p. 452.
- ⁴⁵ ‘Journal of Jean Baptiste Truteau on the upper Missouri’, *AHR*, XIX, 2, January 1914, p. 301. For Abel’s own paper on this topic, see below, chapter five.
- ⁴⁶ Smith, *The Gender of History*, op. cit., p. 115.
- ⁴⁷ ‘Notes and News’, *AHR*, V, 1, October 1899, p. 157.
- ⁴⁸ ‘The Meeting of the American Historical Association at Detroit and Ann Arbor’, *AHR*, VI, 3, April 1901, p. 428.
- ⁴⁹ After the Second World War the position of women in the profession declined. In 1930, sixteen per cent of academic women historians were full professors; by 1970 there were none. See Goggin, op. cit., p. 802.
- ⁵⁰ Lucy Elizabeth Textor, *Official Relations between the United States and the Sioux Indians*, Leland Stanford Junior University Publications, Palo Alto, 1896.
- ⁵¹ Lucy Elizabeth Textor, *A Colony of Émigrés in Canada, 1798–1816*, University of Toronto, Toronto, 1905.
- ⁵² ‘The Meeting of the American Historical Association at Rochester’, *AHR*, XXXIII, 3, April 1927, p. 449.
- ⁵³ According to the records of Chicago University, ‘Rachel Caroline Eaton was granted the degrees of Master of Arts on June 12, 1911 and Doctor of Philosophy on December 23, 1919. The title of her MA thesis was ‘John Ross’ and her doctoral dissertation was ‘John Ross and the Cherokee Indians’; personal correspondence from Thomas C Black, Registrar, University of Chicago, 2002.
- ⁵⁴ *ibid.*

-
- ⁵⁵ Goggin, op. cit., p. 775.
- ⁵⁶ Rose Coser (1973), cited in Graham, op. cit., p. 767.
- ⁵⁷ William H Chafe, *The American Woman*, OUP, New York, 1972, p. 100; cited in Graham, op. cit., p. 771.
- ⁵⁸ *Thirty-eighth Annual Catalogue of Wells College, 1905–06*, Wells College Archives.
- ⁵⁹ Abel to Bourne, 15 March 1906, Bourne Letters, Manuscripts & Archives, Yale University Library, 3/36.
- ⁶⁰ *ibid.*
- ⁶¹ *ibid.*
- ⁶² Abel to Bourne, 10 April 1906, Bourne Letters, op. cit. No independent confirmation of a higher appointment appears in the records of Wells College.
- ⁶³ *ibid.* In this regard it is interesting to note that in the 1890s Hazen was reported by a female colleague to have ‘disliked women of “trained intellect”’; Smith, *Gender of History*, op. cit., p. 195. Abel was eventually appointed by Hazen’s successor, William A Neilson.
- ⁶⁴ Kelsey, op. cit., p. 1. Kelsey gives no source for this information.
- ⁶⁵ Abel had made reference to an earlier of Adams’ petitions to the Senate in her doctoral dissertation.
- ⁶⁶ Richard C Adams, *The Delaware Indians, a brief history*, Hope Farm Press & Bookshop, Saugerties, New York, 1995 (1906).
- ⁶⁷ Annie Heloise Abel (presumed), ‘Re Delaware Indians’, typed MS, WSU MASC, 12/70, p. 5. Emphasis added.
- ⁶⁸ *ibid.*
- ⁶⁹ Hamblin to Abel, 17 August 1917, WSU MASC, 12/71. There is no evidence to show that Abel was subsequently subpoenaed.
- ⁷⁰ *The Amelia & George Abel Family History*, op. cit., p. 3. A letter published in the *Fernhurst Parish Magazine*, May 1986, shows that Annie’s sister Rose certainly visited the village in 1906.
- ⁷¹ Office of the Registrar, Record Group 13010, Series 1, Ferdinand Hamburger Jr Archives, Johns Hopkins University (JHU).
- ⁷² *Johns Hopkins University Circular 1912–1913*, p. 522, Ferdinand Hamburger Jr Archives, JHU.
- ⁷³ *Johns Hopkins University Circular 1914–1915*, p. 39, Ferdinand Hamburger Jr Archives, JHU.
- ⁷⁴ Abel to Mrs Collitz, 25 July 1914, Annie Abel file, Special Collections, Milton S Eisenhower Library, JHU.
- ⁷⁵ Abel to Klara Collitz, 13 October 1914, Annie Abel file, Special Collections, Milton S Eisenhower Library, JHU. Emphasis in the original. In this regard it is interesting to note that the Abel-Henderson archive at WSU contains an album of British newspaper cuttings (circa July 1913) concerning the Suffragettes, notably the various arrests of Sylvia Pankhurst; WSU MASC, 1/7.
- ⁷⁶ Michael McGerr, ‘Political Style and Women’s Power’, *Journal of American History*, LXXVII, 3, December 1990, p. 875.
- ⁷⁷ Cited in Goggin, op. cit., p. 782.
- ⁷⁸ AHA, *Annual Report*, 1983, p. 4.
- ⁷⁹ Morey Rothberg, ‘John Franklin Jameson and the International Historical Community’, *The History Teacher*, XXVI, 4, August 1993, p. 455.
- ⁸⁰ Victor Gondos Jr, *J. Franklin Jameson and the Birth of the National Archives 1906–1926*, University of Pennsylvania Press, Pittsburgh, 1981, p. 58.
- ⁸¹ Waldo Gifford Leland, ‘The National Archives: a programme’, *AHR*, XVIII, 1 October 1912, p. 1.
- ⁸² ‘Notes and News’, *AHR*, XVIII, 3, April 1913, p. 639.
- ⁸³ Abel to Holland, 31 January 1939, WSU MASC, 1/1.
- ⁸⁴ Arthur S Link (ed.), *Papers of Woodrow Wilson*, vol. 27, Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey, 1978, pp. 469–70.
- ⁸⁵ A search of the Wilson papers held at the Library of Congress and other collections has not yielded any official record of Abel’s appointment. Communication from LoC staff, April 2005.
- ⁸⁶ Unidentified newspaper clipping, probably from the *Baltimore Sun*. The date 1915 appears in the headline of a story on the obverse; in possession of James Anderson, Adelaide. The Boston Massacre (March 1770) was one of the events that led to the American Revolution and involved the

killing of five men by British soldiers. ‘Peggy Stewart Days’ continue to be popular celebrations of the burning of the tea-laden brig, the *Peggy Stewart*, in October 1774, by the citizens of Annapolis in support of the Boston revolutionaries.

⁸⁷ The designation ‘Seven Sisters’ was only adopted in 1927 and Goucher College is sometimes referred to as the ‘Eighth Sister’; see Goggin, op. cit., p. 793, fn. 61.

⁸⁸ Annie Heloise Abel biographical file, Smith College Archives.

⁸⁹ WSU MASC, 1/3. The letter sent seeking the advice is unfortunately not on file. Among Abel’s correspondents were Frederick Jackson Turner, Max Farrand, George Burton Adams, Nellie Neilson and Eleanor Lord.

⁹⁰ Abel to Neilson, 21 January 1921, Office of President, William A Neilson Files, Correspondence, Box 1, 32. Smith College Archives.

⁹¹ Neilson to Abel, 24 March 1921, *ibid.*

⁹² *ibid.*

⁹³ Abel to Neilson, 28 March 1921, *ibid.*

⁹⁴ Annie Heloise Abel, ‘Proposals for an Indian State’, *American Historical Association Annual Report* 1, 1907, 87–104; Washington, DC, Government Printing Office, 1909; ‘Report of the Madison Meeting of the American Historical Association’, *AHR*, VIII, no. 2, January 1908, pp. 452–3.

⁹⁵ *ibid.*, p. 89.

⁹⁶ Roy Gittinger, ‘The Separation of Nebraska and Kansas from the Indian Territory’, *MVHR*, III, 4, March 1917, p. 441.

⁹⁷ *ibid.*

⁹⁸ The State of Franklin was a short-lived attempt on the part of some early transmontane pioneers to establish their independence from North Carolina. It was reported in 1785 that the Cherokees were to be incorporated into the proposed state and invited to send delegates to the general assembly. The idea collapsed in 1788; see George Henry Alden, ‘The State of Franklin’, *AHR*, VIII, 2, January 1903, pp. 271–89.

⁹⁹ *ibid.*, p. 90. Like many leaders of the south-eastern tribes, McGillivray was of mixed ancestry.

¹⁰⁰ *ibid.*

¹⁰¹ *ibid.*, p. 91. Although Abel had mentioned the temporary nature of Jefferson’s scheme in *Indian Consolidation*, it is only here that she emphasised it.

¹⁰² *ibid.* Italics in the original.

¹⁰³ *Gale and Seaton’s Register*, 1 Appendix, pp. 57–9, cited in *ibid.*, fn. g.

¹⁰⁴ Morse’s report cited in *ibid.*, p. 92. Emphasis added. As Abel previously discussed in *Indian Consolidation*, Morse’s proposal for Indian removal, improvement and eventual integration at the state level into the United States, was far more detailed than she here implied.

¹⁰⁵ *House Journal*, 18th Congress, 2nd session, p. 56, cited in *ibid.*, p. 93.

¹⁰⁶ *ibid.*, p. 93.

¹⁰⁷ *ibid.*

¹⁰⁸ *ibid.*, p. 94.

¹⁰⁹ *ibid.*

¹¹⁰ *ibid.*, p. 98.

¹¹¹ *ibid.*, p. 99.

¹¹² *ibid.*, p. 97.

¹¹³ *ibid.*, p. 98.

¹¹⁴ Memorial to President Grant, 9 February 1874, cited in *ibid.*, p. 101. Abel also footnoted the fact that although no tribe in its entirety was ‘in league with the Confederacy’, nonetheless the United States imposed a collective punishment in ‘the question of confiscating tribal lands’, fn. f.

¹¹⁵ cited in *ibid.*, p. 102.

¹¹⁶ *ibid.*

¹¹⁷ Frances Paul Prucha, ‘Abel, Annie Heloise’, in *Notable American Women, 1607–1950*, Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1971, p. 5.

-
- ¹¹⁸ Annie Heloise Abel & Eleanor Louisa Lord, *Brief Guide to the Points of Historical Interest in Baltimore City*, Association of History Teachers of Maryland, Baltimore, 1908.
- ¹¹⁹ *ibid.*, pp. 1–2.
- ¹²⁰ *ibid.*, p. 3.
- ¹²¹ Charles Dickens, *American Notes*, cited in *ibid.*, p. 6.
- ¹²² Annie Heloise Abel, undated manuscript circa 1907, WSU MASC, 1/2.
- ¹²³ Francis Browne to Abel, 4 January 1908; WSU MASC, 1/2. A more balanced and favourable review of Marks' work by George Elliot Howard appeared in the *AHR*, Vol. XIII, 3, April 1908, pp. 618–20.
- ¹²⁴ Annie Heloise Abel, review of *The Cherokee Indians* by Thomas Valentine Parker, *AHR*, XIV, 1, October 1908, 184–5.
- ¹²⁵ *ibid.*, p. 184. Emphasis added.
- ¹²⁶ *ibid.*, p. 185.
- ¹²⁷ Annie Heloise Abel, 'The Indians in the Civil War', *AHR*, XV, 2, January 1910, pp. 281–96.
- ¹²⁸ *ibid.*, p. 281.
- ¹²⁹ *ibid.*
- ¹³⁰ The practice of chattel-slavery was in fact very marginal among these tribes and generally limited to a few rich individuals. See Theda Perdue, *Slavery and the Evolution of Cherokee Society, 1540–1866*, University of Tennessee Press, Knoxville, 1979.
- ¹³¹ Office of Indian Affairs (OIA), General Files, 'Cherokee, 1859–1865', cited in Abel, 'Indians in the Civil War', *op. cit.*, p. 282.
- ¹³² *ibid.*, p. 283.
- ¹³³ *ibid.*, pp. 283–4.
- ¹³⁴ *ibid.*, pp. 284–5.
- ¹³⁵ *ibid.*, p. 285.
- ¹³⁶ United States War Department, *The War of the Rebellion: a compilation of the official records of the Union and Confederate Armies* (hereinafter *OR*), series 1, III, Government Printing Office, Washington, DC, (1880–1901), pp. 585–7; cited in *ibid.*, p. 286. This is a reference to the bloody Haitian Slave Revolt of 1791.
- ¹³⁷ *ibid.*, p. 287.
- ¹³⁸ *ibid.*, p. 288.
- ¹³⁹ *ibid.*
- ¹⁴⁰ *ibid.*, p. 289.
- ¹⁴¹ This is conjecture on Abel's part, based on a misreading of the evidence; see below, chapter four.
- ¹⁴² In *Indian Consolidation* Abel had used the alternate spelling, 'Poethleyoholo'.
- ¹⁴³ Abel, 'Indians in the Civil War', *op. cit.*, p. 289.
- ¹⁴⁴ *ibid.*
- ¹⁴⁵ *ibid.*, p. 290. Stand Watie was the leader of the anti-Ross faction within the Cherokee Nation. Not only was he a successful guerilla fighter, he was the very last Confederate officer of rank to surrender, some two months after Appomattox.
- ¹⁴⁶ Pike had already broken his promise by leading his Indian troops to Pea Ridge, Arkansas, albeit reluctantly. Abel, curiously, overlooked this point.
- ¹⁴⁷ *ibid.*
- ¹⁴⁸ *ibid.*, p. 292. What constituted these 'horrid excesses', Abel does not elucidate.
- ¹⁴⁹ *ibid.*
- ¹⁵⁰ *ibid.* 'Jayhawker' was the Southern term for an antislavery activist and had arisen in the pre-War 'Bleeding Kansas' episode.
- ¹⁵¹ *ibid.*, p. 293.
- ¹⁵² *OR*, series I, XXII, i, p. 470, cited in *ibid.*, p. 294–5.
- ¹⁵³ *ibid.*, p. 295.
- ¹⁵⁴ *ibid.*, p. 296.

-
- ¹⁵⁵ Annie Heloise Abel, review of *A History of the United States and Its People, volumes V & VI*, by Elroy McKendree Avery, *The Dial*, March 1, 1910, pp. 146–7.
- ¹⁵⁶ *ibid.*, p. 146.
- ¹⁵⁷ *ibid.*
- ¹⁵⁸ *ibid.*
- ¹⁵⁹ *ibid.*, p. 147.
- ¹⁶⁰ Annie Heloise Abel, review of *John Ross and the Cherokee Indians*, by Rachel Caroline Eaton, *AHR*, XX, 3, April 1915, pp. 672–3.
- ¹⁶¹ *ibid.*, p. 673.
- ¹⁶² Annie Heloise Abel (ed.), *The Official Correspondence of James S Calhoun while Indian Agent at Santa Fe and Superintendent of Indian Affairs in New Mexico*, Office of Indian Affairs, Washington, DC, 1915.
- ¹⁶³ *ibid.*, p. ix.
- ¹⁶⁴ Indian Appropriation Act, 17 June 1910, cited in *ibid.*, p. x.
- ¹⁶⁵ *ibid.*, p. xi.
- ¹⁶⁶ *ibid.*
- ¹⁶⁷ *ibid.*
- ¹⁶⁸ *ibid.*, pp. xii–xiii.
- ¹⁶⁹ *ibid.*, p. xiii.
- ¹⁷⁰ *ibid.* Italics in the original.
- ¹⁷¹ ‘Notes and News’, *AHR*, XIX, 1, October 1913, p. 214.
- ¹⁷² Annie Heloise Abel, (ed.), ‘The Journal of John Greiner’, *Old Santa Fe: a magazine of history, archaeology, genealogy and biography* III, 11, July 1916, 189–243.
- ¹⁷³ *ibid.*, p. 190.
- ¹⁷⁴ Annie Heloise Abel, ‘A New Lewis and Clark Map’, *Geographical Review*, I, 5, May 1916, pp. 329–45 (including facsimile map, facing p. 344.).
- ¹⁷⁵ Edward Hartmann, *Americans from Wales*, The Christopher Publishing House, Boston, 1967, p. 13.
- ¹⁷⁶ George Peckham, *A True Reporte of the Late Discoveries and Possession Taken in the Right of the Crown of England, of the New-Found Lands, by that Valiant and Worthy Gentleman, Sir Humphrey Gilbert, Knight*, 1584; Humphrey Llwyd, *Historie of Cambria*, 1585.
- ¹⁷⁷ A full account of John Evans and the myth of the Welsh Indians is related in David Williams, ‘John Evans’ Strange Journey’, Part 1, *AHR*, LIV, 2, January, 1949, pp. 277–95; Part 2, *AHR*, LIV, 3, April, 1949, pp. 508–29.
- ¹⁷⁸ Abel, ‘A New Lewis and Clark Map’, *op. cit.*, p. 329.
- ¹⁷⁹ Abel footnoted the fact that Quaipe had hoped to publish the new found map in conjunction with the *Ordway Journal*, but since the map was ‘very valuable historically, it was deserving of a more extended, specific and individual treatment’; *ibid.*, p. 329, fn. 2.
- ¹⁸⁰ *ibid.*, p. 330.
- ¹⁸¹ Abel does not explain how a qualified medical practitioner came to be employed as a filing clerk at the OIA, but Hamblin continued to be her occasional research assistant at least until the early 1920s. She does, however, explain that “‘Accounts’ included ‘Estimates’, ‘Property Returns’, ‘Vouchers’ and the like”; *ibid.*, fn. 3.
- ¹⁸² *ibid.*, p. 331.
- ¹⁸³ *ibid.*, p. 331, fn. 6.
- ¹⁸⁴ *ibid.*, p. 331.
- ¹⁸⁵ *ibid.*, p. 332.
- ¹⁸⁶ *ibid.*, p. 334.
- ¹⁸⁷ *ibid.*, p. 335.
- ¹⁸⁸ *ibid.*, p. 338.
- ¹⁸⁹ *ibid.*, p. 339.
- ¹⁹⁰ *ibid.*

¹⁹¹ Cited in *ibid.*, p. 340

¹⁹² This map had been drawn by the French explorer Perrin du Lac and published in 1805; *ibid.*, p. 340, fn. 65.

¹⁹³ *ibid.*, p. 343. For a more recent discussion of the map's provenance see Thomas C Danisi & W Raymond Wood, 'Lewis and Clark's Route Map: James Mackay's map of the Missouri River', *The Western Historical Quarterly*, XXXV, 1, Spring 2004, pp 53–72.

¹⁹⁴ *ibid.*, p. 345.

¹⁹⁵ Loisel is only mentioned in passing in this article, on p. 338. For Abel's later works see below, chapter five.

¹⁹⁶ Cover note, *Smith College Studies in History*.

¹⁹⁷ Annie Heloise Abel (ed.), 'The Cherokee Negotiations of 1822 and 1833', *Smith College Studies in History*, I, 4, July 1916, p. 188. Italics in the original.

¹⁹⁸ Smith, 'The Contribution to Modern Historiography', *op. cit.*, p. 723.