Chapter Five

Adelaide and the aftermath

By 1921, Annie Heloise Abel had achieved much in her publishing and academic career, but she had always considered archival research as her core historical speciality and in that year, as previously shown, she applied for a sabbatical from Smith College to further that research. It was her intention to broaden her oft-stated interest in the history of ‘subject races’ and she planned to travel to New Zealand, Australia, and thence to London to investigate native policy in the British colonies.

At the end of the academic year, she travelled from Massachusetts to the family home in Aberdeen, Washington, to prepare for her trip and make her farewells. On 27 July her eldest brother George came over from nearby Hoquiam, on the other side of the Chehalis river, to say goodbye and on the following day, together with her brother Anthony and her sister Lena, Annie drove the ten miles to Montesano to dine with their older brother Will. In early August she made the first entry into a little notebook that was to serve temporarily as a diary, and wrote that it had been exactly three years since her mother had been taken sick in what was to be her last illness.1

Four days later on 2 August, with their father accompanying them as far as Aberdeen railway station, she and her youngest sister Lucy took the train for Seattle and thence to Vancouver where she boarded the ship for New Zealand. Unfortunately, the diary entries ended on the following day with an enigmatic ‘Finished certain …’ followed by a note scrawled diagonally across the page: ‘Have need for this book for notes taken in New Plymouth and Dunedin so must use some other book for my Diary’.2 Although her thoughts were no doubt fixed upon the Antipodes, while on board ship Abel was still thinking about American Indians. She wrote to her brother Will concerning a possible claim by the Nez Percé and other Indian tribes in Washington State and mentioned that there was a great deal of documentation bearing on the case in the vaults of the Smith College library.3
If Abel ever found another book for use as a diary, it has not survived, but what does remain from this time are a dozen small notebooks, which covered the period from 1921–1925. The earliest of these was dated October 1921 and contained notes on New Zealand history taken in Dunedin at the Early Settlers Association of Otago library. Here she also made a list of books borrowed, and added a rider to ‘check references in the British Museum’, thus confirming her intention to travel on to the United Kingdom. Another list, headed ‘Valuable Historical Books’, included the item: ‘Henderson, Geo. C. [MA] Sir George Grey, pioneer of empire in southern lands, London, 1907’, and noted that the author was a ‘Professor of History at Adelaide University’. Later that same month Abel was researching at the Mitchell Library in Sydney, Australia, where she met the principal librarian of New South Wales, WH Ifould. He not only helped with her documentary research but, since she was to continue her researches in the South Australian public library, also ‘provided her with a letter of introduction to Professor Henderson in Adelaide’.

George Cockburn Henderson was born in 1870 near Newcastle on the New South Wales coast and his early life, in some respects, resembled that of Abel. He was the son of migrants from England, and after leaving school became a pupil teacher before attending the University of Sydney. He graduated in 1893 with a first-class honours degree in history and philosophy and then won a scholarship to Balliol College, Oxford, where, in addition to his studies, he became a proficient rower. After his 1898 graduation with second-class honours, he worked as a lecturer for the Oxford University extension scheme and also undertook a long walking tour of Roman antiquities in Britain. In January of the following year, he married a Quaker, May Gertrude Sturge, at the Friends Meeting House in Leicester. The newly-weds moved to Sydney for a year before he resumed his lectureship back in England; but in 1902 Henderson was appointed to the combined chair of history and English language and literature at the University of Adelaide and returned to Australia without his wife. May Sturge-Henderson remained in England, resumed her career as a writer and by 1911 (having ‘formed another connection’) she and her husband were divorced.

In 1903 Henderson was appointed as a university representative to the Board of Governors of the South Australian Public Library, Museum and Art Gallery and it
was largely due to his enthusiasm for the collection and preservation of historical documents that the first state archives department in Australia was established there. While in South Africa undertaking research for his 1907 biography of the colonial administrator and one-time governor of South Australia, Sir George Grey (1812–1898), Henderson had been greatly impressed with the archival holdings of the Cape Town Public Library. The following year he began a campaign to obtain from the Colonial Office in London the collected despatches sent to and from the Governors of South Australia. Just prior to the outbreak of the First World War, Henderson spent a year in Europe investigating archival preservation and storage methods and, as a result of this investigation, compiled an extensive report for the South Australian government. His recommendations came to fruition in 1920 when the archive building of the public library was opened and the colonial despatches became ‘the valuable nucleus of its collection’.

Ever a physical fitness enthusiast, in 1909 Henderson was a prime mover in raising the funds to provide the university’s sports association with a playing field, pavilion and boathouse. When Australia mounted an Antarctic expedition in 1911, Henderson, as president of the geographical and historical section of the Australasian Association for the Advancement of Science, applied his fund-raising capabilities to that project, arguing that:

the time was come for the History of the Commonwealth to be undertaken in a systematic and scientific way; now with the expedition to Antarctica, Australia’s nascent nationhood might find expression in action.

Soon after the First World War, the university secured sufficient funding to create separate History and English departments, but the long years of heading the combined department had taken its toll on Henderson’s health. Since returning to Adelaide in 1902 he had lived in various lodgings around the city, but around this time he moved into the exclusive Adelaide Club where it became apparent to colleagues that he was suffering from insomnia, and that his long midnight walks through Adelaide’s extensive parklands appeared to offer little relief.

Since the public library was adjacent to the university, when Abel arrived in Adelaide in November 1921, she soon made contact with Henderson and they quickly became friends. They were of a similar age (she was forty-nine and he fifty-one) and as historians with a shared interest in colonial policy and common concern for archival preservation and research, perhaps recognised a mutuality of
spirit. Indeed, Henderson’s biography of Sir George Grey displayed the very same racialist attitudes and similarity of style that Abel had expressed in *Slaveholding Indians*. In discussing an apparent failure to maintain the number of Australian aboriginal children attending school, Henderson remarked that it was no fault of Grey’s:

The failure was in all probability due, as it generally is, to the strain of the inward life, which accompanies the transition from one civilization to another, and which becomes greater by every advance that is made beyond traditional thought and practice; til at last the ‘call from the wild’ becomes so imperative that the still small voice of the idealist is no longer heard, and the savage relapses into the old habits which involve little strain on his mind and nerve.  

Of their early relationship, Henderson’s biographer Marjory Casson wrote:

Her Adelaide friends remember Dr. Abel as a tall, attractive brown-haired woman, remarkably young-looking for her forty-nine years. Henderson assisted her in her researches … and enjoyed taking her about. None the less it came as a surprise to his friends when their engagement was announced after comparatively short acquaintance.

And so, sometime in the southern autumn of 1922, Abel sailed back across the Pacific to put her affairs in order. From Aberdeen, on 17 July, she cabled her resignation from Smith College to President Neilson and the following day, wrote him a letter of explanation:

I am going back to Australia almost immediately, there to marry a professor of history, one who is a specialist, as I am, in the history of British Colonisation. Our intention is to do research work together and to develop an interest in the same within the university.

It is with regret that I abandon my work at Smith. My students may have been few in number but I had their best interests at heart and I believe by them at least my efforts were appreciated. Necessarily, the subjects I taught were not likely ever to be in great demand. I hoped to spend one more year at Smith especially as I have so recently enjoyed my one and only sabbatical; but my health has not been good for several months and I really think it the fairest thing to resign now.

In his reply, Neilson began by offering his warmest congratulations, but then revealed a greater concern with proper procedure by reminding her that members of staff were normally obliged to return to campus after a sabbatical. In this situation, however, he could only accept her resignation and felt sure that if he could find a successor, the trustees would ratify his decision although he was unsure of ‘their attitude towards the payment of half salary during your sabbatical year’. In August, Neilson wrote that the trustees had indeed waived the obligatory post-sabbatical return to campus.
Abel soon sailed back to Adelaide where, on the fine spring day of Friday 27 October 1922, she and Henderson were married at Scots Church on North Terrace, opposite the university campus. One of Henderson’s friends, the Reverend George Davidson, officiated at the wedding, which seems to have been a private affair for despite Henderson’s standing in the community there appeared to be no public announcement. After a short honeymoon in New South Wales, the Hendersons moved into a house situated on a large block of land in Blackwood, then an outlying community in the hills above Adelaide. Marjory Casson paints a picture of something less than domestic bliss:

The house was off the beat of tradespeople; it provided an unsurpassed view … across the foothills to sea; but as it transpired, very little else. Mrs Henderson faced what may well have been her first domesticities beset by the major problem of an acute water shortage. The bathroom went out of action; so did the laundry. People came to call; some were welcome, some apparently not; it probably depended on the domestic situation of the moment. Prominent in the memories of several, on separate occasions, is the picture of Mrs. Henderson prodding with a pot-stick sheets boiling in a kerosene tin on top of the wood stove.

Like her husband, Annie Henderson had lived in serviced accommodation for most of the previous two decades and it seems that these domesticities occupied a great deal of her time, since she left no record of any historical research during this period. There was a regular suburban train service from Blackwood to the city and so the campus would have been easily accessible to her and although her husband continued working at the university, their stated intention of jointly promoting an interest in colonial policy never eventuated.

Only one small notebook of hers has survived from this time, and its contents suggest that she was bored and perhaps lonely. With only fifteen pages of jotted entries, it opened with a quotation from John Stuart Mill that she had found in her husband’s copy of A View of the Art of Colonization (1849), edited by Edward Gibbon Wakefield:

There need be no hesitation in affirming, that colonization, in the present state of the world, is the very best of business, in which the capital of an old and wealthy country can possibly engage.

There are one or two further references to this work in the notebook, but most entries are taken up with direct citations from loaned copies of the local journal, The Blackwood Magazine, of which she wrote: ‘It was a mag devoted to the interests of [the Adelaide Hills communities of] Blackwood, Coromandel Valley, Belair and
Most of the citations concerned the history of local place names and, with a reference to a collection of letters loaned to her by someone in New Zealand, the notebook ends rather abruptly with a sigh of back-to-work resignation: ‘Perhaps I had better begin at the first of the collection to take notes’.  

By Easter 1923, when Marjory Casson was invited to visit, the domestic situation had been somewhat ameliorated by the employment of Henderson’s niece as housekeeper, although the water shortage continued to be a problem.

But the health of professor Henderson had deteriorated greatly. Deserted by sleep, he faced a period of fearful depression each morning. By evening the cloud would have lifted; he would be full of plans for their future home … but haunted always by what the morning held in store. Mrs. Henderson was obviously deeply disturbed and unhappy.

In early June, Henderson presided over a meeting of the university’s library committee, but later that month was hospitalised with depression at a local psychiatric facility where he allowed visits only from his wife. Later, Casson was to ask:

Was it from a desperate sense of responsibility towards her that, on a visit to him in the hospital, he forced on her the decision that she return to America, and their connection be severed forthwith? Uncertain and distracted as she was herself, this decision was none the less a shattering debacle for Mrs Henderson. She returned to her home in Washington.

No reference to this tragic episode is to be found among the couple’s surviving papers, but Casson did provide certain details to the archivist at Smith College with who she was in correspondence in the 1960s. In reply, the archivist wrote:

I am most grateful … for your willingness that I use my discretion in adding the personal information which you sent to our archival collection. I agree that it is too personal in nature to be available to the general reader or researcher … but I feel that it should be added to a carefully restricted file of material about Dr. Abel. The true facts present only a human tragedy beyond the control of the victims, and conceivably, the truth might be of service in correcting less pleasant surmises one day.

This restricted file has yet to be located.

Despite the collapse of her marriage, Annie Henderson did not return to America, at least not immediately. She took recourse to the habits of a lifetime and simply went back to work. Her notebooks indicate that she spent some time in Melbourne researching at that city’s public library, before returning to Sydney where she resided in the beachside suburb of Manly. She continued her work at the Mitchell
Library, taking notes on colonial New Zealand, South Africa and Australia and, perhaps with a note of irony, once mentioned that ‘Miss Gertrude Farr of Blackwood has lent me a book on South Australia: *The Land of Promise*.¹³ She was perhaps also thinking of her own situation when, in the flyleaf of one notebook, she penned the following verse:

The key of yesterday  
I threw away  
And now too late  
Before tomorrow’s close-locked gate  
Helpless I stand in rain to Pray!  
In Rain to sorrow!  
Only the key of yesterday  
Unlocks tomorrow.¹⁴

By June of 1924 Annie Henderson was back in Washington State, for by then she had already been engaged in researching the history of the local Indians at the State Capitol in Olympia.¹⁵ Yet she had never been one to stand still and by the start of the academic year took up an appointment as acting professor of history at Sweet Briar College in Virginia. She was also invited to speak at other colleges: in December she delivered a series of three lectures on ‘British colonisation and native policy in Australia and New Zealand’ to the students of Wilson’s College in Chambersburg, Pennsylvania, and in May 1925 returned to Goucher to deliver a lecture on migration to these countries.¹⁶ She also served on the AHA’s Programme Committee under the chairmanship of the University of Chicago’s professor William Dodd and from about this time she began to sign herself Annie Abel-Henderson.¹⁷

Yet all this activity still did not satisfy her. She applied to Vassar College for a full professorship, and to both the Guggenheim Foundation and the Association of American University Women (AAUW) for research scholarships.¹⁸ From Sweet Briar she wrote to President Neilson at Smith asking for letters of recommendation to both President McCracken at Vassar and the AAUW’s Fellowship Committee: ‘Of the Vassar professorship I have little hope, but I should like seriously to try for the fellowship’.¹⁹ She was certainly intending to use such funds for a further trip to London, and noted that:

The exhaustive comparative study of Native Policy as a phase of British Colonisation, I cannot complete until I have examined the material in the Record Office and the British Museum. It is the biggest thing I have attempted and, perhaps, the most worth while.²⁰
She was indeed awarded the AAUW’s Alice Freeman Palmer Travelling Fellowship for 1925–26 and by September 1925 was living in London and researching British colonial policy at the Colonial Office, the British Museum and the Public Record Office. While studying official correspondence at the Colonial Office she once noted, ‘Someday I think I’d like to re-write the early history of South Australia—using these records more than have been used heretofore’.

Actually, she came to focus her research upon the archives of the Anti-Slavery and Aborigines’ Protection Society (ASAPS) located at Denison House in London where, together with Frank Klingberg (1883–1968), she began to prepare for publication some correspondence of the American antislavery campaigner Lewis Tappan (1788–1863). Klingberg was a native Kansan who, like Abel-Henderson, had been a student of Frank Heywood Hodder at the University of Kansas and was now chairman of the history department at the University of California and on sabbatical in London researching the development of the abolition movement.

In early 1926, perhaps with an eye to the not-so-distant future when the AAUW scholarship would come to an end, Abel-Henderson applied to Yale for a Stirling Research Fellowship, in order to ‘continue the investigation … into the history of British Native Policy’.

In addition to the curriculum vitae, her application stated that she would have no other income apart from the fellowship, and that it was her purpose to enter research ‘as a life work’.

She wrote that during her teaching career:

I was constantly and profoundly impressed with the fact that there was practically nothing available for the use of students on certain subjects that I had good reason to think were of tremendous importance for a right understanding of colonial and national and imperial progress. Foremost among these subjects was the great influence that organized religious and philanthropic bodies have had in the shaping of political policies; in extending, consciously or unconsciously, incidentally or deliberately, the limits of empire; and in spreading civilization … I went deeper and deeper into it myself and came to the conclusion that organized humanitarianism had been almost the only force operating to prevent Anglo-Saxon colonization from being absolutely destructive of primitive and feeble tribes, particularly in the Americas, in Africa, and in Australasia. Native Policy, or the treatment accorded to aboriginal people, I regard as a very vital part of the history of colonization—and, of the colonization itself, a supreme test.

She went on to claim that, with herself as the only exception, no-one had comprehensively studied native policy and, indeed, that such dearth of scholarship had been given ‘considerable publicity’ at a recent AHA meeting. She also sought to impress the scholarship committee by claiming some contemporary relevance for such a study:
Fuller knowledge of what has been done, in the past, to develop Native policies cannot fail to assist in the solution of Native problems of today, as, for instance in the United States and in various parts of Africa. She then informed the committee that she had plans to publish her recent research in a work to be entitled ‘Some Aspects of British Native Policy, 1836–1867; a study in British humanitarianism and a memorial to Dr. Thomas Hodgkin, philanthropist’, and also presented two research options that she felt were open to her. She expressed a preference for continuing her current research, which would culminate in a comprehensive study of British policy in North America, New Zealand, Australia and the South Seas. The fulfilment of such a project, she explained, would require further research in the British, Australian and New Zealand archives, and also an investigation of the Canadian sources—which ‘she had never had the opportunity to examine at all’. The other research option would be to take up the study of native policy in British Africa, which would necessitate an extended visit to that continent.

Her application was supported by letters of reference from Klingberg and Andrew Keogh (1869–1953) the Sterling professor of bibliography at Yale. Klingberg gave her a good, although not a glowing reference, noting that she was a mature student and ‘a woman of demonstrated abilities’, but contradicted her own statement by incorrectly claiming that she had lived in Canada. Keogh had worked as a librarian at Yale for many years and wrote that he remembered having ‘worked with her constantly in her research work’ during her time as a graduate student. He had no hesitation in saying that she was ‘a master of historical method and worthy of any financial assistance that can be given’ and ended his letter with a short anecdote:

I once said to Professor George B. Adams that she was one of the most scholarly women I had ever known. He immediately replied that she was the most scholarly woman student he had ever had.

Despite these positive remarks Abel-Henderson was not successful in her application. When the supporting documentation was returned to her, some papers had gone missing and so she wrote to the office of the dean of the graduate school at Yale to enquire as to their whereabouts. Perhaps hiding a deep disappointment, she also wrote:

I didn’t really expect to get one of the fellowships, because I felt sure there would be a number of younger people applying, particularly young men. In spite of what Professor Keogh and Dr. Klingberg thought, I didn’t think I had the ghost of a chance. I might have had, perhaps, had Professor Adams been alive.
She added that despite this financial setback it was her intention to stay in England and try to complete her current research project, and she certainly attended a garden party held in July 1926 at London’s Royal Holloway College ‘in honour of the members of the Congress of the Universities of the Empire’. Fifty years later, a biographer was to claim:

Finishing her research in London, she sailed for Adelaide and an attempt at reconciliation with her husband. When it became painfully obvious they would be happier apart, she returned to America …

Yet there is no archival evidence of such a visit, Casson certainly made no mention of it and, given Abel-Henderson’s apparent financial situation at the time, it is hard to imagine that she could have undertaken such a journey. The preface to the Tappan work, datelined ‘At sea, December 1926’ and signed jointly by herself and Klingberg, indicates that they were returning to America together and a further letter to Yale certainly confirms that she was back in Aberdeen, Washington, at least as early as May 1927.

In September, perhaps in partial fulfilment of her fellowship obligations, she delivered a lecture entitled ‘English Pre-restoration Colonization’ to the Grays Harbor branch of AAUW at the Emerson Hotel, Hoquiam. According to her incomplete lecture notes, she here repeated the claim—made twenty years earlier at Yale—that the American Constitution was ‘in direct lineal descent’ from the colonial trading company charter. This was in turn derived from the English medieval town charter, ‘one of the earliest embodiments of popular rights, it having usually been gained at the expense of privileged feudalism’. Although conceding that early English colonialism was essentially a commercial enterprise, she claimed that one feature stood out—‘the idealism of the individual colonists’. It was this idealism, she further claimed, that differentiated English–American colonialism from any other, and that it was ‘in idealism and individualism that we must look for the secret of Anglo-Saxon [colonial] success’. Her lecture notes ended somewhat abruptly by introducing Indians by way of Pocahontas’ famed rescue of John Smith who in later life, she claimed:

had visions of rehabilitating himself by shining in the reflected glory of the deceased young squaw. For she was only a squaw after all and just why she has been singled out from the hundreds, nay thousands of equal rank, daughters of chiefs and tribes more powerful than the Powhatan, nobody knows.
In April 1928, Abel-Henderson was invited to address the faculty, students and friends of Lindenwood College in St Charles, Missouri. Her notes for this lecture constituted a long and rambling account of the life of George Champlin Sibley (1782–1863) who, together with his wife, had founded the college in 1827. On the occasion of this address, she was presented with a copy of a short biography of Sibley’s father John, which made mention of her own 1922 edition of a report from Sibley senior when stationed at Natchitoches, Louisiana, in 1807.

In a further attempt to return to teaching, in September 1928 Abel-Henderson went back to her alma mater the University of Kansas, to temporarily replace her old mentor Frank Hodder, who had taken up a one-year appointment at Cornell. The following April, she was invited to deliver the annual Phi Beta Kappa oration and chose the topic ‘New England and New Zealand and the High Water Mark of British Colonization’. In her notes she claimed that the British ‘incipient sense of responsibility to feeble races [was] the germ of the Mandate system under the League of Nations’. New Zealand, she then argued, would have been left to the missionaries to create ‘another South Sea theocracy’ had it not been for the presence of whalers, who were:

a thoroughly bad lot—of all mankind the very worst surely to whom to expose a child race … like the fur traders [in North America], the whalers encouraged the use of ardent spirits … contaminated everything they touched, and spread vice and disorder all about them.

It was the Maoris’ appeal for help against these depredations that resulted in the 1840 Treaty of Waitangi, which—because it recognised certain Maori land rights —she compared with the treaty made with the Iroquois by the colonial New York governor Thomas Dongan in 1684.

She then related that Wakefield—the colonial theorist whose emigration plan had been thwarted in South Australia because it failed to take cognisance of the aborigines—managed to establish seven colonies through his New Zealand Land Company. He had difficulty attracting immigrants, however, because ‘Australasia was remote, had an unsavoury convict past and the Maori were [believed to be] cannibals’. Yet, ‘for Britons of all classes throughout the centuries, land-ownership has summed up all material good. Their very liberties have been based upon it’; and thus it was that the New Zealand Land Company had successfully brought out members of the Bryanites, a religious sect who saw themselves very much in the
tradition of the Pilgrim Fathers. Land was purchased at the foot of Mount Egmont in New Zealand’s North Island by a deed written in both Maori and English, and the procedure was overseen by the Protector of Aborigines. The site—which was to become the town of New Plymouth—was organised on Penn’s colonial principles of town and country blocks and, like Adelaide, surrounded by ‘an inalienable reserve of parkland’. She further noted that these colonists were progressive in their thinking and had enacted such advanced legislation as establishing an eight-hour day and a minimum wage.

Abel-Henderson also explained that extreme poverty in Scotland in the 1840s had led to the establishment of the South Island’s Otago Association by secessionists from the established kirk. By way of anecdote, she here mentioned that because of their ‘reticence’, the dire situation of the Scots—when compared with that of the Irish—had gone largely unnoticed, which had inspired her own distant relative, the poet William Thom, to describe their poverty as ‘A Chieftain Unknown to the Queen’. Finally, she noted that the Anglican colony at nearby Christchurch shared with Otago the distinction ‘of ending British Colonisation on a supremely high note’, although it too had become subject to the colonial levelling process because ‘ladies of refinement could not be persuaded to go there’. This led her to conclude with a peculiar comment, reminiscent of what she had written about William the Conqueror in her notebook at Yale: ‘Give a man a chance and blood will tell; for not all that have been denied privilege or have been overtaken by adversity are basely born’.

How well this oration was received is not recorded, but it seems that she could not rekindle an interest in teaching because soon after it was delivered Abel-Henderson left the University of Kansas. In 1929 she secured a grant-in-aid from the Social Science Research Council and travelled to St Louis and Ottawa to undertake research for what was to be her last published book, an edition of a late-eighteenth-century expedition journal. At this time she also made many notes pertaining to Canadian Indian policy, but only a rough draft of a single lecture, with the title ‘Removal, A One-time Phase of Canadian Indian Policy’, is extant.

In December 1933, she presented the paper ‘British Native Policy and the Colonization of South Australia’ to the thirty-fifth annual meeting of the Pacific Coast Branch of the AHA. Of the several draft manuscript copies of this lecture in Abel-Henderson’s archive, the most complete began:
The effect of colonization upon aboriginal peoples has invariably been disastrous … The task I have here set myself is to relate the history of lost opportunity … had only more of the right men been at hand.72

She noted that despite representations expressing grave concerns for the aborigines, Wakefield’s South Australian Association was supported by an 1834 Act of Parliament to settle ‘waste and unoccupied lands’, but was opposed by the antislavery lobby, which ‘embraced all feeble folk wherever brought into contact with aggressive civilization’.73 In response, the South Australian colonial commissioners made assurance of their intention:

   by every means in their power so to regulate the intercourse between the settlers and the natives, that every security may be given to the latter for the peaceful enjoyment of their rights as Men; and that every facility may be afforded for the spread of civilization amongst them and for their voluntary reception of Moral and Religious Instruction.74

Such assurances were reminiscent of those made to the North American Indians. ‘Specious promises these’, Abel-Henderson remarked, ‘but as history attests, in so many like cases empty withal … too general in tone and phrase to mean anything substantial’. A program of paternal kindness was to be promoted towards aborigines—to respect ‘individual occupancy’ (though none existed), to protect game, to give food and clothing in exchange for labour, to provide medicines and above all, to persuade black parents to send their children to school ‘where they would be taught religion and the arts of civilisation’. The Colonial Office had then created the office of protector of Aborigines, an idea that Abel-Henderson traced to the colonial Spanish protector of slaves. After a brief discussion of some candidates for this post, the draft abruptly ends.75

In retrospect, the years following the Adelaide interlude saw the prospects of rebuilding her academic career steadily decline. Despite her successful college career, it seems unlikely that she ever gained much satisfaction from teaching and when the opportunities came to undertake further research she took them. The chances of college employment became further remote with the onset of the Depression in 1929, and she was indeed fortunate to find herself on a research scholarship at this critical time. Sometime in 1931, Annie Abel-Henderson finally retired to 811 North M Street, Aberdeen, Washington State. It was to be her final home, sharing the house with her father (until his death on 20 February 1934) and her divorced sister, Rose Abel Wright. But her retirement mirrored that of her
father’s former employer, Anthony Salvin, for her later years saw little diminution of her energies. An outbuilding was converted into what she later described as her ‘wee office’, where she continued to research and to write and from this time came two important editorial works, a few academic journal articles and many book reviews. She even planned another research trip to New Zealand, but when that was thwarted by the outbreak of the Second World War, she turned to volunteer war work.

From as early as 1912 Abel-Henderson had been involved with the editing of important historical documents, and after the Adelaide interlude it was with this aspect of the historian’s craft that she would be principally engaged. Just before her marriage, she published an edition of a rare but short document, *A Report from Natchitoches in 1807 by Dr. John Sibley*. This report was addressed to Jefferson’s secretary of war, General Henry Dearborn (1751–1829), from one of the first United States Indian agents to be stationed in the newly acquired Territory of Orleans, soon to become the State of Louisiana. In her introduction, she complained that:

> As usual … interest has only very rarely … extended itself sufficiently to include the affairs of the aborigines when dissociated from relations conditioned by their contact with the superior race.

She further noted, although without explication, that the historical importance of the southern Indians had only been recently realised and therefore Sibley’s report was but a ‘meager contribution to the source material now in demand’. She then gave a brief biographical sketch of the author and a brief description of the ethnological nature of the report and its provenance. Among her notes, which were generally of a comparative nature, Abel-Henderson remarked on the similarity of certain Indian cultural practices to those in described in Tacitus’ *Germania*, from which she drew the unlikely comparison between ‘early German love of gambling’ and ‘Indian devotion to ball-playing’.

Before Meriwether Lewis and William Clark set out on their famous expedition at the head of the Corps of Discovery in May 1804, a small number of less well-known Europeans were already familiar with the Missouri River, at least up as far as the Dakotas. These men were mainly engaged in the fur trade, and in the pre-industrial era pelts were certainly among North America’s most valuable exports but, as Abel-Henderson’s *Geographical Review* article had shown, these men were also
explorers who set out to map the vast distances they travelled and also took more or less scientific observations of what they saw and experienced. By the end of the nineteenth century, the tales of and by these early explorers and scientists had given rise to a distinct historical genre. Elliot Coues (1842–1899), himself an explorer and noted ornithologist, produced editions of many explorer-journals, including *History of the Expedition Under the Command of Captains Lewis and Clark* (1893). To celebrate the first Lewis and Clark centenary in 1905, Reuben Thwaites (1853–1913) had published an eight-volume edition of their original journals and it was in this tradition, and following on from her work on the Evans map, that Abel-Henderson produced some of her most interesting editorial work.8

‘The great war had its effect upon the archives of the government at Washington’. Thus began her account, published in 1921, of the discovery of a chest of documents in the Topographical Section of United States War Department six years earlier. ‘It was a time’, she continued,

for the distribution of personal patronage and party spoils unprecedented in the annals of history … Documents, so jealously guarded in the past that they were never easy of access to the investigator unless he were possessed of the golden senatorial key, were summarily dislodged from their accustomed repositories and dumped, literally dumped, into new quarters, mostly temporary structures. From the sacred precincts of that architectural monstrosity, the State, War, and Navy building, went records of priceless historical value, among them many of the very oldest of those yet accumulated by this great infant nation of the west. The destination of one portion of the evicted was the commodious Munitions building, constructed of concrete and supposedly fireproof, while that of another was a garage, huge and dusty.83

Such vandalism was not entirely without benefit, however, for among the items that came to light during this reorganisation was a metal chest which ‘bore on one of its shorter sides the magical name of “Nicolett”’.84 This would have caused her some considerable excitement because the chest had belonged to Joseph N Nicollet (1786–1843) a well-known explorer and scientist who had mapped parts of the West and spent time among the Indian tribes in the upper Mississippi recording their customs and language.85 Though she described the contents of the chest as a ‘veritable museum’, she had been disappointed, nonetheless, not to find certain long-sought-after documents that were reputed to have been in Nicollet’s possession.86 But there were various notes of Nicollet’s own authorship as well as other documents, four of which were to become the subject of Abel-Henderson’s historical investigations.
Her short introduction to the first of these documents, ‘Trudeau’s Description of the Upper Missouri (Description du haut Missouri par Jean Baptiste Trudeau, voyageur)’, was taken up with as much footnoting as actual text. It assumed, on the part of the reader, an intimate knowledge of the history of western exploration prior to the Lewis and Clark expedition and reflected a trait common to Abel-Henderson’s writing—that of the specialist addressing fellow specialists. The name on the document itself was, she explained, not a signature but rather ‘an indorsement’ and she went to great lengths in order to demonstrate—through internal and other evidence—that the document was indeed written by Trudeau.8 Her former student Ethel M Staley, who now taught French, had examined the manuscript for its ‘philological, syntactical, orthographical, and other peculiarities’.8 The text of the manuscript was reproduced in the original French alongside an English translation and, although the name of the translator is not given, it was probably Staley.8 As was usual for an Abel-Henderson oeuvre, the text was densely footnoted and drew heavily on previously published explorer narratives, especially Thwaites’ edition of the Lewis and Clark journals. The footnotes were generally of a comparative nature, pointing out where the various cited accounts differed, and from them it is evident that Abel-Henderson had studied other documents found in the Nicollet chest, editions of which she would also come to publish.

The second of these could not have had a more different introduction than that she had written for the Trudeau journal. Rather than with a tale of documentary discovery and obscure arguments concerning provenance, ‘Mackay’s Table of Distances’ was introduced with some history, and was the first article to be published under the name Abel-Henderson.9 France and England, she explained, had long been rivals in their exploration and exploitation of North America, but by the 1763 Treaty of Paris, which ended the Seven Years War, France ceded Canada and all its territories east of the Mississippi to Great Britain, and Louisiana to its ally Spain. One result of this continental redistribution was that ‘Scotch highlanders mostly of the Roman Catholic persuasion … introduced for good or ill, the element of fierce competition into the peltry traffic’.9 These men came to fill the void in French trapping and trading interests in Canada and formed various business alliances such as the North West Company, which came to rival the legendary British Hudson Bay Company.
Feeling threatened by both British and, following the War of Independence, American expansion into its Louisiana territory, Spain formed an exploration company headquartered at St Louis and charged with ‘the task of exploring the upper Missouri and of developing its trade’. Its principal agent was James Mackay (1761–1822), a Scot who formerly had been engaged by the North West Company, which was then looking for a route to the Pacific. In 1795 Mackay travelled up the Missouri, established a trading post for his Spanish employers at the villages of the Omaha Indians (near present-day Omaha, Nebraska) and reached the White River (in present-day South Dakota) before returning to St Louis the next year. It was from information gathered during this journey that Mackay calculated a table of distances between the principal sites along the Missouri from its mouth to the White River—a distance that he estimated at 328 leagues (984 miles). After her short introduction, the complete table was reproduced in the original French alongside an English translation and, though she had made no mention of the Nicollet chest, in an addendum Abel-Henderson noted that:

From a study of the resemblances, variations, and discrepancies, the present investigator is fain to insist that the Indian office map is the original Evans production or a copy of it, upon which Lewis and Clark made emendations and addenda and that the map … found with the ‘Table of distances’ in the Nicollet chest is of Mackay authorship. It was it, most probably, that served Perrin du Lac as a basis for the one published with his *Voyage dans les deux Louisianes* …

One tiny fruit of Abel-Henderson’s researches in London was a short journal article, published in 1926 under the grandiloquent title ‘Mexico as a Field for Systematic British Colonization, 1839’. In fact, the article consisted of the reproduction of a single letter from the Irish politician Daniel O’Connell (1775–1847) to the Quaker philanthropist Joseph Sturge (1793–1859), to which she simply added a two-paragraph introduction. The letter concerned O’Connell’s plan to present two motions to the House of Commons, the first of which would have brought British recognition to the newly created State of Texas only if it abolished slavery; the second proposed that Mexico ought to set aside:

A portion of the unoccupied territory … for the purpose of establishing an asylum or free state of persons of colour, her Majesty’s subjects, who may be desirous to emigrate to and establish such a free state.
Because it reflected the concerns of British humanitarians for ‘the negro everywhere, free or unfree’, Abel-Henderson made the exaggerated and self-referential claim that the letter was therefore of significance to ‘the student of frontier history and the specialist in colonization’. For her it seemed to indicate that ‘had things turned out just a little differently, there might have been more remarkable analogies than there actually were … between the westward movement in United States history and modern British colonizaton in Australasia’. In other words, although she failed to mention that O’Connell’s proposals merely delayed Britain’s recognition of Texas, she was presenting this letter as evidence to support her own putative, transnational account in regard to native peoples.

But Abel-Henderson’s sojourn in London produced more than this short article. In April 1926, Klingberg had sought the advice of AHR editor J Franklin Jameson (then at the Carnegie Institution in Washington) about publishing some correspondence of the American antislavery activist Lewis Tappan, which Klingberg and Abel-Henderson ‘had in mind to edit’. Tappan (1788–1873) had been a successful New York merchant, whose Mercantile Agency was to evolve into the well-known credit rating agency, Dun and Bradstreet. Lewis and his brother Arthur had been raised as devout Calvinists, and were among the founders of the American Anti-Slavery Society in 1833. But Lewis Tappan was perhaps best known for his involvement in the famous case surrounding the 1839 Amistad slave mutiny, and the two decades of correspondence to which Klingberg referred (held in the ASAPS archive at Denison House in London) began from this time. Sadly, Jameson’s advice was not recorded, but ‘The Tappan Papers’ first appeared in the April and July issues of the Journal of Negro History in 1927. The April issue of the journal also announced the forthcoming publication of the correspondence in a single volume, which appeared the same year under the main title A Sidelight on Anglo–American Relations 1839–1858, with the addition of a preface and a short conclusion. In the preface Abel-Henderson acknowledged the ‘generous research grant to the junior editor’ from the University of California, and described the work as ‘a joint contribution to the historical literature of Anglo-Saxon humanitarianism’. Following the dedication to their ‘great and inspiring teacher’ Frank Heywood Hodder the introduction—signed by both editors but written in Abel-Henderson’s inimitable, florid style—first gave a glowing report of the worldwide British efforts
in combating slavery and then briefly traced the history of Tappan’s own efforts in America.

The correspondence itself dealt with various issues such as the annexation of Texas, the coastal slave trade, the attitudinal stance of various churches towards slavery and, most importantly, how Britain could help America achieve its abolition. The letters often reflected various differences of opinion within both the American and British antislavery movements, but the references therein were usually so obscure that the editors found it necessary to include copious footnotes, which often comprised yet more correspondence. One letter, which—surprisingly, given Abel-Henderson’s historical interests—was not included in this volume, came from a financial contributor to ASAPS, who had written from Edinburgh in 1837:

I also sent you the Scotsman’s account of the United States war of extermination with ‘peaceful’ Indians goaded to fury by ill-usage. There is no chance for them with the ‘Christian’ Anglo-Saxon. The ‘peaceful’ ones are exterminated all the same as the ‘fierce Apaches’! I must say I prefer the fierce tribes; they perish at least with savage honour.  

The Tappan letters are of interest to the specialist in the history of the antislavery movement but are indeed, as the published title proclaimed, a sidelight. The correspondence ended abruptly in September 1858 and so, in their short conclusion to the book, the editors took the opportunity to make ‘a few general reflections upon the character of the period’.  They made particular note of those political, commercial, intellectual and humanitarian ties that bound the two nations and which had coloured Anglo–American relations prior to the American Civil War. They concluded the book with an extract from a speech given by a British parliamentarian in December 1861, not about slavery, but expressing the hope that America would not be forever divided by that conflict.

Since the Tappan letters had also touched upon the ‘legal and social position of the fugitive slaves in Upper Canada’, the work was briefly described in the Canadian Historical Review but without critical comment. Likewise, a review in the MVHR was merely descriptive although the reviewer did mention the ‘numerous and lengthy footnotes’. A commentator for the English Historical Review noted the warm admiration displayed by the editors for British reformers, drew out some of the more interesting points in the correspondence and considered the volume to be a ‘valuable
work … indispensable to an understanding of Anglo–American relations in the nineteenth century.’

In January 1927, the *Washington Historical Quarterly* (*WHQ*) had published some papers of General Benjamin Bonneville (1796–1878), who had explored the northern Rockies in the years 1831–35 and whose journal had formed the basis of Washington Irving’s fictional classic, *The Adventure of Captain Bonneville* (1837). Although not connected to the contents of Nicollet chest, the publication of these papers was of interest to Abel-Henderson since she herself held copies of two or three letters and reports relating to Bonneville, and in a letter to the *WHQ* editor explained how her friend and research associate the late Howard Hamblin had rediscovered the journal in the United States War Department archives. ‘Such Bonneville material as I did have copied and have been able to locate among the vast mass of historical transcripts that I possess I am sending to you …’ she wrote. This letter was published together with her copies of the Bonneville papers in the July 1927 issue of the *WHQ*.

Among that vast mass of historical transcripts was an explorer’s journal—yet another of the Nicollet texts—that was form to the basis of Abel-Henderson’s next book.

On Friday, July 14, 1837, a young Mandan Indian died of smallpox at Fort Clark, a major fur trading post along the Upper Missouri River. That individual’s death signalled the early stages of one of the most virulent, destructive, and disruptive epidemics known on the American continent. Before the disease burned out, the total death rate soared well into the tens of thousands. The Mandan tribal population dropped below the genetic survival threshold, the balance of power among Indian tribes in the upper West shifted as entire sub-bands disappeared, social structures and customs altered to meet tribal survival needs, and the widespread Upper Missouri trade system was disrupted. In the aftermath many Indian groups, whose hunter class had been too severely decimated to maintain food-obtaining capabilities, increased their dependence on trade goods and government annuities. Others, more nomadic and less damaged by the disease, moved farther westward into areas where game still could be procured. This polarization contributed to the conditions that led to a quarter-century of Indian wars.

So began Clyde Dollar’s 1970s account of the devastating epidemic that swept across the upper Midwest in the late 1830s. Dollar noted both the conclusions of late-nineteenth-century historians who blamed the epidemic on the American Fur Company, and a later view that traced its origins to a spurious account of a
deliberately infected blanket and claimed the epidemic to have been part of program of ‘premeditated Indian genocide’. Dollar contested both these views and, by combining a modern medical overview of smallpox and its epidemiology with contemporary accounts, forensically traced the source of the 1830s outbreak to two Indians who had picked up the disease in St Louis and who, as passengers on a steamboat, had brought it up the Missouri. His most cited primary source document for his own account was Abel-Henderson’s edition of Chardon’s Journal at Fort Clark, published in 1932.

The journal of the fur trader Francis Chardon, written during his sojourn at Fort Clark (in present-day South Dakota) between 1834 and 1839, is arguably the most significant of all the Nicollet texts. In her somewhat longwinded historical introduction, Abel-Henderson related how Chardon came to be at Fort Clark, beginning with an almost impenetrable account of the origins of the fur-trading concern known as the Upper Missouri Outfit. She then sought to reconstruct the details of Chardon’s involvement with the company, described the general milieu of remote frontier trading post life and made much of his several marriages to Indian women. She also made mention of the ‘fanciful’ view of the Mandans held by Jefferson (presumably based on the reports of Lewis and Clark) and the frontier painter George Catlin (1796–1872), both of whom held the tribe in some esteem because of their agricultural practices, which were seen as an advance towards civilisation. She compared these estimations with those of Chardon and others who had actually spent extended periods of time among the Mandans, and argued that:

In the long history of Indian wrongs, so seldom righted, there are tribes that are outstanding because high-minded in an Indian way, noble even by any standard, dignified, tenacious of what was justly their due, fierce if the occasion called for ferocity; but of none of these were the Mandans. Instead of standing alone, apart as it were, because superior to all or most, they really belong, not with the Cherokees, the Sioux, the Northern Cheyennes, and others like them, the proud, the valiant, the dauntless ones, but with their nearest neighbours, the rascally, the cowardly Arikaras and the lascivious Gros Ventres, to whom they, the Mandans, were not one whit superior … it was certainly not from [the traders] that the absurd notions respecting Mandan superiority to other Indians arose. They had discovered no reason for idealizing them. As agriculturalists even, the Mandans were not alone and peculiar. All their near neighbors were cultivators of the soil as were far distant tribes toward the east.

For white people, however, there is something of comfort to be found in the knowledge that the depravity of the upper Missouri tribes as it existed in Chardon’s time was not chargeable against civilization. They were, from all accounts, singularly temperate, not given, in the least, to drunkenness … The depravity of the upper Missouri was inherent. It was what was to have been
expected of their stage of development and that, being so, the unreality of many of
the preconceived notions about them is apparent.

But the knowing the truth about their character and degree of ascent upwards does
not preclude a genuine sympathy for them in the scourge that depleted their ranks
and well-nigh exterminated them—the small-pox epidemic of 1837.15

Abel-Henderson completed her introduction with short sketches of Chardon’s
later life, the attempts to impose a ‘Native Policy’ on the upper Missouri, and the
decline in the fur trade.16 She concluded with the observation that in 1834—the year
Chardon took up residence at Fort Clark—Protestant missionaries had begun their
proselytising among the Sioux on the upper Mississippi, whereas ‘the tribes of the
upper Missouri were to remain neglected by the agents of civilization for many a
long day yet’, and that the Upper Missouri Outfit ‘did nothing, anywhere, for the
evangelization of the aborigines it exploited’. Chardon’s journal was, therefore

reminiscent of a period that some profess to find romantic but that has positively
nothing to say for itself when considered from the standpoint of Indian
advancement. Rather did the white men … relapse into barbarism than do aught to
assist the red in emerging from it. Not the virtues but the vices of the superior race
were propagated and diffused … Who of us dares to say that, in the face of an
inevitable deterioration, physical, moral, and mental, coming to them from mere
contact with whites, the small-pox epidemic was the greatest calamity that could
have befallen the Mandans.17

To her introduction and to the Journal itself, Abel appended over five hundred
endnotes (covering more than a hundred and twenty pages) of the most minute and
precise details, most of which seemed to serve as a demonstration of the breadth of
her background research rather than to provide much illumination to the main
narrative. She also added ten appendices, most of only tangential interest though one
comprised a list naming the initial hundred and twenty Mandan victims.

Strangely enough, Abel-Henderson’s edition of Chardon’s Journal apparently
drew no critical comment. Perhaps this was because the smallpox epidemic was
already known through the account of the famous traveller and ornithologist John
James Audubon (1785–1851) who had heard about it from Chardon himself. The
historian Milo M Quaife had also published the journal in the MVHR, but with only
minor notation, just two years before Abel-Henderson’s more extensively annotated
version appeared.118
It all began, innocently enough, with a letter from Abel-Henderson in 1936 to Joseph Brandt, director of the University of Oklahoma Press (UOP), expressing her ‘favorable opinions’ of JS Kinney’s *Indian Land Administration*, which was then under consideration for publication. In reply, Brandt thanked her for her comments, not just on the Kinney manuscript but also for her generally favourable reviews of UOP’s publications, and hoped that the press might ‘have the honor in having you represented in our *The Civilization of the American Indian Series*’. Three weeks later, she replied that Brandt was:

very kind to express the wish that something of mine might be some day in that series. I wish I had something to offer you. I have a MS. on hand; but I’m afraid it isn’t like anything you have yet published. It is a translation of Pierre Tabeau’s narrative of an upper Missouri expedition made in the time of Lewis and Clark.

She explained that the manuscript had been translated by her sister Rose Abel Wright and prefaced with a historical introduction ‘of which I think I have reason to be quite proud. I spent a lot of time on it—the best part of two winters in Ottawa’. She further explained that publication in Canada had been cancelled because of the Depression, and the expense of printing both the French and a translation had also made it an unlikely proposition for an American publisher. Thus began a correspondence that was to continue until the end of 1940.

By December 1936, having again attempted to get the Tabeau narrative published in Canada, Abel-Henderson finally decided to submit her edition to the UOP. She again wrote to Brandt explaining how she had concluded from both internal evidence and that afforded by the Lewis and Clark journals that Tabeau was indeed the author of the unsigned original manuscript found in the Nicollet chest in 1915, that her sister had translated it in 1921 and, since her return from Australia, she had resumed editing it. ‘It has been a tremendous labor and I shall be relieved when the work is finally in print’, she wrote, adding that in Montreal she had come across a second version of the original manuscript, but written ‘by the same hand’.

In February 1937 she posted a draft copy of her own edition to UOP, hoping for a quick result. She wanted to add it to her list of publications as part of a forthcoming application for a further grant-in-aid from the Social Science Research Council, without which she could not continue to gather material on United States Indian Policy. However, in May, and still with no definitive reply from Brandt, she was
disquietened to receive news that a French-Canadian scholar was about to publish the results of his investigations into Tabeau’s voyages. These were based on the Montreal manuscript, which she felt lacked certain perspectives and so rendered it historically less valuable. She was also very anxious not to ‘let the results of years of [her own] labor be lost’.125

By July, Brandt was able to confirm that although there remained certain technical problems to be solved—particularly the plethora of footnotes—UOP’s own reviewers had praised her work highly and it had been recommended for publication.126 This news was not only greatly welcomed, it also mollified Abel-Henderson’s attitude towards the Canadians, who she thought might pip her at the publication post. ‘I want to be courteous toward the Canadian people’, she wrote to Brandt, although not without some self-justification, for they had ‘acknowledged generously all the favors I have shown them’.127 In September, she received an enquiry about the Tabeau narrative from a professor at Washington University in St Louis—an enquiry that she reiterated in a letter to Brandt the following month as evidence of a ‘lively interest in the matter’.128 His reply reflected the realities of the Depression, for ‘budget retrenchment’—which had left UOP ‘in the sad state of having too much work for the size of our staff and yet too large a staff for our income’—had caused publication delays.129

Over the next couple of months the correspondence between Abel-Henderson and UOP dealt mainly with contractual and technical matters, not the least of which was the elimination or condensation of some two hundred of the nearly six hundred footnotes that accompanied the historical introduction and the translated text of the manuscript. In early December Annie revealed, ‘in confidence’, that she had been invited to undertake research in New Zealand and that she was planning to leave the following autumn. She would not, however, undertake this trip until the Tabeau work was published, adding that the proofreading and indexing ‘I like to attend to myself’.130

By now, publication plans were well underway and although an interdepartmental memo proposed an ambitious edition of two thousand copies, a pencilled annotation suggested that ‘500 would be as many as the trade would take’.131 Then, just before Christmas 1937, came a potential setback. Believing that sales would be insufficient and that the material neither ‘seemed to fall within our
Indian Series’, nor have ‘little to do with our Southwest Indian situation’, University of Oklahoma president, WB Bizzell, expressed doubts to Brandt about the publication of the Tabeau manuscript. In a spirited defence, Brandt replied that he considered it to be ‘one of the most significant historical documents ever offered to the Press’. Furthermore, he had discussed it with the university’s historian Edward Everett Dale and with Abraham P Nasatir (an authority on Lewis and Clark), both of whom thought that once the bulky footnotes had been reduced ‘there would be a wide market for the book’. Brandt concluded by stating that:

Mrs Abel-Henderson is considered the foremost Indian historian of the country; and the Lewis and Clark association of Tabeau lifts the book into importance. In the light of this I think it would be a most serious mistake for the University not to publish the work.\[^{133}\]

Evidently, this sufficiently impressed Bizzell for, between Christmas and New Year, Brandt sent Abel-Henderson the publishing contracts. By February of 1938 she had returned the amended draft, but by May she still had received no word as to its progress. ‘I am wondering what can be the matter and am dreadfully afraid’, she wrote to Brandt. She also reminded him that she had undertaken to begin the New Zealand work later that year, and so was anxious to receive the galleyproofs in order to complete the proofreading and indexing. Brandt wrote back apologetically that although work on her book was in hand, the plant superintendent of some twenty-six years had suddenly died and that, coincidentally, Brandt himself had accepted the position of director at Princeton University Press.\[^{135}\]

Abel-Henderson must have eventually received the galleyproofs and returned them because Brandt’s successor, Savoie Lottinville, wrote to her in August with a request for her biographical details and to say that the book was ‘scheduled for publication in November’. In reply, she wrote that although very pleased at the prospect of this work finally appearing in print, she was still ‘anxious to know whether each copy of the proof, galley and page, will come to me. I always like to be sure that everything is as nearly accurate as vigilance can make it’. She further remarked that: ‘I have always made the index to any book I have written and shall be very willing to make the index for Tabeau’. About the question of her name, she had this to say:

I have adhered to my maiden-name in all my publications since my marriage except in the matter of book-reviews. I began to do this at the suggestion of Dr. Jamieson [sic], a suggestion that had its own appeal for me in addition to the
argument he made, which was to the effect that I had made my reputation under the name of Abel and it would be wise to continue to use it. Moreover Abel-Henderson is decidedly awkward. I use the hyphenated form only because most people know me as ‘Dr. Abel’, my old colleagues and students in particular. The name, ‘Henderson’ standing alone means absolutely nothing and does not distinguish me at all.138

By the end of August, the title of the book had finally been agreed upon and Lottinville advised her of the technical typographic details about which she professed ignorance. Further delays were brought about by numerous minor changes and errors in the text; she postponed her departure for New Zealand and yet, in February 1939 was still insisting on further minor changes and corrections. In spite of the fact that these delays were occasioned by her own perfectionism, at the end of March she wrote to Lottinville in desperation:

What has happened to Tabeau? I have been hoping daily for weeks and weeks to hear from you … and am beginning to fear, since no word comes, that something untoward has happened. Oh I hope not! Although I have my passport and am all expectancy with respect to my visit to New Zealand, I don’t like to depart until I see a copy …139

Within a few days, Lottinville replied that the delay was due to UOP being inundated with university work. He assured her, however, that the printing presses were about to run, that the copies would be sent to Chicago for binding and the whole process should take about three weeks from his date of writing. He ended by saying, ‘it is going to be a handsome volume and one of which both you and we may be proud’, adding in a postscript that the book would retail for three dollars a copy.140 She responded with relief that the delay was due not to ‘any mishap in the work itself’ and stated she had booked her New Zealand passage for 30 August, sailing on the SS Aorangi from Vancouver.

By April, the Tabeau work had still not appeared and yet, despite having been in close correspondence for three years, Abel-Henderson could still write to UOP to ask, ‘Would you care to see my Russian book when it is finished? It is the recollections of experiences of a Russian artillery officer in the White Army …’141 Lottinville replied that there were still production delays with Tabeau, but as far as the Russian book was concerned, he noted that there were ‘at least two excellent Russian scholars here on whom we could depend for any checking that you might require …’142
It still took a couple of months to finalise the jacket details of the Tabeau book, but meanwhile an expression of interest came from an unlikely source—Paramount Pictures. They had noted the March 1939 announcement of UOP’s intention to publish and would ‘appreciate your sending us a blurb or descriptive material …’ Perhaps envisioning a western epic in the making, Lottinville replied somewhat hopefully that the Tabeau book contained ‘a very human story of early-day exploration which might very well make it suitable for your purpose’.

Finally, on Monday 24 July 1939, Tabeau’s Narrative of Loisel’s Expedition to the Upper Missouri appeared in print. A week later Abel-Henderson wrote to her publisher:

I cannot begin to tell you adequately how immensely pleased I am—and I speak for my sister also—with this book. Its appearance is beautiful, I think. I have let several people see it and they, one and all, have been loud in their praises … I do thank you and all concerned most sincerely for what you have done and I hope, for your sake, it will be a financial success. I have never expected large returns for myself but I trust you will be more than reimbursed.

In the same letter she offered a copy of the manuscript of her Russian book, noting that she was intending to write the preface on board the Aorangi but, with the imminent threat of a war that would necessarily involve New Zealand, three weeks later she wrote that she ‘had been persuaded to defer her departure’. In this she was no doubt disappointed, but it at least would give her time to ‘finish comfortably my work on Russia’. She also wrote that she would be very happy for the University of Oklahoma to add her copy of the original Tabeau manuscript to their collection for she had had to ‘give away many things, books and maps particularly, collected through the years with difficulty and at greater or less expense, because I simply haven’t room for them’.

Although Tabeau’s Narrative was to be Annie Abel-Henderson’s last published book, it was in her preface that she related the origins of her historical interest and how that interest had developed. She wrote:

My personal interest in the North American Indians may be said to date from the time when, as a child in England, I revelled in The Three Trappers, Afar in the Forest, In the Far, Far, West, the very authors’ names of which I have forgotten or, what is more likely, never knew. They and others like them were the particular property of my brothers and, in the jealous fashion of children, their perusal, no doubt, permitted to me only as a rare privilege. A privilege in truth it must have been; for, in the years since, the interest that they, half fact, half fiction, aroused in me has never waned. On the contrary, the interest has never waned, inspiring the
seeking and reading of innumerable travel narratives that have been their successor.

Regardless of that interest, however, it was never my intention, originally, to undertake the editing of fur-trader journals. I had no wish to be diverted from the task I had already set myself; research into the treatment accorded aborigines by Anglo-Saxon peoples bent upon colonizing; but, having been prevailed upon by friends at the Indian Office to undertake the identification of the so-called Lewis and Clark itinerary map, it was futile to raise objections to the companion studies next presented, the Truteau, the Mackay, the Chardon and the Loisel-Tabeau.¹⁴⁸

She then explained the provenance of the two Tabeau manuscripts and how the present edition came to be published. She regarded her sister’s translation as ‘in a class by itself’, noted that it had been checked by other scholars and that, as well as the term ‘Savage’ (Fr. ‘Sauvage’) as the accepted French synonym for Indian, Tabeau’s spelling of Indian names had been retained.¹⁴⁹

In the long and, as was her wont, densely footnoted ‘Historical Introduction’, Abel-Henderson extemporised on the complex of personal and political connections between the European powers on the continent as they strove to control the fur trade through their various trading companies.¹⁵⁰ Indeed, she located Tabeau’s narrative at the centre of this complex, relating it to:

the old Spanish régime in Louisiana through Régis Loisel [Tabeau’s employer] who held a commission from Lieutenant-Governor Delassus; to the old French régime in Quebec through the French-Canadians who figure in its pages; to British North America through the occasional to the Hudson’s Bay and North West companies; and, finally, to the infant republic of the United States through it’s author’s contact with the explorers Meriwether Lewis and William Clark, it combines, in a way, all parts of the continent at the time of one of its most interesting stages, politically.¹⁵¹

The narrative itself is not at all political, but a collection of first-hand observations, sketches of the dangers of Missouri river navigation, the animals, birds, fish and fruit of the river region. The last and longest section described the ‘nations which roam over or inhabit the Upper Missouri’ in which Tabeau’s general antipathy towards Indians was very apparent.¹⁵² Abel-Henderson’s contribution here mirrored what she had added to Chardon’s Journal and consisted of nearly six hundred footnotes (some simply drawing attention to variations in the two manuscripts; others obtuse or obscure) and some appended documents concerning Tabeau’s life.

Only two weeks after publication, the Kansas City Times ran a headline article about the book, probably because Tabeau had travelled past the future site of that city. Largely descriptive of the narrative itself, the article offered no critique,
although it did note that the edition was the work of two sisters. The Minnesota historian Grace Lee Nute, writing for the *MVHR*, considered the narrative ‘an authentic description of Indians’ and remarked that it ‘had a complicated history’ of its own. She also noted that, despite the erroneous attribution of the document chest to Jean N Nicollet (rather than to Joseph), Abel-Henderson had ‘displayed a vast amount of erudition’, but Nute regretted that there was no French text and considered the translation to be lacking. On the other hand, Louise Phelps Kellogg (the first woman to win the Justin Winsor prize, three years before Abel-Henderson) thought the editing to have been ‘skillful’; however, in describing the provenance of the original documents, she also pointed out the Nicollet error. Abraham Nasatir, arguably the leading authority of the day on explorer history, considered the Tabeau work to be a highly valuable contribution to the genre, found the introduction to be masterly and had derived ‘genuine pleasure from this excellent volume’. He added that the historical introduction was written in a ‘charming style’, that the translator had caught the spirit of the original and that, overall, the work demonstrated the ‘exhaustive research so characteristic of Miss Abel’. Because of its ethnographic interest, the narrative was also described in academic journals outside of the discipline of history, but none carried any comment about the editorial work.

In 1941, in what would be her last published work apart from a couple of book reviews, Abel-Henderson complemented her editions of the Calhoun and Greiner journals with *Indian Affairs in New Mexico under the Administration of William Carr Lane*. This minor piece consisted of extracts of yet another journal, which she described as ‘no pretentious thing’, written not by Lane, who had succeeded James Calhoun as both territorial governor and superintendent of Indian affairs, but by an official, John Ward, who ‘was best remembered for a fairly full statistical account … of the Pueblo Indians’.

Book reviewing had become an important part of Abel-Henderson’s scholarly activity, especially after her college career had effectively come to an end and her first reviews after the Adelaide interlude appeared in the *AHR* of January 1925. These considered two histories of white settlement in Australia and of the first, Stephen Roberts’ *History of Australian Land Settlement 1788–1920*, she was positively exuberant in her praise: ‘A difficult subject handled most wonderfully
well!’ she wrote. She thought the illustrative material and documentation were excellent and that the footnotes both strengthened and elucidated the text. Of the second work, *The Foundation and Settlement of South Australia, 1829–1845* by Grenfell Price, she was more critical. Noting that the author was a descendent of a pioneer coastal surveyor, she criticised him for emphasising the Mediterranean character of South Australia above all else. She considered his views ‘frankly colonial’ and his ‘sympathies capitalistic’ and this had led him to ignore a great many aspects of settlement, in particular the treatment of aborigines. She also criticised his ‘occasional slovenliness of style’ and ‘lack of preciseness in citation’.

Abel-Henderson’s next critique appeared five years later and was remarkable in that it was the only book on South African history she ever reviewed, Ralph Kilpin’s *The Romance of a Colonial Parliament*. She thought it a courageous attempt at a popularisation of constitutional history, but criticised Kilpin’s tendency to ‘put an over-emphasis upon Dutch achievement and to slur, if not utterly to ignore British’. Nonetheless, despite these faults she considered the work to be interesting.

The following year she reviewed two further works on the history of Australia. The first was an edited translation by Henry Stevens of a report from a 1607 Spanish expedition to the East Indies that she considered a ‘veritable delight … because of the fine scholarship it display[ed] from the beginning to the end of the volume’. The expedition was compelled by bad weather to sail through the Torres Strait and led, according to the editor, ‘incidentally [to] the first definite discovery of Australia’. Yet, as Abel-Henderson quite correctly points out, this claim was based on the assumption ‘that the discovery of the islands in close proximity to a mainland is equivalent to the discovery of the latter’.

She noted that Edward Shann, in his *Economic History of Australia*, had devoted much space to immigration:

The intensity of feeling engendered, in turn, by the convict, the assisted immigrant, the Oriental, to say nothing of the warning found in the experience of other English speaking countries, has made the gradual development of a ‘White Australia’ policy altogether logical …

She remarked that although the work contained a wealth of information, cited reputable authorities, evinced good research and was of historical merit, it contained some glaring omissions, and lacked both dignity of style and ‘clarity of thought and expression’. She felt that any reader would soon tire of the indirect references and
come to resent all the ‘innuendoes and veiled criticisms which … prove to be somewhat pointless, trite or without occasion’. 164

Over the next four years, Abel-Henderson’s book reviews considered works of North American Indian history. She was scathing of Grant Foreman’s *A Traveler in Indian Territory*, which was based on the private journal of a United States army officer who had served in the West. She thought that the journal held more ethnological than historical interest and that the annotation ‘added little or nothing of importance to what was originally there’. In her opinion, this annotation was ‘anything but scholarly … ignoring of recognized authority … of slight value … badly arranged, superfluous and frequently lacking where most needed’. Being a recognised authority herself, she highlighted a few inaccuracies and concluded her review with the complaint that the indexing was ‘almost as bad as the annotating’. Despite all this criticism she did concede that the editor’s task had been difficult and in the end highly recommended the book. 165

Of Otto Frederikson’s *The Liquor Question Among the Indian Tribes in Kansas* she wrote that:

> it would be puerile to cavil at its title on the ground that it is inappropriate, lacking precision and simplicity. To apply the term *question* to Indian intemperance … in the red man’s country west of the Missouri … would have been absurd and impossible for many decades after 1804 … It is, forsooth, to carry back into that fairly remote past a phraseology having political significance born of the prohibition issue of today.

But, since it revealed federal government inadequacy in most aspects of Indian policy, she considered the book to be ‘an interesting and excellent piece of work’, but also felt that it could have been considerably enhanced by reference to western travel narratives. 166

In 1932 Alban Hoopes of the University of Philadelphia became the first to follow in Abel-Henderson’s pioneering footsteps by publishing a doctoral dissertation on United States Indian policy, which she reviewed early in 1934. *Indian Affairs and their Administration* covered the decade of the 1850s following the transfer of the OIA from the War Department to the newly created Department of the Interior in 1849, and made particular reference to Texas, the Southwest and the Oregon Territory. She considered the work to be ‘a very readable and connected narrative’ that handled the mass of detail in a ‘highly acceptable manner’, but took issue with the conclusion that the reservation system had its inception in California. 167
Two book reviews by Abel-Henderson appeared in the March 1934 issue of the *MVHR*. She was very critical of George Warren Hinman’s *The American Indian and Christian Missions* and wrote that:

> The reader must move lightly over the chapters that are marred more or less by unassimilated quoted material, sweeping generalizations, inaccuracies of detail, verbal repetition, superficial knowledge—even ignorance, and focus his attention upon those … that deal with subject matter interesting enough in itself to offset the glaring deficiencies that are everywhere apparent from the literary point of view.

About the only good thing she could say about the book was that the forceful policy of President Jackson and the peaceful policy of President Grant were well contrasted and noted that the final chapter held out the hope that ‘in realizing their own spiritual needs, the Indians will, at no distant day, themselves adequately supply them’.

It is difficult from Abel-Henderson’s review alone to know what to make of Frank Linderman’s *Red Mother*. Based on a series of interviews with a Sioux woman called Pretty-shield, the book idealises Indians and ‘leaves upon the reader the definite impression that Indian women were not mere “hewers of wood and drawers of water”’. Of Linderman himself, Abel-Henderson wrote that:

> were it not that his long acquaintance with the Indians—forty odd years —makes him virtually criticism-proof, one might legitimately wonder whether he has sufficiently … overcome the serious drawbacks that the Socratic method of inquiry is heir to … to make what he has transcribed the final word on any given subject. Readers who, having delved among old travel narratives, have come to know the Indians, men and women, as the first explorers knew them … would like nothing better than to feel justified in re-casting their views and in thinking the red folk the idealized beings that this author and his ilk have apparently found them.

Having extensively researched the history of the Canadian fur trade for both the Chardon and Tabeau narratives, Abel-Henderson considered the editing of *Five Fur Traders of the Northwest* by Charles M Gates to have been ‘first-rate’, the footnotes to have been ‘truly explanatory’ and that the Society of Colonial Dames was ‘to be congratulated for so greatly furthering the cause of historical research by adding to its list of assisted works this exceptionally good one’. On the other hand, she found John Bartlet Brebner’s *The Explorers of North America* to be ‘decidedly disappointing’. She drew attention to the fact that whereas the names of French explorers in North America were familiar to every schoolboy, English explorers had remained obscure and, though some recent scholarship had gone someway to rectify this situation, that could not be said for the work under review. Rather than providing a basis for ‘a right understanding of modern complex international relationships’, the
work tended ‘to enhance the glory of the Spaniards and … particularly the French’, and of the twenty-seven chapters, only ‘a meagre three’ were devoted to English explorers. Although Abel-Henderson considered the book to be ‘surprisingly free from errors of fact’, true to style, she could not resist pointing out a few.  

In her next review, of Ralph Greenlee Lounsbury’s *The British Fishery at Newfoundland, 1634–1763*, she wrote that it was a valuable economic study but argued that it showed ‘signs of haste or, one should say, of insufficient knowledge, which, because of the general excellence … of the book, the reviewer would fain ignore’. She regarded Grant Foreman’s *The Five Civilized Tribes* as ‘in some respects, unquestionably his best work’ and noted that although ‘the southern emigrant tribes had only in comparatively recent times been distinguished collectively as the *Five Civilized*, Foreman’s book revealed that such a designation would have been equally appropriate in the removal era. Abel-Henderson then warmed to the topic with which she was so familiar:  

With consummate skill the author has assembled his evidence. It is cumulative, drawn from a variety of sources, astonishing, unassailable. Reading it, weighing it, pondering over it, we are convinced, as never before, of the shocking injustice of the Jacksonian removal policy. Men, women and children of no matter what race, who had so incontestably proved their capacity for the white man’s vaunted civilization, ought never to have been disturbed, uprooted, despoiled; in order that that same white man’s land hunger and general cupidity might be satisfied.  

In 1934 Angie Debo, another historian who was to follow Abel-Henderson’s pioneering efforts in Indian history, published *The Rise and Fall of the Choctaw Republic*. In her review, Abel-Henderson noted that the first half of the book, which dealt with the early history of the Choctaws, made no claim to originality:  

It is a tale retold, but told, on the whole, surprisingly well … Taken in its entirety, the narrative is most illuminating and instructive and, to American national pride, not at all flattering. The book repays a very careful reading.  

*The Journal of Modern History* regularly published lists of recent works, and in their December 1936 edition called upon Abel-Henderson for a brief comment upon volume twenty-three of *Studies in American Church History*. She began her notice with a familiar theme:  

Did any lingering doubt exist that the Jesuits and members of other Roman Catholic orders were agents of empire … consciously working for the extension of French dominion in the New World at the same time that they were endeavoring to save the souls of the heathen, it would be dispelled completely by this dissertation.
Since the work did not ‘wholly exclude Huguenot … enterprises’, Abel-Henderson criticised the author for exceeding both the geographical and confessional limits of the title and for seeming to have ‘no clear idea as to what constitutes colonialism’. She further complained at the unfounded implication that the men dealt with in this work were ‘invariably ministering to the Indians’ and that by the seventh chapter ‘the red men are lost sight of altogether’.176

In 1936, as part of their Civilization of the American Indian Series, the UOP issued Cherokee Messenger by Althea Bass, the story of the Reverend Samuel Worcester, a missionary to the Cherokee for thirty-four years. In her review, most of Abel-Henderson’s remarks refer to Worcester himself, of whom she wrote that there was ‘no finer type of missionary’. Although she considered that the work ‘fully [upheld] the standard set by the best of its predecessors and [had] claim to literary merit well above the average’, she had little else to say beyond terse complaints about the lack of a bibliography and that the index was full, but unannotated.177

Over the following years, Abel-Henderson was invited once more to review books on Australian history and began with three works about the Reverend Samuel Marsden, one-time chaplain of the New South Wales penal settlement. She considered him to be:

hardly of the stuff of which missionaries proper are made. Had he been, he could not have failed to have sympathy for the Australian blacks, who were at his very door … and who were not only benighted but in grave danger of contamination because of close proximity to the convicts. The blacks Marsden rejected out of hand as hopeless, declaring them, without any attempt at their improvement, to be utterly destitute of a capacity for civilization.

She then turned to the works under review: The Letters and Journals of Samuel Marsden, 1765–1838 and Marsden’s Lieutenants by John Rawson Elder; and Marsden and the Missions: prelude to Waitangi by Eric Ramsden, which dealt with Marsden’s later missions to New Zealand and his attempts to convert the Maori. Abel-Henderson noted that either separately or in combination these three books were ‘greatly worth while’. They dealt, she wrote, with ‘the history of an organized attack on a native social system’, to which she added—somewhat curiously given her remarks about Marsden and the fact that she was planning a return visit to New Zealand—‘that time has justified the attack is beside the point’.178 At this time, Abel-Henderson also wrote a short review of the edited memoirs of Canon James Stack, another New Zealand missionary. She had little to say by way of critique of
the book, but much to say of the author, whom she considered was ‘a gentle, lovable, and truly great man’.179

Her experiences in Adelaide seemed not to have soured Abel-Henderson’s interest in the history of South Australia and she had long waited ‘for a full knowledge of the source material’ that derived from the housekeeper of the colony’s founder, Colonel William Light (1786–1839). His antecedents had always been clouded by a hint of scandal, and she was disappointed in MP Mayo’s *The Life and Letters of Col. William Light* because it had failed to clarify ‘whether or no Light’s mother was a rajah’s daughter and the island of Penang her dowry’.180

The year 1938 marked the hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the first colony in Australia and early in the following year Abel-Henderson wrote a short review of four narratives of Australian settlement: *The First Fleet* by Owen Rutter; *The Foundation of Australia, 1786–1800* by Eris O’Brien; *Phillip of Australia* by M Barnard Eldershaw and *Immigration into Eastern Australia, 1788–1851* by RB Madgwick. She considered that:

> Of all the means devised for doing honor to the New South Wales sesqui-centenary nothing could be finer in conception and in execution than the array of scholarly works [which were] from the point of view of research and historical scholarship generally … first class.181

It had been more than thirty years since Abel-Henderson’s first pioneering histories of Indian policies had appeared, so she was pleased to witness the development of an entire genre. At the end of 1938 she reviewed Morris Wardell’s *A Political History of the Cherokee Nation, 1838–1907*. She wrote:

> To one who undertook some of the earliest special studies of the relations subsisting between the United States government and the Five Civilised Tribes it cannot be anything but gratifying to see this succession of excellent tribal histories … Dr. Debo’s Choctaw was a fine piece of work, her Creek bids fair to be another, as Dr. Wardell’s Cherokee certainly is. It is a privilege to bear testimony to their merit.182

Nonetheless, she was critical of Wardell’s presumption of a new direction of Indian policy after the 1866 Fort Smith Council, and his antipathy towards the Cherokee chief John Ross. And, for a ‘book that so well tells the tale’, she could still pick out no less than ten minor blemishes, each carefully indicated by page number.

*Cherokee Cavaliers*, edited by Edward Everett Dale and Gaston Litton, comprised a set of letters originating from the leading families of that Cherokee
faction which had first agreed to the tribe’s removal and then joined the rebels in the Civil War. In her review, Abel-Henderson revealed how she regarded this faction by noting that the editors had ‘little that is derogatory to say of anything or anybody’. She further noted that a letter from Andrew Jackson that seemed to have advised retaliatory factional violence was ‘inserted without condemnatory comment’. She found some of the correspondence to be of little importance, especially those letters from the female members of the Watie and Boudinot families, and further complained at the lack of a bibliography and citation of authorities.

In the months prior to United States’ involvement in the Second World War, Abel-Henderson reviewed an edited translation of Tixier’s ‘Travels on the Osage Prairies’, a travel journal written by a young French doctor in the 1840s. She thought this ‘a prize indeed’ and made particular mention of the description of life in an Osage village, which was the most complete for the period. Similarly, for Ralph Hedrick Ogle’s Federal Control of the Western Apaches, 1848–1886, Abel-Henderson had nothing but praise. The work covered the period from the Mexican War until the capture of the renowned Apache chief Geronimo in 1886 and was, in her words, ‘a treatise on United States–Indian relations, scholarly in the highest degree’. She particularly praised the author’s exploration of ‘every possible avenue of information’ and although a few white men had resisted the ‘relentless war even to the point of extermination’, she considered that defeat of the Apaches was inevitable and that the end of the long struggle ‘must have brought relief to conquered and conqueror alike’.

Of Loring Benson Priest’s Uncle Sam’s Stepchildren, her last book review until after the Second World War, Abel-Henderson was particularly scathing:

Being somewhat of a pioneer among those who have, through the years, made a special study of the political and economic fortunes of the North American Indians and therefore rather well acquainted with the subject, I feel compelled, in the interests of historical truth, to take strong exception to the first paragraph of the preface … and the first section of the opening chapter entitled ‘Concentration’. I take exception because there is scarcely an idea expressed or implication conveyed that squares with the facts … The half-truths and the faulty deductions are even more numerous than the downright errors; but altogether they are grossly misleading and, if not deliberately so, must be presumed to indicate that the knowledge behind them is neither broad nor deep.

Having let go this devastating broadside, she then conceded that these and other passages detracted from what she considered to be overall ‘a quite meritorious piece
of constructive work’. The author had skilfully handled his sources but had given no bibliography and his annotations were mere citations, which was ‘all very well if a reader … be within reach of a library like the Congressional’. The work was subtitled *The Reformation of United States Policy 1865–1887*, and Abel-Henderson considered that ‘in view of all the harm wrought by the Dawes Act, the misery, the fraud, the shameful corruption, it is a misreading of history to think of it or anything that led up to it as a *reformation* of the United States Indian policy’.

Sometime in late 1938, the president of Washington State College, EO Holland, wrote to Annie Abel-Henderson from the Pullman campus in eastern Washington suggesting the establishment of a ‘Friends of the Library’ group and asking her to serve on its advisory committee. At the end of the year, she responded very positively and considered it a great honour to be asked to serve in such a capacity. She regretted however that:

> circumstances might prevent my being very active if I accept membership, because, just as soon as I am free and if a European war does not prevent or make inadvisable, I am going to New Zealand to be gone a full twelve months. I have been asked to examine a collection of private papers there.

She also made mention of the Tabeau book, which was about to be published, and offered to the library her notes and transcripts from the OIA concerning Indians in California. In late January she again wrote to Holland notifying him that she had posted her private copies of *Slaveholding Indians* to the college library and that she also intended to donate a portfolio of Australian Eucalypti. This was a set of exquisitely drawn lithographs which had been presented to her during her stay in Adelaide by Thomas Gill, a member of the South Australian Branch of the Royal Geographical Society, and ‘represented by him to be rather valuable because very rare’. Abel-Henderson thought Holland might like it for his ‘Treasure Room’, for as a folio edition she found it unwieldy and felt that it would be of more use in the library.

In reply to an enquiry by Holland, she then went on to explain how the California Indian transcripts came to be made. In December 1906 she had been at the AHA annual meeting at Providence, Rhode Island, to be presented with the Justin Winsor Prize for her doctoral dissertation. On her way back to Baltimore and at the urging of her Yale professor George Burton Adams, she had called in to visit her
other professor, the ailing Edward Gaylord Bourne who ‘lay very ill, ill unto death, as it proved’. He wished to congratulate her on winning the prize, and during their conversation had mentioned his latest work, *Spain in America*, and suggested that she ‘might find it exceedingly interesting to look into the matter of American treatment of the California Indians who had come under the tutelage of the Mission System’.190

That same spring I began to act upon his suggestion. Every week-end (Fridays and Saturdays) I spent in Washington D.C., at the Indian Office, and, finding that the California files had, as yet, never been examined by the research worker, I proceeded to have transcripts made of them. My youngest sister joined me and did most of the typewriting …191

She went on to explain that she had always intended to fulfil Bourne’s suggestion but was unable to find a publisher. The Bureau of Ethnology at the Smithsonian Institution had kept her transcripts for many months but would only publish them on the condition that ‘every reference to political affairs was … omitted’. This she refused to do ‘because after, all, my interest was historical rather than ethnological’.192 She never again found the opportunity to work on the California transcripts because at the time she was living on the eastern seaboard and had ‘little acquaintance with Pacific coast affairs’.193 She then went on to reiterate a favourite complaint, the sad condition of the OIA files in the early part the century and how, ‘under Executive Order of President Wilson’, she had held ‘the unique post of Historian of the Indian Office’.194

In conclusion, she wrote that she was still awaiting publication of the Tabeau manuscript and also offered to obtain anything of interest for the library during her forthcoming trip to New Zealand. Holland had obviously sent her some money to cover any such purchases, for she later wrote to him expressing embarrassment at receiving it since she was still unsure of her departure date. ‘However,’ she assured him, ‘I really am going and the money you sent is safe enough with me’.195

Later that month the Hoquiam *Washingtonian* reported:

One of the most unusual gifts received recently by the state college of Washington library is a collection of material on Australia, presented by Dr. Annie Heloise Abel-Henderson …196

The report made special mention of *The Forest Flora of South Australia*, the portfolio that had been presented to her in Adelaide, as well as the special editions of Australian newspapers containing ‘a wealth of information on the natives, resources
and history of Australia’. In citing the opinion of Herman Deutsch of the college’s history department, who ‘classed Dr. Henderson as one of the ablest women historians in this country’, the report also claimed that she had done ‘considerable research on the habits of primitive peoples’, that she was shortly to leave for a year’s study in New Zealand and that her gift was ‘the second to the library in recent weeks’.

By April 1939 she had her passport and had booked her passage for the end of August; but it wasn’t until the last day of July that the Tabeau book finally made its appearance and events in Europe were moving towards war. In October, Abel-Henderson wrote to Holland informing him that because of the outbreak of hostilities her trip to New Zealand had been postponed indefinitely, and although she had not yet asked for a refund of her fare (she had paid in full for a round-trip ticket) she was beginning to despair about ever going. She then added: ‘My personal disappointments, however, are as nothing compared with the awful situation that occasions them’.

Holland replied, suggesting the establishment of a winter history seminar at the college, at which she was delighted and proposed, not surprisingly, that the seminar be on ‘Native policy—say, British Colonisation with an emphasis upon the treatment of aboriginal folk or the United States Indian Policy as a phase of the American Westward Movement’. In fact, she was unable to attend in person because of a previous commitment to a meeting of the Pacific Coast branch of the AHA where she was to present a paper entitled, ‘Removal as a Phase of Canadian Indian Policy’. She also mentioned that she would hold onto her New Zealand tickets in the hope that the course of the war would still make it possible for her to go.

Annie Abel-Henderson never did get to go to New Zealand a second time and it is not known whether or not she participated in the winter seminar. America was not to enter the war until the end of 1941, by which time Britain was under siege from both U-boats and bombardment from the Luftwaffe. Her Anglo-Saxonism, which had informed so much of her outlook in her historical writings, now took on a practical aspect. She joined the Daughters of the British Empire (DBE)—an organisation of women of British descent who wished not only to maintain links with the mother country but who, particularly in this perilous time, rallied to her aid by actively supporting the British-American War Relief Association. In Aberdeen,
Annie Heloise Abel-Henderson
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Abel-Henderson founded the Margaret Tudor branch and for two years she was the DBE’s Washington State regent. On 12 September 1946, in recognition of her efforts, she became one of fifty-five Washingtonians to be presented with the King’s Medal for Service in the Cause of Freedom by Lord Inverchapel, the British ambassador to the United States. According to the *Aberdeen Daily World*, this was ‘the second honor bestowed on Dr Henderson for her service during the war’.201

At the end of that month the Washington State College librarian, writing in acknowledgement of her taking out life membership of the Friends of the Library, wished Abel-Henderson well after a recent spell in hospital.202 A few days later she wrote to Holland that her strength was ‘a very uncertain quantity these days [and] has not been any too great for several days past’. She thanked him for sending her a copy of *Mary Richardson Walker: her book* by Ruth Kerr McKee, noting that ‘missionary work among aboriginal folk always had for me a far more than ordinary interest’. She also wrote that she was ‘seeking a way to safeguard the notes I took when holding the … Alice Freeman Palmer Travelling Fellowship’, explaining that she had hoped to work on these notes herself, ‘but the war and various other circumstances interrupted my labors and now my health puts a practical end to everything’. Having already donated some books on United States and British history to the University of British Columbia, whose ‘student body has grown to a fantastic size’ and yet whose ‘library facilities are very, very limited’, she now offered her Australian and New Zealand books to the library at Pullman. ‘As soon as the weather permits, I shall cross over to my wee study in a detached building to pack a few rare books for your treasury’, she wrote, adding in a postscript: ‘What wouldn’t I give to be able to come to Pullman as in other days; but my health isn’t equal to travelling’.203

For some years, ever since her planned second trip to New Zealand, she had been attempting to clear her study, but by January 1947 she was finally putting her affairs in order. In her last letter to Holland she wrote that she had willed to the college all her manuscripts, notes, notebooks, pamphlets and books and anything else having to do with her historical studies, ‘particularly those having to do with phases of British Native Policy’.204 She also left:

anything I have on U.S. Indian Affairs, likewise everything in my study … on a Russian matter … the Memoirs, so to speak, of Major Makarenko, head of the Cohasset Riding Academy. He was with the White Army and for reasons connected with the safety of relatives yet in Russia wished his name not to be used. He is yet alive and may no longer insist on anonymity.205
Holland replied to this letter, but it was left to her sister Rose to respond: ‘Your letter of the 15th of January … has been read to her but because of her very serious illness no discussion could follow … I am sorry to write that there is no hope for her recovery’. At the beginning of February Annie Abel was admitted to St Joseph’s hospital in Aberdeen, and a month later, Rose again wrote to Holland:

My sisters and I … sit by her bedside for many hours and do many things that are so necessary. She suffers no pain but then she is under the influence of drugs and as uremia has started, we hope she will be spared the terrible pain that cancer brings … her mind often wanders …

On Friday 14 March 1947 at 8.25 pm, just twenty-four days after her 74th birthday, Annie Heloise Abel-Henderson died. She had suffered from cancer for some time and her death certificate recorded the proximate cause for her demise as a hemorrhage of the femoral artery brought on by the disease. Her death was reported in many of the local newspapers and when the news reached the Laessig family, former neighbours of the Abels in far away Kansas, the Salina Journal published a short obituary. On the Monday 17 March, the rector of St Andrew’s Episcopal church officiated at a private funeral service in Aberdeen. The cortege then drove the ten miles to the Montesano cemetery where her remains were laid to rest alongside those of her parents.
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