

## Chapter six

### Locating Annie Abel

Towards the end of March 1947, in a letter to her bereaved sister, Holland eulogised Annie Abel-Henderson:

Few persons, either men or women, have made a more notable contribution to historical research here in America than did Doctor Henderson during her long and productive life.<sup>1</sup>

In reply, Rose Abel Wright thanked him for his kind appreciation of her sister. ‘She was in the truest sense of the word a research student’, she wrote.<sup>2</sup> Two months later the college library at Pullman took delivery of forty cartons of books, notes and manuscripts from Abel-Henderson’s personal collection.<sup>3</sup> Among these were some three hundred and forty titles covering topics such as Australasian, British, and Scottish history, Russia, Polynesia, North American Indians, the Peninsula War and the Spanish Inquisition, colonialism and slavery—a range which reflects the eclectic nature of her enquiring mind. In recognition of her bequest, a printed card was inserted in the fly-leaf of each of these works and her elder brother Will, who had at one time acted as an attorney for the college, donated a further one hundred and twenty-two books in memory of his late sister.<sup>4</sup>

In July, research notes that Abel-Henderson had taken at the London Missionary Society, the Dominion Archives at Ottawa and from the George C Sibley papers in St Louis, were listed by the *AHR* as being among documents that had been recently donated to the United States Library of Congress.<sup>5</sup> Later that year short obituaries appeared in both the *AHR* and the *Journal of Southern History* but these were little more than brief biographical and bibliographical notices.<sup>6</sup> The January 1948 issue of *The Record*, journal of the Friends of the Library at Pullman, published a short memorial describing Abel-Henderson as

‘undoubtedly one of the ablest women historians of her day’.<sup>7</sup> It went on to describe her as having:

all of the patience, astuteness, and penetrating powers of deduction expected only of a Sherlock Holmes or G-man. On one occasion a class in Pacific Northwest history had the good fortune to hear her tell her experiences on the trail of [a] significant document. Several students were so interested that they requested the opportunity to meet her later and get more of her stories about these treasure hunts. Inclined to be somewhat formal in her public appearances, she was definitely at her best in a small circle of kindred spirits.<sup>8</sup>

Yet for many years she was all but forgotten. In the early 1970s Francis Paul Prucha, the pre-eminent historian of Indian policy, wrote her entry in the biographical dictionary *Notable American Women* and summarised her work on Indian policy as ‘authoritative studies [which] placed her in the top rank of American historians of her generation’.<sup>9</sup> In 1973 Harry Kelsey of the Los Angeles County Museum of Natural History wrote a memorial for the journal *Arizona and the West* as part of an ongoing series celebrating the lives of past historians. Since this short piece was unsourced, it is now difficult to assess the accuracy of some of the biographical details and Kelsey did make the rather over-generous claim that ‘she gained a better grasp of federal Indian policy than any other historian has since been able to acquire’. He was more correct, however, in stating that *Slaveholding Indians* makes for a difficult read and that her most important legacy was ‘the publication of great masses of original documents’.<sup>10</sup>

Abel was of course listed in Prucha’s 1977 bibliography of works on United States Indian policy where, apart from Helen Hunt Jackson, she was identified as by far the earliest author on this topic. The only critical comment that Prucha had to make in his introductory essay was that her dissertation ‘although old, is still a very useful compendium of data’.<sup>11</sup> The reissued volumes of *Slaveholding Indians*—and the inclusion of Green and Perdue’s introductions—drew some critical interest in Abel’s work, although a 1995 review of a century of Indian historiography published in the *AHR* surprisingly made no mention of Abel whatsoever. Indeed, by omitting any reference to her 1910 article ‘The Indians in the Civil War’, the compiler could claim that in the decade following 1908, no essay on Indians appeared in the *AHR*.<sup>12</sup>

Abel was included in two broad-ranging and generally well-researched works that helped to redress an imbalance in the historiographical record by reassessing the often-unheralded contribution of women historians. In her historiographical study *History's Memory* (2002) Ellen Fitzpatrick first mentioned the early-twentieth-century anthropological interest in Indians, then noted that Abel's was 'the first important and sustained scholarly work' in the field of Indian history. In a short critique of 'The Indians in the Civil War' article, Fitzpatrick pointed out that although it 'evinced signs of prejudice and paternalism, its tone was strikingly different from that adopted by most professional historians at the time'. Indeed, most historians of the time either ignored Indians altogether or simply made them another element of a wild and savage landscape. Fitzpatrick, therefore, considered Abel's attempt to understand events from the Indians' perspective to be 'remarkable'. She did, however, inflate Abel's published output on Indian history to 'almost a dozen books', whereas the total actually comprised only five original works, including a trilogy, plus four annotated editions of historical documents, which only touched on Indian history.<sup>13</sup>

In *Women and the Historical Enterprise in America* (2003), Julie Des Jardins likewise overstated Abel's historiographical contribution somewhat. In arguing for the 'role of intercultural broker' played by women historians, Des Jardins claimed that Abel 'wrote pieces on Native Americans in the West with regularity for the *MVHR*'.<sup>14</sup> In fact, Abel contributed only two articles to that journal, neither of which dealt with Indians—although between 1933 and 1938 it did publish five of Abel's book reviews on Indian topics. To buttress her argument concerning the paucity of research facilities afforded to academic women, Des Jardins argued Abel would not have completed *Slaveholding Indians* were it not for the access to the research material made available by her employment as historian at the Office of Indian Affairs (OIA) in 1912.<sup>15</sup> Yet Abel had gained much earlier access to that material and had already published 'The Indians in the Civil War' two years before her employment there. Des Jardins also claimed that Abel supplemented her salaries at Goucher and Smith with AAUW and SSRC scholarships but, as has been shown, Abel won these scholarships *after* her academic career had come to an end.<sup>16</sup>

To be fair to both of these writers, Abel appears but briefly in their works, and more importantly, Fitzpatrick and Des Jardins would each locate Abel within a broadening of American history that typified the scholarship of the progressive era and, as a pioneer in the field of Indian history, Abel certainly contributed to that process. Yet her histories were overtly political and not at all 'progressive' in the sense that they sought to contribute towards any amelioration of Indians' lives. Indeed, Abel's early works focussed very much on the question of policy and the white men who developed it, not the people whose lives it directly affected and largely destroyed.

In the summer of 1885, as the twelve year-old Annie Abel and her two sisters were reunited with their family in Kansas, General George Crook deployed some three thousand troops along the Mexican border in the final campaign against less than a hundred and fifty Apaches under Geronimo. The following year Geronimo surrendered, but at about the same time a revivalist religion known as the Ghost Dance was gaining popularity among remnant Indian populations in the American West. Although this movement presented no real threat of a renewed Indian uprising, heightened tensions led to the infamous massacre at Wounded Knee Creek in South Dakota on 29 December 1890, when the Sioux chief Big Foot and three hundred of his followers were mown down by rifle and Hotchkiss cannon fire. Just over two weeks later the Sioux formally surrendered at the Pine Ridge reservation, thus ending four centuries of warfare against the Indians.<sup>17</sup>

Although none of these events are mentioned or even hinted at in any of Abel's work, as a teenager growing up in a literate household she would, no doubt, have been aware of them. Yet it is improbable that at this time she ever met an Indian because more than a decade before her arrival in Kansas, the total Indian population of that state was recorded at less than a thousand.<sup>18</sup> Much later, she would make claims about an abiding interest in the history of 'subject races' and the childhood stimulus provided by her brothers' adventure-book stories, but it was probably at Frank Hodder's suggestion that Abel first developed a real interest in Indian history. His influence can be discerned in her work on the Kansas reservations, where she addressed an issue

that not only held local interest, but also had national significance. At this early stage of her career, she could locate the 'Indian problem' not just within the national context of territorial expansion and the injustices that involved, but also as a contributing factor to the Civil War. These were precocious historical insights for a young scholar at a time when on the Turnerian frontier the greatest significance of Indians lay in presenting the 'common danger' that provided a focus for 'developing the stalwart and rugged qualities of the frontiersman'.<sup>19</sup>

Just three years after Wounded Knee, at the Chicago World Columbian Exposition where Frederick Jackson Turner had first expounded his frontier thesis, William 'Buffalo Bill' Cody had already begun to turn frontier history into the popular 'cowboys and Indians' spectacle that was to later develop into an entire Hollywood genre. By the turn of the century, the total Indian population of the United States had fallen to less than a quarter of a million, which seemed to confirm the widely held view that Indians would soon disappear just as the buffalo had. If there was any academic interest in Indians, it was as subjects of the newly emergent academic disciplines of ethnography and anthropology where there was an urgency to capture as much information as possible about them before their presumed demise.<sup>20</sup>

Thus Abel displayed some courage in continuing to pursue Indian history—a topic that held little academic interest at this time. One reason for her persistence is to be found, perhaps, in the trajectory of her career, for nothing succeeds like success. The precocious insights of her Kansas reservations paper had no doubt contributed to her winning a scholarship to Yale. Then, under the guidance of Rankean scholars, she discovered in the OIA a rich, untapped vein of archival material with which to develop the themes she had only begun to consider in Kansas. With Bourne's encouragement in particular, this led to doctoral thesis on Indian removals that gained her both professional recognition and a substantial monetary prize. Despite all the difficulties of access and retrieval attendant upon the chaotic situation then prevailing in the OIA filing rooms, Abel became a Rankean archival fossicker *par excellence* and it was her assiduous application of this 'scientific' methodology to an almost unexplored area of historical research that won her

accolades from the profession. Indeed, she became so smitten with this type of research that, in addition to her heavy teaching schedule at Goucher, she was even prepared to give up most of every weekend to investigate the Californian Indian files. It would have been at this time that Abel began to consider researching Indian involvement in the Civil War, which led first to the *AHR* article of 1910 and eventually to the *Slaveholding Indians* trilogy. She must by now have become a familiar figure around the OIA and been recognised as something of an expert, which would have then led to her employment in editing the Calhoun correspondence. The discovery of the Nicollet chest proved to be an historian's treasure trove and while she set its contents aside to concentrate on *Slaveholding Indians*, it was to provide her with the raw materials that allowed her to continue working, despite all the vicissitudes of her later life.

The word 'Indian' appeared in the title in almost every one of Abel's early works but, in and of themselves, Indians were not the subjects of her investigations. She was not unsympathetic, but her attitude towards them was at best ambivalent. Some tribes she described as noble, proud, valiant or dauntless; others as treacherous, rascally, cowardly or lascivious, and she would often apply these adjectives without any explanation. Her descriptions of Indians ranged from the romantic to the racist, from wandering Ishmaelites to slothful and incompetent savages whose civilisation was only a veneer. Not that Abel was an ill-informed racist; she was a well-informed racist who could substantiate her claims by citing the then current scientific literature, or what passed for it. Besides, she was heir to a long tradition of what in modern parlance might be termed 'the Indian as other'.<sup>21</sup>

In the Norse sagas, earliest of the New World narratives, the Inuit of what is now Newfoundland were called 'skraelings' meaning 'wretches', and from the time of Columbus to the American Revolution, Indians featured in colonial discourse in more or less racist terms. As Europeans advanced their hegemony over the continent, they not only struggled against the Indians but also struggled to fit Indians into their own racial preconceptions, and thereby developed an entire attitudinal register that ranged from Aristotelian 'natural slaves' to 'noble savages'. But wherever they fit on this register, 'the Indian as

other' was given the imprimatur of science during the last third of the nineteenth century onward with the development of social-Darwinian ideas of racial hierarchy. Given particular historic credence during Abel's student years with such notions as Teutonic germ theory, racial theory did not begin to come under serious challenge until after the Second World War. Classifications such as half-breed and full blood, which were a recurrent trope in Abel's works, might now be considered to have no scientific basis, but the blood-quantum was still an operative policy standard within the Indian Office while she was yet researching in its archives.<sup>22</sup>

Although it appears that she may have lent her research expertise to help the Delawares in their claim against the United States government, from her published work it is clear that Abel was not interested in a reform agenda such as that promulgated by Helen Hunt Jackson, whose efforts at alerting the United States to the plight of the Indians had contributed to the passage of the 1887 General Allotment (or Dawes) Act. Although this measure had emerged from a humanitarian impulse, it effectively destroyed tribal power by forcibly allotting land to Indians individually, which then exposed them as easy prey to speculation and fraud.<sup>23</sup> In the preface to her master's thesis on the Sioux, Elizabeth Textor had echoed Jackson's reformist stance when the Dawes Act had been in operation for a few years, yet she was still optimistic that it would prove to remedy previous injustices and lead to a genuine improvement in Indians' lives. Six years later, in 1902, all Abel could say was that in the new century, communal landholding was 'repugnant' and 'non-progressive'.<sup>24</sup>

From Abel's first published paper it was apparent that her primary interest was political, rather than social, history and most particularly the treatment of 'subject races' under colonialism. As her Yale notebooks attest, this interest was enhanced during her doctoral training and continued right through to her pursuits of 'native policy' throughout the British Empire twenty years later. Even in her editions of the explorer narratives, her introductions showed more concern with the political background to these adventures, than with the social realities that the narratives themselves revealed.

Abel took great pride in the ancient lineage of Anglo-Saxon principles of justice, from their early documented formulation in Magna Carta through to the

American Constitution, and whatever she felt about Indians it was the ultimate denial of such justice to them as ‘subject races’ that were revealed in her histories. As she was able to show, despite the good intentions of some missionaries and politicians the various Indian colonisation schemes in North America were all abject failures: the Kansas reservation projects were mired in corruption; the various plans for removal were either not enacted or cruelly enforced; and the Indians never got their own state. The five great southern tribes overcame the trauma of their forced expulsion and not only managed to re-establish themselves in the West, but did so by the adoption of Anglo-Saxon modes of governance by which they achieved a high degree of acculturation. Then false promises of further autonomy drew them into a Civil War that led them to the brink of extinction as independent peoples. In the end, American destiny was manifest by unfettered capitalism and ultimately that is where Abel—quite correctly—laid the blame: not just for taking Indian land and denying Indians justice, but for betraying the ancient principles on which that justice was founded and thereby betraying the American republic itself.

Thus, despite the early-twentieth-century view that history ought to be a social science concerned with explicating the present, Abel’s work was very much a paradigm of history as past politics. This was due not only to her nineteenth-century training but also to the very limitations of the archival record. It simply would not have occurred to her to broaden her research and consult Indian tribal records; neither would she have considered Indian oral histories as reliable source material, much less put herself in a position to record them. In terms of her own training, her archival research was good methodological practice but it also reflected a general tendency within the academy towards narrower and narrower specialisation. In the history of Indian–white relations she was certainly a pioneer, but in ploughing a new furrow she created somewhat of an academic cul-de-sac for herself. She may have been, as Prucha was later to claim, in the top rank of American historians of her generation, but she was an expert in a field of one.

Abel’s works were far from comprehensive histories and were styled in the highly focussed, monographic structure that typified the historical scholarship



of the early twentieth century. They retained the flavour of seminar papers in which she adopted the stance of a scholar addressing fellow scholars of whose historical knowledge much could be assumed. In seeking to reveal an objective history, the Rankean method demanded little commentary, but a retelling of history simply ‘as it happened’ also necessitated the referencing of every authoritative source and for this Abel cannot be faulted. However, she often took this necessity to a ponderous extreme by footnoting long documents that usually detracted from her main text and sometimes even obscured it. Indeed, the impression might well be drawn that the inclusion of these long footnotes was not so much to authenticate the history, but rather to demonstrate Abel’s own Rankean credentials. What Abel did reveal—and this is perhaps her greatest contribution to Indian history—is that in the treatment of Indian peoples, the United States stands condemned by its own documentation. All the atrocities, all the frauds and all the sufferings heaped upon all the Indians are all there in the archives.

Once in a while Abel would let slip the scientific mask of objectivity and allow herself a rare moment of emotional commentary, usually occasioned by some outrageous piece of white hypocrisy. Her meanings were often obscured within long, rambling sentences that employed archaic language and awkward phraseology, comprising a multitude of clauses and sub-clauses that required careful rereading to unravel. As a critic, Abel expected from the authors that she reviewed the same high standards of research that she applied to herself and she was scathing if they failed in this regard. Yet many of the criticisms that she levelled at others could well be applied to her own work: her inappropriate titles, her literary deficiencies, her losing sight of the Indians and her rejection of the Blacks.

In 1913, as Abel was fossicking for her source material in the Indian Office files, Joseph K Dixon published *The Vanishing Race: the last great Indian Council and the Indians’ story of the Custer fight*. This was an heroic elegy replete with posed and doctored photogravures, the penultimate of which depicted a line of Indians riding into what was entitled ‘The Sunset of the Dying Race’; the final picture showed a group of forlorn and riderless horses

and was called simply, 'The Empty Saddle'.<sup>25</sup> Obituaries such as Dixon's expressed a commonly held perception, but they proved to be premature for, in spite of everything they had suffered in the wake of white conquest, Indians demonstrated a remarkable cultural resilience. They not only survived, but their numbers began slowly to increase and so did historical interest in them.

With this increased interest came a discernible shift in American Indian scholarship and two writers in particular, Grant Foreman (1869–1953) and Angie Debo (1890–1988), led the way towards a history that concerned itself primarily with Indians, rather than with policy. Foreman developed an interest in Indian history when he was employed as a fieldworker and attorney with the Dawes Commission in Oklahoma, a circumstance that gave him unique access to tribal records.<sup>26</sup> Debo likewise extended her research sources beyond the official archives in Washington to include 'barely examined tribal government manuscripts to court records, census statistics, election returns, interviews with surviving Choctaws, and painstaking perusal of Indian newspapers'.<sup>27</sup> Both historians acknowledged Abel's pioneering efforts and each dealt in their writings with the politics of Indian affairs, but more importantly their direct contact with Indians allowed for a close empathy—quite distinct from Abel's distant and racially qualified sympathy. Yet Foreman was particularly effusive in his praise of her work and in a 1927 review of Oklahoma historiography he wrote of Indian removals:

The only adequate account of those events is that written by Doctor Annie Heloise Abel for her doctor's degree at Yale and published in the American Historical Report for 1906, under the title of 'History of Events Resulting in Indian Consolidation West of the Mississippi.' The history of Oklahoma is bound up with the lives and tragedies of these Indians, and no one can claim to understand that phase of our history unless familiar with this work of Doctor Abel's. In it the student will find reference to all the manuscripts and published documents relating to that subject.

Doctor Abel easily ranks with our leading historians by virtue of three other great works [*Slaveholding Indians*] concerning our country and Indians... This work of Doctor Abel's is monumental; the tremendous amount of research among original sources in the archives of Washington, the infinite pains, intelligent and unbiased marshalling of facts has resulted in a great achievement. Doctor Abel's books are of unquestioned authority and no student can claim to know Oklahoma history who is not familiar with these exhaustive accounts of Indian Territory during the Civil War.<sup>28</sup>

Although it had not become an Indian state, Oklahoma retained the largest Indian population in America and it is therefore not surprising that it became an early centre for Indian scholarship. Foreman and Debo were both published by the University of Oklahoma Press, which in the interwar years was at the forefront of promoting what was still a very small field of historical enquiry. Just prior to the outbreak of the Second World War, Dean Trickett, a local historian from Tulsa, revisited the topic of Abel's great work and began a series of articles entitled 'The Civil War in the Indian Territory' that was published over several issues of the *Chronicles of Oklahoma*.<sup>29</sup> Because he was not writing for a professional or professorial audience, Trickett's account was far more readable than that of Abel's and he succeeded in doing what she had sought to do—to bring into stark contrast the situation of the Indians in that theatre of the Civil War. Trickett avoided getting bogged down in the minutiae of the politics and painted clear, broad backgrounds to his narrative that lacked any of Abel's racist bias. But he made frequent reference to Abel's own work and, like hers, his account relied heavily on the *Official Records of the War of the Rebellion*, although it must be said that Trickett's footnotes were brief references rather than the laboured over-citations of primary texts that was Abel's habit. Sadly, his account ended abruptly at the aftermath of the battle of Pea Ridge, published in the same month as the attack on Pearl Harbor.

The empathetic stance of writers like Foreman and Debo foreshadowed the huge surge in Indian historical scholarship that began with the emergence of Indian political activism on the back of the black civil rights movement of the 1960s. The inclusion in these new histories of a wider archival research base and authentic Indian voices combined with the perspectives of archaeology, ecology and other disciplines, transformed Indian history into a broad field of scholarship that Abel would have barely recognised. Her early efforts were more fully explored in studies such as Miner and Unrau's *The End of Indian Kansas*, and the history of Indian policy was the focus of the many studies by Francis Paul Prucha whose monumental two-volume *The Great Father* has become the standard work on the topic.<sup>30</sup> The impetus for reissuing the volumes of *Slaveholding Indians* in the 1990s no doubt came from the burgeoning interest in Indian history and while modern scholars might baulk at Abel's racist language, none have found substantive fault with the facts of her history.

Among the tens of thousands of volumes that have been written about every conceivable aspect of the Civil War, very few have specifically addressed the issue of Indian involvement in that conflict.<sup>31</sup>

It was the move to Kansas that had provided Annie Abel with the main chance. There her family had bought productive land at the peak of an agricultural boom, and so were able to sustain themselves through the hard times and then put all the children through college. Although the move caused her to miss two years of schooling during her early teens, that state's relatively progressive attitude to education and liberal attitude towards women allowed her to progress to university, an opportunity that would not have been available to a woman of her class in late-Victorian England. The emergence of women's historical scholarship may have been slow and arduous, but she rose to the challenge and succeeded on the profession's own terms. The move from Kansas to Yale must have given a tremendous boost to Abel's confidence as a scholar and then, having gained a doctorate with a highly considered dissertation, she found herself almost at the bottom of the professional academic ladder. Yet with an energy and dogged determination that seems to have been a hallmark of the entire Abel family, she climbed back up that ladder to reach a highly respectable—and respected—level of professional success. Then, after fifteen years researching in the OIA, she sought to extend her exploration of the effects of colonisation by embarking on an ambitious comparative project of global dimensions—the fulfilment of which was thwarted by her failed marriage and ultimately, it would seem, by a lack of resources.

After her Adelaide experience, no-one would have blamed Abel for simply retiring quietly in the bosom of her family, but that was not in her nature. She had persevered all her life and continued to do so for another twenty-five years. Despite all the travelling and the archival research that she undertook or planned to undertake, this period of her life did not produce the results that she might have hoped for, but even when she did finally settle in Aberdeen she was not discouraged and simply continued working with what she had: some historical manuscripts and a lifetime of scholarship.

She had been a pioneer both on the frontier and in the academy; her experience in Kansas developed in her the fortitude to pursue a topic of only minor interest and place it firmly on the academic agenda. As with most pioneers she brought her prejudices and predilections with her, but in ploughing a new furrow she helped prepare the ground for a vast and fruitful field of scholarship. This was her greatest achievement and her lasting legacy. The Oklahoma Historical Society came to recognise this when, in April 2002, it finally paid heed to the words of Grant Foreman written seventy-five years previously and inducted Annie Heloise Abel-Henderson into its Historians Hall of Fame.<sup>32</sup>

In January 1947, just two months before her death, Annie Abel-Henderson's very last publication appeared in the *AHR*. Displaying all the pedantry of her previous book reviews, this was a critique of Grant Foreman's *The Last Trek of the Indians*, a work that considered the story of those Indians—other than the Five Civilised tribes—who had been removed to the West. Despite his kind words about her twenty years earlier, she found this work of Foreman's to be 'filled with erroneous matter' and was especially critical of his lack of historical understanding in regards to the War of 1812. She took particular exception to the use of the word 'trek' in relation to Indian removals because, not only had it been borrowed from South African history, it also implied voluntary movement. Since the time of the Jackson presidency this had never been the case and 'no one knows that better than Mr. Foreman himself', she wrote. Indeed she pointed out that nearly half of the book, dealt with Indians who had been removed through 'compulsion, persuasion under duress, cajolery, and fraud [and] found lodgement in country supposedly barred to white settlement forever'. She also pointed out that the *last* trek of these Indians was in fact their further removal from Kansas to Oklahoma, an issue that was of particular interest to her since she had first considered it more than forty years previously.<sup>33</sup>

Although she would have written these words as the effects of her last illness were taking hold, Annie Heloise Abel-Henderson had lost none of her critical acumen or her passion for history. The impact of expanding empires

upon native peoples had been at the core of her research interest and, although she did not always live up to the ideal, it was this process that she had sought to explicate as objective history, unsullied by romanticism. Her final paragraph makes a fitting summary to this historian's history:

Less repetitious research and more genuine study of writers who have the necessary background would go a long way to put Indian history in its right perspective and eventually force it to be incorporated into our school textbooks. We should have less of local patriotism, less of hypocrisy and complacency and understand 'manifest destiny' for what it most certainly was, the American type of imperialism.

## Notes

---

- <sup>1</sup> Holland to Rose Abel Wright, 21 March 1947, WSU MASC, 1/1.
- <sup>2</sup> Rose Abel Wright to Holland, 31 March 1947, WSU MASC, 1/1.
- <sup>3</sup> A letter of enquiry to the archives suggests that by 1955 Abel-Henderson's notes had still not been catalogued, WSU MASC, 1/1.
- <sup>4</sup> A full list of these library bequests is to be found at WSU MASC, 1/1.
- <sup>5</sup> 'Historical News', *AHR*, LII, 4, July 1947, p. 821. These papers were forwarded to WSU, Pullman in 1964 and are now included in Abel-Henderson's archive; personal correspondence with Library of Congress, December 2004.
- <sup>6</sup> 'Historical News', *AHR*, LII, 4, July 1947, p. 833; 'Historical Notes and News', *Journal of Southern History*, XIII, 3, August 1947, pp. 423–4. A similar notice appeared in the *Obituary Record*, Bulletin of Yale University, Number 106, New Haven 1948, pp. 177–8.
- <sup>7</sup> *The Record*, State College of Washington, Pullman, January 1948, p. 6.
- <sup>8</sup> *ibid.* Since there is no record of Annie Abel-Henderson ever teaching at Pullman, this observation may refer to the winter seminars of the early 1940s when she was perhaps employed *ex officio*.
- <sup>9</sup> Frances Paul Prucha, entry for 'Abel, Annie Heloise', in ET James, JW James & PS Boyer, (eds.), *Notable American Women, 1607–1950, a biographical dictionary*, vol. I, Bellknap Press of Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1971, pp. 4–6.
- <sup>10</sup> Harry Kelsey, 'A Dedication to the Memory of Annie Heloise Abel-Henderson', *Arizona and the West*, XV, 1, 1973, p. 4.
- <sup>11</sup> Francis Paul Prucha, *United States Indian Policy, a critical bibliography*, Indiana University Press, Bloomington, 1977, p. 9.
- <sup>12</sup> R David Edmunds, 'Native Americans, New Voices: American Indian history, 1895–1995', *AHR*, C, 3, June 1995, p. 720.
- <sup>13</sup> Ellen Fitzpatrick, *History's Memory, writing America's past, 1880–1980*, Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University Press, 2002, pp. 84–5.
- <sup>14</sup> 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. 93 & 97.
- <sup>15</sup> *ibid.*, p.65.
- <sup>16</sup> *ibid.*, p. 49.
- <sup>17</sup> There are a number of works on the final phases of armed Indian resistance but Dee Brown, *Bury My Heart at Wounded Knee*, Holt Reinhart & Winston, 1970, New York, has become a classic.
- <sup>18</sup> William Frank Zornow, *Kansas: a history of the jayhawk state*, University of Oklahoma Press, Norman, 1957, p. 10.
- <sup>19</sup> Frederick Jackson Turner, 'The Significance of the Frontier in American History', *Frontier and Section, selected essays of Frederick Jackson Turner*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1961, p. 46.
- <sup>20</sup> The extent to which Indians were perceived in ethnographic rather than historical terms, is illustrated by Abel's vain attempt at having both the text of her PhD dissertation and the notes on California Indians published by the Smithsonian's Bureau of American Ethnology.
- <sup>21</sup> See, for example, 'Imagining the Other: first encounters in North America', in James Axtell, *Beyond 1492: encounters in colonial North America*, Oxford University Press, New York, 1992, pp. 25–74.
- <sup>22</sup> See Laurence F Schmeckebier, *The Office of Indian Affairs: its history, activities and organization*, Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, 1927, pp. 136–7. This was certainly the first publication to cite all of Abel's Indian works.
- <sup>23</sup> The abuses of the Dawes Act were revealed the Miriam Report of 1928. It documented massive fraud and misappropriation by the very government agents sent to administer the

---

Act. In 1887 Indians held 138 million acres in what was to become Oklahoma; by 1934, when the Dawes Act was repealed, that had been reduced to 47 million acres.

- <sup>24</sup> Only forty years later did Abel-Henderson acknowledge the abuses of the Dawes Act, see chapter five.
- <sup>25</sup> The full reference to what would now be considered an exceedingly patronising book is, Joseph K Dixon, *The Vanishing Race: the last Indian council a record in picture and story of the last great Indian Council, participated in by eminent Indian chiefs from nearly every Indian reservation in the United States, together with the story of their lives as told by themselves, their speeches and folklore tales, their solemn farewell and the indians' story of the Custer fight*, Doubleday Page & Co., Garden City, New York, 1913.
- <sup>26</sup> The Dawes Commission was established in 1893 to implement the Dawes Act.
- <sup>27</sup> Ellen Fitzpatrick, *History's Memory, writing America's past, 1880–1980*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 2002, p. 129.
- <sup>28</sup> Grant Foreman, 'Sources of Oklahoma History', *Chronicles of Oklahoma*, V, 1, March 1927, p. 47.
- <sup>29</sup> Dean Trickett, 'The Civil War in the Indian Territory', *Chronicles of Oklahoma*, XVII, 3, September 1939, pp. 315–27; XVII, 4, December 1939, pp. 401–12; XVIII, 2, June 1940, pp. 142–153; XVIII, 3, September, 1940, pp. 266–80; IXX, 1, March 1941, pp. 55–69; IXX, 4, December 1941, pp. 381–96.
- <sup>30</sup> H Craig Miner & William E Unrau, *The End of Indian Kansas, a study of cultural revolution, 1854–1871*, The Regents Press of Kansas, Lawrence, 1978. Francis Paul Prucha, *The Great Father: the United States government and the American Indian*, University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln, 1984.
- <sup>31</sup> Indian involvement in the Civil War often rates a mention in tribal histories, but the most comprehensive works on this topic to date, are Alvin Josephy, *The Civil War in the American West*, Alfred Knopf, New York, 1992, and Laurence M Hauptmann, *Between Two Fires, American Indians in the Civil War*, The Free Press, New York, 1995.
- <sup>32</sup> Connie G Armstrong, 'Oklahoma Historians Hall of Fame: Annie Heloise Abel', *Chronicles of Oklahoma*, LXXX, 2, Summer 2002, pp. 216–19.
- <sup>33</sup> Abel-Henderson, review of *The Last Trek of the Indians*, by Grant Foreman, *AHR*, LII, 2, January 1947, pp. 336–7. Edmunds, op. cit., p. 722, erroneously dates this work of Foreman's to 1932. In fact it was published in 1946.