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Abstract

Stereotyping based on misrepresentations of American Indian Peoples is still a common occurrence. To combat such a view, this study examines representations of the Osage tribe that are found in history and anthropology text written about them, as well as, museum exhibits between 1960 and 2010. I want to determine if certain themes stand out through the examination of a collection of Osage materials that are not as apparent with reviews of individual works. The study also attempts to identify the source of some misrepresentation of the Osage through an examination of primary source materials used by the authors. Through the examination of source material I hope to find possible origins of the misrepresentations of the Osage tribe. After coding descriptive passages in the Osage texts, themes were revealed by looking at the collective work. Many of which are the result of the text emphasizing a particular period of Osage history. The primary data sources showed an overreliance on non-Osage sources for descriptions of the Osage People which gave biased representations.
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Chapter 1

Introduction
Introduction

My study examines the representations of the Wa.zha.zhe (pronounced Wah-zhah-zhay), or the People more familiarly known as the Osage, in previous anthropological and historical research as well as museum exhibits. It examines the stereotypical themes related to representations that are not apparent in the examination of individual works on the Wa.zha.zhe People. A number of texts and ethnographies exist about the tribes’ history and culture. Individual reviews already exist on many of the books that I used as part of my research; however, no research currently exists that examines those works collectively. An overreliance on outdated descriptions of the Wa.zha.zhe found in primary data sources, such as journals, letters, and government documents, contributed to misrepresentations of contemporary Wa.zha.zhe People and, through overgeneralization, stereotypes of other American Indians (Berkhofer 26-27; Ward 6). My preliminary study revealed a gap in the progression of events and societal changes leading to how the Wa.zha.zhe People arrived at their present state of affairs. There is seems to be a large gap in Wa.zha.zhe history over the last 100 years. An examination of the literature on the Wa.zha.zhe People may determine whether misrepresentations in the historical and anthropological texts and museum exhibits are the result of outdated descriptions of the Wa.zha.zhe.

Outline of the study

My thesis consists of six chapters. The first chapter incorporates the introduction to my topic and my research question. I continue in Chapter Two with background information on how the disciplines of history, anthropology, and museum studies deal with American Indians. A review of the literature framing American Indian representations within each discipline follows. Chapter Two concludes with the impact the study adds to the scholarship of Indigenous Studies,
History, Anthropology, and Museum Studies. Chapter Three begins with descriptions of the materials and museums that I used for my data. Chapter Four describes the methods I used to retrieve the data from the text and analyze it. I describe the results of what I found during analysis in Chapter Five. In Chapter Six I conclude by describing how the results I found answered my initial research question, and what impact those answers have on the fields of Indigenous Studies, History, Anthropology, and Museum Studies. I then conclude with additional questions that the study has brought forth, as well as, suggestions for future topics of study concerning the Wa.zha.zhe People.

**Importance**

The main reason I chose to examine the literature on the Wa.zha.zhe is that I am a descendant. I say “descendant” because I am not an enrolled citizen of the Osage Nation. Family history from older family members report my great grandmother is Wa.zha.zhe, but paper records are sketchy. She was born in 1872, during a time of great change and transition in the tribe. In any case, I have always been interested in my family history. I have read a variety of books and articles about the Wa.zha.zhe People as a child, and in doing so I developed my own stereotypes about the Wa.zha.zhe. As I grew older and met more Wa.zha.zhe people, many of those stereotypes proved false. While my views changed, the information in the books that I read remained the same. I was an urban Indian, who grew up around other Indians; if I had misconceptions, what were non-Natives thinking? Generally, most students are not going to seek out social interaction with Wa.zha.zhe people as part of their research. The average high school student who is curious about the Wa.zha.zhe or just writing a paper for a class project is not likely to travel to Pawhuska, Gray Horse, or Hominy districts in Oklahoma and get to know the
Wa.zha.zhe there. They aren’t going to go to I’n.lon.schka (a Wa.zha.zhe ceremonial dance), powwows, or hand games.

I have wondered how the inaccurate ideas about American Indians are formed. I talked to elementary, middle, and high school classrooms for nearly 25 years about the American Indian history around St. Louis, Missouri. I heard some interesting questions from my audiences about American Indians, the Wa.zha.zhe, or my family. Not all the questions were from the students either. Many of the questions from the adults begin with; “Well I read somewhere that…” and I begin to cringe. These types of questions lead me to believe there is a significant amount of information about American Indians that is outdated, inaccurate, or completely false. There has been so much written about or by American Indians in general (a Google search on Oct. 26, 2012 revealed 97,400,000 search results) it would be impossible to look at all of them. So I chose to begin to seek the answers to my research question with the tribe I was most familiar with and feel the most passionately about, the Wa.zha.zhe. Growing up away from most of the Wa.zha.zhe People, I found it difficult to access information, especially when it came to present day Wa.zha.zhe.

Discrepancies exist in the scholarship I use for my literature review and the writings about the Wa.zha.zhe that I used for my data concerning the capitalization of certain words. Throughout the study I capitalize “People(s)” when referring to a large group that shares common origins and or culture. Authors use a variety of terms to describe North American Indigenous populations; therefore, I want to clarify my use of terminology. For the purpose of this study I will use “Indian”, “American Indian”, “Native”, “Native American”, “Native People” and “North American Indigenous’ interchangeably throughout the paper. Conversely, I will use “non-Indian” and “non-Native” to describe those whose ancestors are not Indigenous to North
America. The word “Osage” is used by museums, anthropologists, and historians to describe the people who refer to themselves as Wa.zha.zhe, the Name Givers or Ni.U.kon.ska, Children of the Middle Waters (an older term the Wa.zha.zhe once used to describe themselves) (Burns xiii; Mathews 31, 46). I will use Wa.zha.zhe from this point forward to refer to the tribe and its citizens as it is the preferred term of the Wa.zha.zhe People (Osage Nation). Everyone else falls under the category of “non-Wa.zha.zhe”, including other Indigenous North American Peoples.

A practice worth noting is the Wa.zha.zhe use of the period (.). The Wa.zha.zhe separate syllables of Wa.zha.zhe words with periods (.), instead of hyphens (-) (Osage Nation Language Website). Hyphenation between syllables is common practice for scholars studying American Indian languages when writing or spelling words. It is practice unfamiliar to most scholars and I have been questioned on my use of periods in the past. I employ the Wa.zha.zhe method for writing Wa.zha.zhe words with the exception of their use within direct quotes where the author may have used hyphens to separate the syllables, which is common in historical and anthropological text. Because I am writing about representations of the Wa.zha.zhe, I will regard the proper use of the Wa.zha.zhe language that is used by the Wa.zha.zhe People.

Research questions

My research question asks: How do historical and anthropological texts written between 1960 and 2010 and current museum exhibits differ in the ways in which they present the Wa.zha.zhe People? As I answer my question I will be addressing the origin of certain stereotypes about the Wa.zha.zhe people. The examination of stereotypes serves as a tool for the understanding of representations (P.Deloria 8). Stereotypes are useful in that they allow us to view the effects of representations. According to Phillip Deloria, stereotype originally referred to printing plates used in the printing industry for the reproduction of indistinguishable images,
just like Indians are viewed as “exactly alike” (8). Robert Berkhofer defines stereotypes as “any image we today no longer find accurate in light of our knowledge.” Berkhofer goes on to define image as the literal, even pictorial, representation people had of the Indian in their minds (xvii). I will use stereotypes as a tool for examining the generic representations and images used to describe groups of people in this case the Wa.zha.zhe. To do this I chose three academic fields that seem to provide us with representations on the Wa.zha.zhe People.

I chose the disciplines of History, Anthropology, and Museum Studies for the close relationship and influence that each has with the others. Richard King states that History and Anthropology intersect in museum exhibits and “sanction the appropriation and naming of difference”(5). Conversely, museums often employ historians and anthropologists to manage their collections. I focused my study on a particular tribe and time period within the three fields of scholarship that claim authority over American Indian knowledge (Biolosi and Zimmerman 65, 211; Deloria 213; PC. Smith 27; Martin 104; Ward 4-6; Watkins 275). Anthropological and historical texts, and museum exhibits seem to be the main sources of information that students at many academic levels rely upon when they want to learn about a People of other cultures. In some cases such descriptions leave readers with out-of-date images of the Wa.zha.zhe People and, because of the tendency to overgeneralize, other American Indians as well (Berkhofer 26-27; Ward 6). Non-Natives tend to appropriate knowledge about one tribe and inappropriately extrapolate that knowledge to other American Indian Peoples. Wa.zha.zhe writers have used some of these sources as well, but they also look to Wa.zha.zhe elders and others knowledgeable about their history and culture to confirm their findings and bring them up to speed on more current issues. A majority of readers do not seek such confirmations and are often left only with
images of the Wa.zha.zhe; while the information may be accurate, overgeneralization can lead to misrepresentation.
Chapter 2

Framing the Discussion
Literature Review

The literature presented in this section is the contextualizing literature for my study, not that on the Wa.zha.zhe from which I will gather the data. Misrepresentation and overgeneralization are major problems with the study of American Indian Peoples, beginning with the terminology used. Even as I write, I am forced to use the same false references to a mythic “American Indian” identity because that is how a majority of the discussions on American Indian groups are framed. “In fact, it can be argued that no character in the pantheon of American historical figures has been cast and recast, interpreted, reinterpreted, and misinterpreted more frequently than the American Indian (Flavin 1).” The overgeneralization of American Indians ignores the diversity of American Indian People that leads to their misrepresentation (Almeida 5; Berkhofer 3,5; Ward 6). Misrepresentation often ignores the fact that many groups of American Indian Peoples existed and still exist to this day. That is why in Indigenous Studies we use the term *Peoples* with an (s) instead of *People*. At the core of the issue is that the concept of *Indianness* does not really exist (Deloria 265). No such group ever existed until non-Natives made it up. At present we can say that the diversity of American Indian Peoples is recognized by a majority of Americans…but can we?

Scholars have produced a lot of research addressing American Indian stereotypes in general. Studies have examined American Indians in the movies, media, and textbooks. There are even entire databases devoted to the discussion of American Indian Mascots (American Indian Stereotypes, Native Americans Movies). While some sources proved more useful to this study than others, the topic of American Indian stereotypes has been thoroughly examined. In each case, studies were about general American Indian stereotypes. To protect the integrity of
my study design, I focus my analysis on a particular Native group, but some discussion of
general stereotyping is in order.

The misrepresentation of American Indians had recently reared its ugly head. Within the
past year, Abercrombie & Fitch, Victoria’s Secret, and the rock band No Doubt have all been in
the headlines for misrepresenting American Indian Peoples. Recent news stories and comments
left by online readers about the misrepresentation of American Indian Peoples attest to the
perpetuation of generalized images of American Indians (Berkhofer 26; Ward 6). After 500 years
of contact, stereotyping of American Indians still occurs (Deschowitz; Lewis). Despite
recognition of diversity amongst American Indian Peoples, parts of society still tend to
overgeneralize them.

Stereotyping is not only an external issue for Native People. Native stereotyping can also
come from other Indians. Some American Indians internalize the stereotypes placed on them by
non-Indians. Due to embedded colonial discourse that exists within anthropology and history,
many American Indians have bought into the stereotypes about them causing some American
Indians to “act out” their stereotypes (Berkhofer 195; King 10; Martin 104; PC. Smith 168;
Shulman 2; Ward 104). During my employment at Haskell Indian Nations University, I saw
many students that act and dress in certain ways because that is what is expected. For those
students who do not fit the mold of how Native People are supposed to look, acting a certain way
is not enough. I see many students living the stereotypes imposed on them by non-Natives
which helps perpetuate the overgeneralization of Native people and insults the traditions of their
respective tribes (PC. Smith 27; Welch 26). Natives that act and dress in a stereotypical fashion
help assert non- Native stereotypes about American Indian People. So how are these
misrepresentations about American Indians perpetuated?
An examination of how Anthropology, History, and Museum studies position themselves within the American Indian conversation may give us an answer. By reviewing the attitudes that scholars brought with them in their approach to the study of American Indians we can trace how authority over American Indian representations was taken. The manner in which information is collected and presented or in some cases not collected or not presented by scholars determines American Indian identities and how they are discussed (Biolosi and Zimmerman 5; C. Smith 2; King 5). What information scholars have recorded or deem important dictates how others view American Indians through control of information. Authority over American Indian representations has been discussed and contested in all three disciplines (Deloria 82; King 17; PC. Shulman 1; Smith 27; Ward 6; Watkins 275). Anthropologists, historians, and museums are positioned between American Indians and a majority of the general public. They are considered to “know about Indians” by most people due to the fact that they know more than the people who they are informing. In the case of historians and anthropologists, they supposedly know more than their students; museums supposedly possess more knowledge than their visitors.

Despite the conceived positions of authority in some disciplines, the academy is not exempt from misrepresenting American Indian Peoples. Scholars come with their own sets of preconceived notions about American Indians. Due to ingrained beliefs about American Indian Peoples, there are professors whose classroom lectures still deliver outdated and incorrect descriptions of American Indian cultures and practices (Biolosi and Zimmerman 211; Ward 3). Misrepresentations about American Indian are often passed down as fact from professor to students leading to the formation of stereotypes. In addition, as professors discuss American Indian cultures, religions, and world views in their classrooms, they often do so in colonial and imperialist terms, placing American Indians in a “conceptual prison” (Deloria 93; King 104;
Welch 28). Examining Native Peoples through a single lens limits the discussion of American Indian topics to a one-sided Western approach and eliminates the objectivity desired by scholars.

**History**

What is History and should it not remain the same? Everyone is familiar with the term that applies to something in the past, but what does it mean to study history? Historians examine the relationships in a series of events. The way historians interpret the past may change either through new theories, new scholars entering the field, and the effects of popular belief by society (Flavin 1, 11). “A history is all about who is telling the stories and to whom the storyteller is speaking, and how both understand their present circumstances (P.C. Smith 53).” There are a variety of influences on the way we view history. This has lead some American Indians to challenge the histories written about them, especially the ways they have been presented.

The portrayal of American Indian Peoples in history scholarship, course texts, and other popular works of history leads to stereotypes of who American Indians are today. American Indian people are often judged by how close they resemble the images of their pasts (Deloria 82; PC. Smith 27). Historians in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries often have to rely on written accounts from the 18th and 19th centuries for their descriptions (Fixico 14,74; Flavin 2; Martin 104; Digital Library Okstate-19th Century Representations). The biased accounts from pioneers, soldiers, traders, or government officials are useful, but offer one sided opinions of American Indians from the very people who were often at odds with tribes (Fixico 14; Flavin 2; Martin 104). Non-Native accounts of the tumultuous relationships between early Whites and American Indians are often littered with the racist ideologies of their times. The 18th century writer, James Fenimore Cooper, while not a historian, had little experience with American Indians and relied...
on the historic accounts of White writers for his source material on American Indian descriptions (Digital Library OkState-19th Century Representations). Cooper’s work exemplifies how inaccurate historic misrepresentations of American Indians can influence other areas of society. As outdated images get recycled in other works they reinforce past stereotypes of American Indian Peoples and can create new ones. Such as the Victoria’s Secret model dressed in an eagle feather headdress combined with a Navajo necklace for the month of November in its Fall 2012 Fashion show.

Some historians have relied heavily on biased accounts while others have not included American Indian viewpoints. Don Fixico claims most academic historians have ignored American Indians’ views of past events; writing history with only a portion of the information. Fixico further suggests that if any other discipline ignored half the information on their subject, they would be accused of sloppy scholarship (101). Such bias in the choice of data sources historians use leaves the general public with a mere portion of American history. Dominant society has treated American Indians as a kind of appendage to the main story of American history (Parman 10). Although more recent works have done a better job including American Indian points of view, there remains little inclusion of American Indian societies prior to the arrival of Whites or after they were put on reservations (Almeida 5; Berkofer 29; Martin 36; Parman 14). Exclusion of American Indians in the rest of the history of American has turned American Indian history into a sidebar of White history. As a result, American Indian history in essence became merely an account of American Indian and White interactions.

Much of American Indian history that is available today is written by White scholars and only chronicles White history in relation to American Indian Peoples. Until recently, American Indian history was not recognized due to it being an oral history. American Indian thought
worlds were ignored by historians for the most part as White historians continued to focus on the significance of Indian-White relations (Fixico 101; Martin 27-28). “Indian-white history thus becomes white history because it expresses our or our forbears’ perception of reality (Martin 33).” The exclusion of American Indian voices in the writing of American history has led to a history that does not serve all American, but only Whites (Calloway 129; P. Deloria 11). Even though historians refer to “Indian history” such works only examined how the U.S. was formed and how Indians were a problem as the country grew. In essence it is a history of colonialism rather than the history of Indigenous Peoples.

**Anthropology**

History is not the only discipline that has shown bias in its study of American Indians; anthropology has its share of issues with the study of American Indians as well. Compared to the study of history, the discipline of Anthropology is rather young. Anthropology emerged as a discipline sometime in the 19th century. Since its inception it seems the preferred method by academics in the study of human cultures, especially when it comes to American Indians. Societies around the world have had their fair share of bad things happen to them, “but Indians have been cursed above other people in history. Indians have anthropologists (V. Deloria 78).” As a young discipline anthropology was complete with its mistakes early on. This is not unusual anytime new methodologies are being formed; it takes a while to work out the kinks. Unfortunately, many of these were made in studies involving American Indian Peoples.

Anthropologists and American Indian Peoples have had tumultuous relationships in the past. Early anthropologists, like early missionaries, came with a message of friendship and help, yet conducted themselves in very unethical ways. As American Indians were forced onto reservations in the mid-19th century; the U.S. government and museums sent anthropologists to
record what they thought were vanishing lifestyles (Berkhofer 30; D. King 26; Fixico 76). The vanishing Indian was a popular American Indian stereotype during the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Even though the government had sent the Indians to reservations, public outcry emerged from sympathetic Whites in the east who wanted to capture “the vanishing American Indian lifestyle” before their lives were changed by reservation living. Compared to the vast amount of research and misreporting conducted by early anthropologists, death by cavalry was at least quick, but the lasting effects of early anthropological reports are considered a slow, painful death by some American Indian people (Deloria 81). Many early anthropologists manipulated their findings to support what they thought the government and Whites in the east wanted to hear. Early Indian policies, some still practiced today, were influenced by those early ethnographic reports. Anthropologists managed to capture a large amount of information on the tribes they studied; however, a lot of important information on American Indian cultures is lost.

Much of the knowledge concerning American Indian women and children is lost as a result of the biased studies conducted by anthropologists in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Fixico believes that “Early researchers interested in Indians usually overlooked Native American females (43).” The amount of past information available on American Indian women is significantly less than the amount of information available on men. “Equally daunting is the task of determining what sort of impact gender and perceptions of gender may have had on shaping Native societies and interaction between Natives and non-Natives (Fixico 73).” Because anthropological studies were primarily conducted by White males, the behaviors they studied were primarily that of men. A shortage of female anthropologists during the reservation period only complicated the matter. Not all is lost, however, because American Indians have retained their own cultures, but anthropologists have been reluctant to listen.
The field of anthropology has not been very welcoming to American Indians or what American Indians know about themselves. American Indians who are knowledgeable about their own cultures and histories challenge the authority over American Indian representations that anthropology has claimed. Biolosi and Zimmerman argue that Indians, even those who are trained in anthropology, cannot be trusted to be objective, analytical, or to understand what is happening in their own communities. They go on to state that; Anthropology determined that it is more valuable and scholarly to have non-Native anthropologists study Indians (211). The message Anthropology has sent to American Indians is that the disciple considers it more acceptable to be “objective” and misrepresent American Indians than to report “subjective” information correctly. As such, we have come to know that objectivity is somewhat of an anthropological myth as no one can approach a subject without prior influence. The Indian and non-Indian anthropologist debate is not about who is right or wrong, but in whose representation has the most authority.

**Museums**

This same debate is carried out in museums as well, where anthropologists and historians remain key informants. Museums still remain a dominant place to where people go to find information. Most of us have visited a museum of one type or another, whether it was through personal interest or a school fieldtrip. Some objects or works may have caught our interest, perhaps not. Very seldom do we stop to think of what the purposes of collections are or how the collections were gathered in the first place. For American Indians the question sometimes lingers: by what right and by whose authority were these collections gathered? Or in modern times who gets to discern between art and artifact?
It makes sense that American Indian people would have issues with the way museums present American Indians; after all museums were the same institutions that sent early anthropologists to their reservations to capture their supposedly vanishing cultures. Those same museums were, and still are, informed about their collections by historians and anthropologists and, as a result, harbor some of the same issues of authority and bias. Museums in the early 20th century funded archaeological digs in the name of science with positive results based on the amount of material recovered suitable for exhibits (D. King 26). King asserts that “Collecting practices of museum pioneers showed little regard for ethics or cultural sensitivity (28).”

Anthropologists at the time were little more than pot hunters and grave robbers. Museums sometimes display objects as mere items of curiosity with little knowledge of their use. Early 20th century American Indians often viewed museums as warehouses for stolen family heirlooms, sacred items, and sometimes their ancestors (D. King 26-28). On most days you could likely find more dead Indians in history and anthropology museums than live ones. The Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act made it illegal for museums to not just display but own identifiable American Indian remains (National Park Service). Before the passing of NAGPRA in 1990 objects looted from graves and sometimes even the bodies themselves were a part of museum exhibits.

There is little Indigenous input in the majority of exhibits about American Indians. Museums take control of exhibit narrative through space, classification, and authority (C. Smith 2). Exhibit placement, design, and labeling are ways by which museums place themselves in positions of authority over American Indian objects and the stories being told about Native Peoples. An exhibit that leaves American Indians in the past or labels display objects in the past tense belittles them, denies their equality, and presents them as having no significant contribution
to the present. It also gives museums visitors, especially young ones, the impression that American Indians did indeed vanish. Afterwards, upon return to their schools they are in awe, yet doubtful, that the person standing before them is an Indian because no one told them that American Indians are still alive and that they no longer live in tipis.

American Indian artists are questioning the authority over their representations that the art world has previously claimed. Art museums demonstrate colonial hegemony at its worst. Art museums define what can and cannot get called American Indian art. What visitors see in museums is so carefully selected, presented, and consumed through the Western lens that there is little Indian left but an imagined past creating inauthentic representations of American Indians (Rangel 31-32). Art museums select what is appealing to them, and then select what they believe visitors would like to see. The museum practice of defining for American Indian artist what American Indian art must look like takes away American Indian expression, misrepresents the complexity of American Indian cultures and does little more than serve the consumers that buy them (Deloria and Salisbury 224; Rangel 31,34). Objects adorned with silver and turquoise, beads and feathers, animal fetishes, pottery, or woven textiles become commoditized; produced objects for sale rather than expression. Which then begs the question, is it still Indian art?

For the area of museums and museum studies tribal museums do an outstanding job at representing American Indian Peoples. Where individual American Indian people have been ignored, tribal museums as institutions have given American Indians a voice in the museum setting. Kings suggests that “Tribal culture centers and museums have not replaced traditional institutes, but have instead enhanced preservation (30).” Tribal museums have become accepted places to store objects that are precious to the tribe and allow sacred objects to be preserved yet still used. Tribal museums became important players in the realm of American Indian
representations as many engage in successful partnerships with other museums and institutions that reach broader audiences (D. King 30). Tribal museums develop traveling exhibits that are loaned to larger institutions to reach an audience that may not travel to their own museums. What is presented is strictly the voice of the people whom the exhibits are about. In a field where individual American Indians are often ignored, tribal museums exist as institutions where American Indian voices can be heard.

Museums exist as the amalgamation of the Museum Studies, Anthropology, and History disciplines and allow us the opportunity to examine more readily response to feedback in the fields. Museum exhibits and labels can change easier than published books and articles. Once written works are published, they remain for use by other scholars to be cited, critiqued, or praised. Exhibits, however, can respond almost immediately to public feedback. This allows historians and anthropologists the opportunity to rethink previous positions or correct mistakes in how they represent Peoples and events. Museums exist as a place where the biases of all three fields come together in one place, but offer an arena for the discussion of those representations to be discussed and debated by a range of audiences.

**Significance**

A number of studies have been conducted on American Indian stereotypes and imagery that exist in the fields of Anthropology, History, and Museum Studies. Few of those studies have looked at a collection of work that focuses on a specific tribe. Studies that rely on overgeneralized ideas of Indigenous identities can actually add to stereotyping. American Indian stereotypes are often looked at collectively, as if American Indians were one group of people. As stated earlier, groups known to non-Natives as American Indians are actually made up of hundreds of distinct cultural groups (Almeida 5; Berkhofer 3,5; Ward 6). American Indian
Studies scholars are aware of this, yet we have been dragged into conversations that talk about the phenomenon of American Indian stereotypes through a Western lens.

Tribal groups across the United States have different reactions to stereotyping because stereotypes affect them in a variety of ways. Tribes from some areas may contest overgeneralization while some tribes may deal with exclusion of the representations. Many Plains tribes and those of the Southwest are what many non-Natives think of when they think of American Indians. One only need look at the images of Karli Kloss from the 2012 Victoria Secret Fall fashion show for evidence (Derschowitz). The company dropped the images from its fall line, but one can see that the popular imagery of the Plains and Southwest dominate her costume. Tribes of the Great Basin, California, Northwest, Arctic, and sub-Arctic are grossly under represented and many non-Natives are hard pressed to visualize them with images other than Eskimos and totem poles. While there are some similarities among many American Indians, more focused studies may yield slightly different data on the effects of different stereotypes on particular groups of American Indians.

Less prevalent are studies that look for the causes attributed to the perpetuation of those stereotypes over time. Studies focused on collections of work about specific tribes could prove useful to determine the origin of stereotypical views. Determining where the strengths, weaknesses, and gaps exist in previous research concerning the Wa.zha.zhe may reveal why some representations continue. Unlike graduate students and Ph.D.’s that have been trained to examine data through an objective lens, high school students and most museum visitors are not so objective with their observations. If a majority of the representations of the Wa.zha.zhe are from the past, then that is how they will be viewed. More examinations of particular tribes are
needed to fill gaps in the informative research about tribes like the Wa.zha.zhe. Focused studies limit the amount of overgeneralizing that can occur.

My study also examines the primary data about the tribe. An inquiry into the epistemology of Wa.zha.zhe representations in the secondary data will determine if misrepresentations exist as a result of bias in the primary data sources. There has not been a study that examines the primary Wa.zha.zhe data and its use by anthropologists, historians and museums. As a result, future scholars researching the Wa.zha.zhe may avoid choosing certain areas of study due to insufficient amounts of primary source material to conduct their research. Due to possible limitations in the primary data about the Wa.zha.zhe, some questions may never be answered. A large study focusing on a variety of scholarly research about the Wa.zha.zhe would reveal a number of themes not apparent in smaller, individual studies of the Osage literature.
Chapter 3

The Wa.zha.zhe Data
The textual data I will use for my thesis consists of descriptions of the Osage People found in historical and anthropological writing and the visual representation of the Wa.zha.zhe in museum exhibits. I chose works authored between 1960 and 2010 for adults, by both Wa.zha.zhe and non-Wa.zha.zhe, men and women, from beginning scholars to veterans in their fields. A diverse collection of books and articles written about the Wa.zha.zhe gives me a set of data to compare the ways the Wa.zha.zhe have been represented in them, taking into consideration the time period of the author. Due to the nature of museum exhibits I am limited to museums that display Wa.zha.zhe objects at the time of the study. I chose museums ran by different entities such as an American Indian tribe, local governments, historical preservation, and art institutions. This way I hope to get a wide variety of works from which to examine the various ways the Wa.zha.zhe are represented.

By coding each of the descriptions, patterns emerge that may correlate with a review of the literature about American Indians in general. Analyzing each work within its historical context may allow us to see why a particular viewpoint dominates the data involving the Wa.zha.zhe based on the frequencies in which individual themes occur in the collective data. Once that step is completed I can then begin to consider where a particular author found the information they used for their descriptions and look for alternative ways of interpreting their data. Doing so allows me to determine if past descriptions of the Wa.zha.zhe are being recycled, leading to outdated and stereotyped impressions of the Wa.zha.zhe. New methods may emerge for interpreting the data, leading to alternative representations of the Wa.zha.zhe People for the rest of the world.

I chose the period between 1960 and 2010 for the literature due to the rapid changes that occurred in American society in regards to its treatment toward American Indians. Literature
from the 19th and early 20th centuries portrayed Indians as a problem for Euro-Americans to eliminate (Deloria and Salisbury 249). A significant amount of the ethnographic literature concerning American Indians written during the early 20th century was focused on the idea that American Indian cultures were vanishing. Other areas of focus before 1960 concentrated on the formation of United States Indian policy (Deloria 11). Non-Native attitudes towards Indians seem to change a great deal in the literature occurring between 1960 and 2010 than in the previous century. The diversity in the literature concerning the Wa.zha.zhe is limited before 1960.

In the latter part of the 20th century some Wa.zha.zhe began to write about their own history. That era added Wa.zha.zhe voices, such as John Mathews and Louis Burns, to the conversation about the history of the tribe. With the variety of methods used in the literature to present the Wa.zha.zhe People, I will discuss the strengths and weaknesses, in order to present information in a structured format. Historical and anthropological texts and museum exhibits that describe the Wa.zha.zhe will be analyzed to demonstrate how each represents or misrepresents the Wa.zha.zhe People.

**Textual Data**

**The Historians**

**W. David Baird (1939- present)**

David Baird is the author of the Wa.zha.zhe Centennial Celebration book *The Osage People.* According to Baird’s autobiography by the Western History Association, he earned his PhD in History and Geography from the University of Oklahoma in 1969. Baird taught history at the University of Arkansas, Oklahoma State University, and Pepperdine University. He also served as the 28th president of the Western History Association. He has written eleven other works on American Indians and Oklahoma history not including numerous articles and book
chapters. His research interests include Churches of Christ in Oklahoma, History of Oklahoma, History of the American West, and Native Americans (Baird 104, Loughlin).

Bairds’ *The Osage People* was written to commemorate the first 100 years of the tribes history on their reservation in Oklahoma. Baird begins with a brief ethnohistory of the Wa.zha.zhe People and their early encounters with Europeans and Americans. He follows with the historical circumstances that brought the Wa.zha.zhe to their current reservation. Baird describes the many changes the Wa.zha.zhe underwent in the first few years on the reservation. He then discusses the many legislative Acts that influenced the Wa.zha.zhe People, including Oklahoma statehood in 1907 (71). Baird describes how the discovery of oil on the reservation in 1920 affected the Wa.zha.zhe people, for the better and worse, including the infamous “Osage reign of terror”, a multi murder plot to steal the mineral rights from Wa.zha.zhe families. Baird describes the Wa.zha.zhe form of government at that time and the changing demographics of the tribe. Baird concludes with some perceived challenges that could face the Wa.zha.zhe People in the future.

**Louis F. Burns (Osage) (1920-2012)**

Louis Burns authored *A History of the Osage People* and *Symbolic and Decorative Art of the Osage People*, along with 11 other books about his tribe. According to his obituary in the Bartlesville Examiner, Burns was raised on a cattle ranch in the Wa.zha.zhe Reservation. Burns earned a M.A. in history from Kansas State University- Emporia and completed course work for a PhD in history from University of Southern California- Los Angeles. Burns taught U.S Western History, Geography, and U.S. History at Emporia State University and Santiago Community College. Burns remained devoted to preserving the Wa.zha.zhe culture throughout his life. Burns was inducted into the Oklahoma Historians Hall of Fame in 2002 (Bartlesville Examiner-Enterprise).
In *A History of the Osage People*, Louis Burns draws upon the earlier works of John Joseph Mathews and Francis La Flesche to create an ethno-historical account of the tribe. Much of Burns’ work tells the story of a people with an uncanny ability to survive and adapt to their changing world. Using oral history and later historical documents, he follows the Wa.zha.zhe from the eastern woodlands of the United States on to the prairie and plains of the Mid-west. He chronicles their rise to power, from controlling almost the entire lower Missouri Valley at one point to their decline at the hands of a young American nation. Burns tells the Wa.zha.zhe story of resilience and resistance to encroaching tribes, settlers, and foreign governments. With this being the second edition of his book, Burns was able to correct some of his prior misgivings, namely confusing explanations of certain events. But it is still apparent in his book that he tends to fill gaps in history with some far-fetched ideas, such as when he claims the Wa.zha.zhe originated in the Chesapeake Bay area. He gives no historical or anthropological evidence to support this claim. The strength of his work, however, lies in his detailed section headers. Despite having to wade through some of the story telling, it makes his work very useful as a reference for those who want to study Wa.zha.zhe history.

Burns took a more ethnohistorical approach with *Symbolic and Decorative Art of the Osage People*. Burns provides both history and cultural context in his book on traditional Wa.zha.zhe artistic mediums. He attempts to make some connections between Wa.zha.zhe artistic traditions and older cultures such as the Mississippian and Meso-American societies. He provides basic background information for when some of the newer artistic traditions began and how they are used in Wa.zha.zhe culture. Besides a great deal of discussion, Burns includes a large amount of imagery to provide readers with clear examples of the concepts. The designs
themselves are taken out of context for closer examination. This took away from the cultural contextualization Burns was trying to achieve.

**Gilbert C. Din (19??- present) and A.P Nasatir (1905-1991)**

Gilbert Din co-wrote *Imperial Osages* with A.P. Nasitir. According to Din’s biography he earned his PhD from the University of Madrid. He taught history at Fort Lewis College between 1965 and 1990. His primary research interests are in colonial Louisiana and Spanish Colonial border lands. Through Ridouts’ biography on Nasitir in *The Journal of San Diego History*, we know that Nasitir was first made aware of the Wa.zha.zhe People through his M.A. thesis work on the Chouteau family. He earned his PhD in history from the University of California-Berkeley in 1925. Shortly after, Nasitir was asked to begin gathering information on the Wa.zha.zhe for one of University of Oklahoma Press’s Civilization of the American Indian series. Nasitir taught history at the University of Iowa and University of Chile. He is well-known in the Latin Studies community (Ridout). His research interests were in Spain in the Mississippi Valley and the French in California.

Din and Nasitir creatively begin their work with a portrayal of Wa.zha.zhe beginnings according to, one of many, Wa.zha.zhe creation stories. In the next chapter they continue with an anthropological illustration of Wa.zha.zhe life prior to contact with Europeans. Din and Nasitir describe early French-Wa.zha.zhe relationships and give an account of how those relationships progressed over the years. The next chapter describes the uneasy relationship the Wa.zha.zhe had with the Spanish. Din and Nasitir describe the effects that the Seven Years War had on the Wa.zha.zhe and the growing strain that grew in their relationships with Spain and the Americans. The book continues with accounts of growing Spanish-Wa.zha.zhe frustration with each other and the political tactics each used to avoid an all-out Spanish-Wa.zha.zhe war. The book ends with a change of hands of the Louisiana Territory into American possession and the evacuation
of Spanish officials. Din and Nasitir conclude by providing a few hypothetical situations that may have occurred had the Spanish maintained control of the territory and how that may have affected the Wa.zha.zhe People.

**Kathleen DuVal (19??-present)**

Kathleen Duval is the author of *The Native Ground: Indians and Colonists in the Heart of the Continent* her first book, and the article “Cross-Cultural Crime and Osage justice in the Western Mississippi Valley, 1700-1826.” According to her UNC faculty web page, DuVal is an associate professor at the University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill, where she teaches courses in American and American Indian histories. DuVal received her PhD from the University of California- Davis in 2001. Her research interests include cross cultural relationships during the colonial period of American history. She has since published several articles on Indian-Colonist interactions in Southeast America (UNC, OAH).

Kathleen DuVal’s book *On Native Ground*, focuses on the power relationships between tribes along the Arkansas River Valley, European immigrants, and immigrant tribes relocated from the east looking for a new home. DuVal reasons that the tribes living in that area, namely the Quapaw and Wa.zha.zhe, had the final say as to who they would allow to live on their lands not Europeans. She argues that forced encroachment on Native lands by Europeans early on would not have been possible without the dense population numbers Europeans had in the east. It would not be until years after the War of 1812 that the Euro-Americans would gain more power and actually have the military strength to enforce their will upon the Native People of that region. DuVal’s book empowers Americans Indians in general by illustrating the degree of influence that their ancestors asserted on their own lands. Her insight into the reality of population ratios and influence brings a new way of thinking to Indian/ White relations prior to the War of 1812. She focuses primarily on human relations and touches a bit on a reliance on
trade goods by Native people, but there is little discussion of what impact European-borne
diseases may have had on those relationships in addition to increased military strength of
Europeans toward the Native people in the region.

DuVals’ article “Cross-Cultural Crime and Osage Justice in the Western Mississippi
Valley, 1700-1826” examines how the terms of justice changed for the Wa.zha.zhe People in
regard to cross-cultural crimes committed against Whites. DuVal argues that early in the 16th
century the Wa.zha.zhe had the upper hand by greatly outnumbering the French and later the
Spanish. The Wa.zha.zhe also proved valuable business partners and allies against other tribes
for the French and Spanish, so keeping the Wa.zha.zhe happy was a priority. Wa.zha.zhe justice
would always rule and their leaders handed out punishments to their own. DuVal claims that as
the American nation grew relationships changed. In the early 19th century, the Wa.zha.zhe
numbers dwindled and a shift in power culminated in a change of who handed out the
punishment for crimes against Whites. DuVals’ articles ends with the examination of an incident
where several Wa.zha.zhe were handed over to U.S. authorities for trial and the details about the
case and its aftermath.

Tai Edwards (1980- present)
Tai Edwards wrote Osage Gender: Continuity, Change, and Colonization, 1720’s-1870’s
as her doctoral dissertation. According to her faculty webpage at Johnson County Community
College, Edwards is one of the first scholars to specifically examine gender roles among the
Wa.zha.zhe. She received her PhD from the University of Kansas in 2010. Edwards is an
assistant professor of history at JCCC where she teaches courses in U.S. History. Her research
interests are in U.S. expansion, gender, North American colonization, Indigenous peoples, and
environmental history (History Department-Edwards, Personal Communication).
Edwards uses the current recorded knowledge of a peoples’ history and reexamines it through a different perspective. Edwards used a great deal of the classic Wa.zha.zhe historical text, written by Mathews and La Flesche, to tighten her focus and examine the gender based relationships in Wa.zha.zhe society. She reports on how those roles have changed and how they have remained the same during the 150 year period she examines. Edwards presents Wa.zha.zhe gender roles as a supportive and balanced exchange that is often misconstrued by non-Native cultures as one gender dominating another. Like other texts concerning the Wa.zha.zhe, Edwards ends her study prior to Wa.zha.zhe removal to their present reservation in Oklahoma. A further study of gender roles following this period, with how those might have been affected after the acceptance of Peyotism, warrants further study. Edwards’ dissertation is groundbreaking and serves as a good stepping stone to scholarly work in Wa.zha.zhe history from the Wa.zha.zhe women’s point of view. That viewpoint is missing almost entirely from the historical study of the tribe.

J. Fredrick Fausz (1947- present)
Fredrick Fausz wrote the article “Becoming 'A Nation of Quakers': The Removal of the Osage Indians from Missouri”. According to his faculty webpage, he received his PhD in Early American History from the College of William and Mary in 1977. Fausz has taught at St. Mary’s College in Maryland and the University of Missouri- St. Louis where he is currently a tenured Associate Professor. Fausz has taught courses on Colonial America, Indian History, History of the Fur Trade, and White-Indian Relations. He is a highly published author of Colonial History, Early U.S. History, and American Indian History with almost 50 published books and articles. His research interests include American Indians, Colonial America, Fur Trade, and the Lewis and Clark Expedition (UMSL history).
Fredrick Fausz’s article “Becoming a Nation of Quakers: The Removal of the Osage Indians from Missouri,” refers to a quote by explorer Zebulon Pike describing their obedience to the directions of U.S. President Thomas Jefferson. Fausz’ pro-Wa.zha.zhe article follows U.S.-Wa.zha.zhe relations through a century of colonialism and the continued support of the United States by the Wa.zha.zhe People. He portrays the Wa.zha.zhe as unwavering friends of the United States. Fausz condemns the U.S. governments’ unconscionable repayment for that support by removing the Wa.zha.zhe from their lands in Missouri. While Fausz does not blame Jefferson directly, Fausz’ perspective is that Jeffersonian Indian policy was powerless against the swarms of white settlers that sets this work apart from others. Fausz contends that Jefferson and the U.S. Army were often outnumbered by white citizens who wanted the Wa.zha.zhe removed. This is a compelling argument toward a type of frontier justice that is often seen in other periods of U.S. history where corrupt politics rule. Fausz’ historical accounts are well supported by historical documentation. He has become a scholar whose research is to be included when studying the history of the Wa.zha.zhe people.

**John Joseph Mathews (Osage) (1895-1979)**

John Joseph Mathews wrote *The Osages: Children of the Middle Waters* as well as several other books about the Wa.zha.zhe people. According to articles by Boling and Logsdon Mathews grew up on the Wa.zha.zhe Reservation. A novelist and historian, he completed a Bachelor of Arts degree in Natural Science at Oxford University in 1923. Mathews served on the Wa.zha.zhe Tribal council from 1934 to 1942. He is credited with the development of the Wa.zha.zhe Tribal Museum in Pawhuska. Mathews was posthumously inducted into the Oklahoma Historians Hall of Fame in 1996 (Boling, Logsdon).

John Joseph Mathews’ book *The Osages: Children of the Middle Waters*, is considered by some to be the Bible of Wa.zha.zhe history. Mathews’ book begins by recounting Wa.zha.zhe
oral traditions of descending to earth and guides us on a journey through time through the eyes of the Wa.zha.zhe. He begins with life before the Europeans would enter the Wa.zha.zhe world, their many dealings with the French, Spanish, English and lastly the Americans. He continues with life on their final reservation in Oklahoma, the loss of their traditional religion, acceptance of Peyotism and the discovery of oil. Mathews ends his story with his people continuing into modern times with an uncertain future before them. *The Osages* still remains the most complete single account of Wa.zha.zhe history to date. Any book written on the Wa.zha.zhe ever since is certain to include it in its bibliography. The book is well organized by subject and in a linear fashion. Sub-chapters make it a wonderful starting point and reference guide for any in depth scholarly work on a particular Wa.zha.zhe subject matter. A well written book, it covers so much that there is plenty of room for more in depth study. At the time it was written, however, no such book on the Wa.zha.zhe existed so it remains a starting point for anyone wanting to learn more about the Wa.zha.zhe People.

**Willard H. Rollings (Cherokee) (1948-2008)**

Willard H. Rollings authored *The Osage: An Ethnohistorical Study of Hegemony on the Prairie-Plains* and *Unaffected by the Gospel: Osage Resistance to the Christian Invasion 1673-1906: A Cultural Victory*. According to his obituary in the Lubbock Avalanche-Journal, Rollings earned a PhD in History from Texas Tech University in 1983. Rollings held a postdoctoral fellowship at the D’Arcy McNickle Center for the History of the American Indian. He taught at Southwest Missouri State University, Texas Tech University, and the University of Las Vegas-Nevada, receiving teaching awards at each one. At UNLV Rollings taught classes in American Indian History and American Indian Studies. His published works also include two books on the Comanche tribe (*Lubbock-Avalanche Journal, Rollings*).
Willard H. Rollings’ *The Osage* is a more focused study of the Wa.zha.zhe People. Unlike previous works, it starts with them already on the Missouri Prairie. Rollings’ book narrows down the plethora of Wa.zha.zhe related text to specifically examine the time of European contact. Rollings focuses on the diplomatic skills that enabled them to control trade along the Missouri for the middle part of the Indian Fur Trade. Rollings work examines the Wa.zha.zhe style of diplomacy, politics and economics that at first baffled European traders. Once the Wa.zha.zhe culture was learned by French-Wa.zha.zhe trading families their political system was easily navigated and manipulated. This caused a rift in the Wa.zha.zhe social structure and signaled the end for their hegemony in the area. Rollings ends his book with an account of the dramatic changes occurring to the Wa.zha.zhe, both biologically and politically, around the early 1800’s that led to the end of their rule. The book is very well written and researched and gives a balanced history of the region and the people in it. Rollings effectively uses anti-Wa.zha.zhe and pro-Wa.zha.zhe quotes at the beginning of the chapters. This use allows readers to begin each section with that thought echoing in their minds as they weigh the information Rollings presents. This book, while paying more attention to a specific time period in Wa.zha.zhe history, still leaves some unanswered questions about specific relationships and events.

One of these would be the topic of Rollings’ next work, *Unaffected by the Gospel, Osage Resistance to the Christian Invasion 1673-1906: A Cultural Victory*. The Wa.zha.zhe asked for the missions to be established, but passively resisted Christianization. Rollings states that this may have been part of Wa.zha.zhe diplomacy to appear more civilized to Europeans who were siding against them in favor of immigrant tribes like the Cherokee who were being given ceded Wa.zha.zhe lands. Rollings contends that, while neither Catholic nor Protestant missionaries
were very successful at converting the Wa.zha.zhe, they would be converted by the Native-Christian hybrid religion of Big Moon Peyotism. Rollings argues while not solely Christian, Peyotism would allow the Wa.zha.zhe to accept parts of Christianity, but on Wa.zha.zhe terms. *Unaffected by the Gospel*, like Rollings previous work, is well balanced and straightforward. Rollings chose to present information as a series of events with cause and effect, which can make those that prefer the chronological approach to history feel lost. Nevertheless, I found his approach effective. While it the order of events is harder to follow it certainly makes their relationships clearer. The main weakness of the book is its dating the Christian” invasion” to 1673. While having first contact with Christians that year, most of the missions and attempts at Christianization occurred during the 19th century.

**Terry P. Wilson (Potowatomi) (1941-present)**

Terry P. Wilson authored *The Osage* and *The Underground Reservation: Osage Oil*. His biography in the back of *The Osage* states that, he earned his PhD from Oklahoma State University. He served as coordinator of Indian culture at Eastern Montana College and professor of history at Southwestern State University in Oklahoma. Wilson is a former Department Chair and retired professor of Native American Studies at the University of California- Berkley. Besides the Wa.zha.zhe People, his research interests also include people of mixed race descent and American Indian History (Wilson 112).

Wilson’s *The Osage* is part of the Chelsea House Press, Indians of North America series. He begins with a description of Wa.zha.zhe life before meeting Europeans. He then briefly discusses Wa.zha.zhe interactions with various European groups, removal from Missouri, their time on the reservation in Kansas, and the final move to Oklahoma. He gives considerable attention to the affect this move had on the Wa.zha.zhe lifestyle. Wilson describes the many effects that the discovery of oil had on the tribe. He also addresses the effects of more worldly
events on the Wa.zha.zhe such as the Great Depression and World Wars I and II. Wilson concludes with discussions on political restructuring within the tribe as well as changing Wa.zha.zhe wedding customs and the I’n.lon.schka.

_The Underground Reservation: Osage Oil_ describes the impacts that sudden wealth had on the Wa.zha.zhe. Wilson refreshingly begins the book with the Wa.zha.zhe leaving Kansas for their new reservation in Oklahoma. He tells of the difficult beginnings that the Wa.zha.zhe had on their new reservation and the cultural, economic, social, and political changes they had to endure. Wilson explores the impact of wealth among the Wa.zha.zhe after the discovery of oil on their land and the troubles that came with it. He also gives considerable attention to the unique position the Wa.zha.zhe found themselves in because they had not accepted allotment at first but agreed to it later on many of their own terms. Wilson gives well balanced attention to the changes in Wa.zha.zhe society during the early and middle 20th century. This book is unique in that he is one of the few who have taken Wa.zha.zhe history to the then present time, describing more recent changes in Wa.zha.zhe cultural, societal, and ceremonial life.

**Kristie C. Wolferman (1948- present)**

Kristie Wolferman wrote _The Osage in Missouri_ as part of the Missouri Heritage Readers series. Wolferman is a teacher and historian in the Kansas City area. Her book gives a brief overview of Wa.zha.zhe life at the time of European contact until they ceded their final lands in Missouri. She describes early Wa.zha.zhe dealings with the Europeans and the economic growth of the tribe. Wolferman follows with the changing status of the tribe and their relationship with the Americans. She does not get too in depth in any particular subject but her study serves as a good starting point for those interested in the Wa.zha.zhe. The afterward of the book gives a very brief history of the Wa.zha.zhe, after their move to Kansas, removal to Oklahoma, and the discovery of oil on the reservation.
The Anthropologists

Garrick Bailey (19??-present)

Garrick Bailey edited *Traditions of the Osage* and co-authored *Art of the Osage* with Daniel Swan. According to the faculty web page at the University of Tulsa, he is a professor of anthropology and received his PhD in anthropology from the University of Oregon in 1970. He teaches courses on North American Indians and General Anthropology. His research interests include contemporary Indians of the United States and Canada, historic tribes of the prairie-plains, and special interests on the Wa.zha.zhe and Navajo. From 2000-2006 he served as a member of the Department of Interior’s Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act review committee (Anthropology Department-Bailey).

In Garrick Bailey’s *Traditions of the Osage*, he assembles a collection of stories recorded by Francis La Flesche to give insight as to what the Wa.zha.zhe People deemed important in their lives. Bailey analyzes some of the stories putting them into context of Wa.zha.zhe culture that the reader may better understand. Bailey is not the first to attempt this. His book follows a book by James Dorsey with the same title, but Dorsey misinterpreted some of La Flesches’ work and it lacked the additional commentary that Bailey’s work contains. Bailey’s work is limited to what La Flesche recorded. To make it more useful Bailey could have also included other works by anthropologists on the Wa.zha.zhe. It is a shame that more of the children’s stories were not recorded, but La Flesche was a product of his time, Indian or not, and recorded the things that White scholars and the Bureau of American Ethnology were interested in knowing.

Bailey co-authored *Art of the Osage* with Daniel Swan which serves as the catalog for a 2004 exhibit at the St. Louis Art Museum (SLAM) under the same name. The exhibit coincided with the bicentennial celebration of the Lewis and Clark Expedition. The book is filled with color photos of Wa.zha.zhe artifacts from the exhibit. Bailey and Swan wrote six chapters on the
Chapter subjects range from Wa.zha.zhe art and history, various stages of Wa.zha.zhe religious life, and the I’n.lon.schka. Osage cultural consultant E. Sean Standingbear and SLAM director Jim Nunley co-wrote the final chapter of the book that focuses on who the Wa.zha.zhe People are in the 20th century.

**Alice Anne Callahan (Osage) (1926-2004)**

Alice Anne Callahan authored *The Osage Ceremonial Dance I’n-Lon-Schka*. The obituary in the Lawrence Journal World says that Alice grew up in Independence, Kansas, just northeast of the Wa.zha.zhe Reservation. Callahan earned her PhD in music from Syracuse University in 1977. She taught at Southwest Texas State then returned to teach music from her undergraduate alma mater, Baker University where she taught from 1953 until retirement in 1989. While Callahan was a music teacher, she was always proud of her Wa.zha.zhe heritage (Callahan-Russell). Her book seemed the way for her to combine her two interests.

Callahan’s study of one of the most important modern Wa.zha.zhe ceremonies is a magnificent piece of scholarship and is not likely to be surpassed any time soon. Hailed by some to be the most significant piece that will ever be written on the ceremony, Callahan strips down the Wa.zha.zhe I’n-lon-schka into definable parts. She uses Wa.zha.zhe accounts to explain what those parts mean to the overall ceremony. She not only records the history of the dance among the Wa.zha.zhe, but manages to record and give insight to the dance steps themselves, the many songs that accompany it, and even the clothing that the dancers wear. If it were not for Callahan’s work, some of this information could be forgotten. She even recorded some of the changes that have been made by the tribe while keeping with the dances original intent.

Anthropologically, making this comparison says a lot about what is most important to the ceremony, but also says a lot about what remained important to the Wa.zha.zhe People. It would
be a great service to the Wa.zha.zhe for someone else to pick up where Callahan left off to see what changes have taken place to the I’n-lon-schka in the last fifty years.

Jean Dennison (Osage) (1979-present)

Jean Dennison wrote *Constituting an Osage Nation: Histories, Citizenship, and Sovereignties* for her doctoral dissertation (Personal Communication). Dennison grew up just outside the Wa.zha.zhe reservation boundaries in Tulsa, Oklahoma (Dennison 2-3). According to her CV, she earned her PhD in Anthropology from the University of Florida-Gainesville in 2008. Dennison is an assistant professor of Anthropology at the University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill. She teaches anthropology classes on American Indians and Colonial Settlers. Jeans’ research interests include Wa.zha.zhe politics, representation, governance, visual anthropology, and sovereignty (Dennison Vitae).

Dennison’s dissertation *Constituting an Osage Nation: Histories, Citizenship, and Sovereignties* explores the Wa.zha.zhe issues and processes behind the reformation and establishment of the Wa.zha.zhe Constitution of 2006. Dennison captures the difficulty for the Wa.zha.zhe and the historical issues the Wa.zha.zhe faced in rewriting a document that would serve the needs of the future Wa.zha.zhe People as well as the present. Her second chapter discusses the impact that colonization has had on the tribe and its further impact on the constitutional reform process. One of those issues, and the topic of her third chapter, discusses blood quantum and its ties to perceived authority, identity, and exclusion for both Wa.zha.zhe and U.S. governments. Her fourth chapter explores blood from a unifying standpoint that binds the Wa.zha.zhe People together. In her fifth chapter Dennison explores the concept of American Indian sovereignty and the understanding of the term in relation to the Wa.zha.zhe constitutional reform process. In her final chapter she discusses the problems that arose during the reform process and how those were played out not only in the meeting room, but also in the community.
Alice Beck Kehoe (1934-present)

Alice Kehoe is the author of Osage Texts and Cahokia Data. She is an anthropologist, who received her PhD from Harvard and taught at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln and Marquette University where she is now professor emeritus having retired in 2000 (Macmillan,Vanderkam). Kehoe studied many American Indian cultures from Canada to Bolivia. She is well known for being a skeptic of what is “known” about American Indians according to anthropologists and historians (Vanderkam). Her research interests include American Indian Studies, Archeology, and American Discovery.

Alice Kehoe compares statuary found at the Cahokia Mounds site and compares it with a description of the Rite of Vigil recorded by Francis La Flesche in her essay Osage Texts and Cahokia Data found in a collection of anthropological works. The statuary Kehoe examined is described word for word in La Flesches’ account of a priest’s wife weaving a sacred envelope for a sacred shrine down to the type of fur she is sitting on. This is an astounding piece of anthropological work. And it makes a strong case for anthropologists studying American Indian cultures as positive, which has not always been the case. Equally impressive is Kehoe’s presentation of these finding to the Wa.zha.zhe People. Kehoe’s analysis of Wa.zha.zhe occupancy of the Cahokia site is now accepted as part of the tribes’ origins, as stated earlier. Anthropology has many gaps, but once in a while they hit it big. Questions still remain unanswered. It could be mere coincidence, or the statue and the story La Flesche recorded could be from a group the Wa.zha.zhe had absorbed into their tribe. It is a link though and a compelling one at that. There is simply not enough known about pre European Wa.zha.zhe origins or about Cahokia itself to determine any additional links at the present time.

Jami C. Powell (Osage) (1986-present)
Jami Powell wrote an article in the Lambda Alpha Journal titled “Finding Our Way: Osage Ribbonwork and Revival”. Powell, the daughter of a Navy father, moved around frequently as a young person, but remembers returning to the Osage reservation each June to attend the I’n.lon.schka dances (Powell personal communication). According to her CV, Powell received her BA’s in Anthropology and Spanish from the University of Denver in 2009. She is currently attending the University of North Carolina- Chapel Hill pursuing a M.A. in Anthropology. Her research interests include ethnology and ethnohistory, museum anthropology, cultural preservation, and American Indians (Powell personal communication).

Powell’s article explores how the Wa.zha.zhe were first introduced to the unfamiliar medium and possible explanations as to how this uniquely “American” style of ribbon applique was developed by American Indians around the Prairie and Great Lakes regions of the U.S. Powell explores the meaning of ribbonwork designs and color choice among the Wa.zha.zhe. She also examines the different varieties that the Wa.zha.zhe use as well as their importance to cultural and ceremonial life. Powell chronicles the decline of ribbonwork and its resurgence due in part to the increased interest in tribal ceremonies by younger Wa.zha.zhe. Powell ends with a discussion of the role of ribbonwork from decorative in traditional times to a free standing art form.

Daniel C. Swan (1955- present)
Daniel C. Swan authored Early Osage Peyotism and is co-author of Art of the Osage with Garrick Bailey. He has published a number of articles on the Wa.zha.zhe People. According to the University of Oklahoma’s blog, Swan is Associate Curator of Ethnology at the Sam Noble Oklahoma Museum of Natural History and an Associate Professor of Anthropology at the University of Oklahoma. He received his PhD from the University of Oklahoma in 1990. Dr. Swan is an ethnologist and has worked for 25 years to educate the public about a variety of
topics surrounding Native American History, culture and language. He has worked for the Science Museum of Minnesota, Oklahoma Historical Society, the Gilcrease Museum and served as Director of the White Hair Memorial- Wa.zha.zhe Cultural Resource Center. His research centers around the Peyote Religion, with much of his work focusing on various aspect of the Peyote Religion among the Wa.zha.zhe and Navajo Peoples (Swan, Swan-snoman).

Swans’ article in Plains Anthropologist titled “Early Osage Peyotism” is an ethnohistorical study of when the tribe was first introduced to the new religion and how Big Moon Peyotism gained a foothold for the years that followed. Swan uses his study of the Wa.zha.zhe to contend that adoption of Peyotism by Plains tribes was not a single event or individual, but a series of events and a collection of individuals that lead to the religions’ rapid diffusion among tribes. Swan provides an overview of several accounts of how neighboring Peyotists were asked to introduce members of the tribe to the new religion. He follows with its growth amongst tribal members in varying districts and the decline of Wa.zha.zhe “traditional” religion. Swan provides a variety of cultural reasons that existed which allowed for the rapid acceptance of Peyotism. He concludes that the timing was perfect for the new religion to come into the Wa.zha.zhe world. This came as a result of the old religion entering a state of decline which left an opening for Peyotism in Wa.zha.zhe ceremonial life. Swan calls for reexamination of past Peyotism studies of other tribes questioning whether their acceptance of the religion was as linear as previously thought.

**The Museums**

Museums exhibits impact the way the general public views American Indians. They represent another way the general public gets information about American Indians. Because museums play such a large role, I have chosen to examine the Wa.zha.zhe exhibits at the Osage
Tribal Museum located in Pawhuska, OK, the Fort Osage Historic Site museum in Sibley, MO, the Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art in Kansas City, MO, the Kansas State Historical Society Museum in Topeka, KS, the Gilcrease Museum in Tulsa, OK, the Bartlesville Area History Museum located in Bartlesville, OK, the Historic Arkansas Museum in Little Rock, AR, and Missouri’s American Indian Cultural Center at Van Meter State Park outside Marshall, MO. These eight museums vary in purpose and mission, which affects how they present their collections. The diversity of presentation styles gives me the opportunity to study the variety of presentation methods used to present the Wa.zha.zhe People to the public. When museum visitors are presented with images of American Indians in museum exhibits, those images have the potential to have a larger influence on museum visitors than textual representations. By the nature of museum exhibition these exhibits already lay out the representation of the Wa.zha.zhe they would like museum visitors to see.

**Bartlesville Area History Museum**

The Bartlesville Area History Museum, as the name suggests, captures the local history of the town of Bartlesville, Oklahoma and the surrounding area. The museum was established in 1965. It is privately owned and is housed in the top floor of an old hotel from the areas oil boom days. Its mission is to present the history of Washington County. The museum covers the history of American Indian tribes, the Civil War, outlaws, and oil barons from the surrounding area. It houses two unnamed Wa.zha.zhe exhibits, one about the tribe and the other exhibit consists of the Wa.zha.zhe Peoples role in the discovery of oil.

**Fort Osage Education Center**

The Fort Osage Education Center is part of the Fort Osage Historic Site located in Sibley, Missouri. The site is owned and operated by Jackson County Parks and Recreation Department. Originally known as Fort Clark, the site was founded in 1808 as part of the U.S fur factory
system. The factory was closed in 1821 and the site was abandoned and later lost. It was
rediscovered in the 1940’s and was deemed a national landmark in 1964. Thirty percent of the
fort was reconstructed and interpretive history tours are given on the premises. The Fort Osage
Education Center was opened in November 2007 to compliment Fort Osage and display some of
the archaeological items found at the site. It houses an unnamed exhibit about the Wa.zha.zhe
People. The Center’s mission is to provide unique interpretive exhibits and educational
programming that meet the educational standards of Kansas and Missouri schools. The Center
receives approximately 6-8,000 visitors annually.

**Gilcrease Museum**

The Gilcrease Museum is located in Tulsa, Oklahoma. It was originally founded as a
private museum by, Tulsa oilman and Creek Nation citizen, Thomas Gilcrease. Gilcrease first
opened the museum in San Antonio, Texas without much success. Determined to see it succeed,
he reopened the museum in 1949, near his home in Tulsa. Oil prices fell and the money
Gilcrease depended on to acquire his large collection dried up. In 1954 the City of Tulsa sold
bonds to raise money and pay off the oilman’s debts. Gilcrease gave the City of Tulsa title to his
collection and they named the museum after him. In 2008, the City of Tulsa partnered with the
University of Tulsa to advance the museum and become the steward of the collection. Today, the
museum’s mission is to bring art, history, and people together to discover, enjoy and understand
the diverse heritage of the Americas. The museum receives approximately 60-70,000 visitors per
year. The *Enduring Spirit: American Indian Artistic Traditions* exhibit showcases American
Indian Art from tribes across the country. The Gilcrease also displays Wa.zha.zhe items in the
Kravis Discover Center and in the exhibit “Beading, Weaving, Dancing: The Art of Woody
Crumbo”.
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**Historic Arkansas Museum**

Founded in 1941 as the Arkansas Restoration Museum, the Historic Arkansas Museum is the first accredited history museum in Arkansas. The museum is located in an area approximately one block in size in the city of Little Rock, Arkansas. It receives approximately 90,000 visitors each year. Louise Loughborough founded the museum in 1939 to preserve several old homes in the area. The museum has expanded to what is now a collection of historic buildings from the surrounding area. Its mission is to “communicate the early history of Arkansas and its creative legacy through the preserving, interpreting, and presenting stories and collections for the education and enjoyment of the people we serve” (Historic Arkansas). The museum houses the *We Walk in Two Worlds* exhibit which includes Wa.zha.zhe items along with items from the Caddo and Quapaw People.

**Missouri’s American Indian Cultural Center**

Formerly known as the Van Meter State Park Visitors Center, Missouri’s American Indian Cultural Center (MAICC) is part of Van Meter State Park located near Marshall, Missouri. It is part of the Missouri State Parks system. The land for the park was donated to the state by Annie Vanmeter in memory of her late husband in 1932. Originally the park visitor center, a name change, along with a change in the parks mission, occurred in 2006 along with a physical expansion which doubled the size of the original building. The MAICC pays tribute to the nine tribes that once called Missouri home. MAICCs’ focus is beyond that of a museum, the new museum acts as a cultural center, bringing in presenters from the nine tribes that once lived in Missouri. The central portion of the museum houses the histories of each tribe, while outlying exhibits reflect the present day cultures of the nine tribes.

**Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art**

The Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art was founded by William Rockhill Nelson and Mary McAfee Atkins. Through the combination of their trusts the museum was opened as a single
building in 1933. Today the museum covers 22 acres of the Kansas City, Missouri landscape. It consists of two buildings, the original 1933 museum, and a more modern building opened in 2007. There are numerous large sculptures dotting the surrounding landscape. The museum’s mission is to provide enjoyment and understanding of the visual arts and the varied cultures they represent. It is committed through its collections and programs to being a vital partner in the educational and cultural life of Kansas City and a preeminent institution both nationally and internationally”. The Nelson-Atkins receives approximately 400,000 visitors to the museum annually. It has two Wa.zha.zhe items on display in its “American Indian Art” exhibit.

**Osage Tribal Museum**

The Osage Tribal Museum is the oldest tribally owned museum in the United States. The Museum is located in Pawhuska, Oklahoma, seat of the Osage Nation. Built in 1872, the museum was originally a chapel, then a school house and dormitory before becoming the home of the Osage Tribal Museum. Wa.zha.zhe historian, John Joseph Mathews is credited with pushing for the creation of the museum. With approval from Chief Fred Lookout and the 14th Osage congress the museum was dedicated in May of 1938 (Osage Museum). Much of the museums 6,000 object collection is donated by Wa.zha.zhe families, including hundreds of photographs and family heirlooms. The museum receives approximately 5,000 visitors a year.
Chapter 4

Methodology
**Data Collection**

The works of history and anthropology books as well as museum exhibits discussed in this chapter make up my data. I examined the history and anthropology sources for any textual passages and pictures describing the Wa.zha.zhe People. I only visited museums with Wa.zha.zhe items on display so that I could see how the items are presented to the public. During the museum visits I cataloged what type of items were on display, how they are described, how many are on display in relation to the rest of the exhibit, and placement within the museum. I will employ content analysis to identify the descriptive passages of the Wa.zha.zhe People out of the text. I will do the same with the wall placards in the Wa.zha.zhe exhibits.

I will then use coding to place the descriptions from the texts and museum exhibits into themes based on their relation to each other. Lockyer defines coding as, “a systematic way in which to condense extensive data sets into smaller analyzable units through the creation of categories and concepts derived from the data” (137). I will identify basic themes in the literature and then reexamine them to look for specific trends and patterns. I will also examine the Wa.zha.zhe items and exhibits to determine if those representations are in line with the overall message of the exhibit. I will compare the descriptions of the Wa.zha.zhe with each other based on time, gender, and age found in the museum exhibits and the literature. These will then be divided by the fields of study that produce them in order to determine which field or methods have produced the most well rounded description of the Wa.zha.zhe People.

I will scan the bibliography of each book looking for primary data used by the authors that includes descriptions of the Wa.zha.zhe. I will examine the Wa.zha.zhe descriptions from the primary data sources used in the historical and anthropological texts I am studying to see
where the authors acquired their data. When possible, I will do the same for the museum exhibits. This step will also allow me to examine where museums and authors are pulling the majority of the information they use in Wa.zha.zhe exhibits and if anthropology and history are as wedded to Wa.zha.zhe exhibits as they have been to other American Indians. An examination of the primary sources of Wa.zha.zhe descriptions will allow me to determine if bias in the chosen primary source materials was a factor in the authors’ representation of the Wa.zha.zhe. Once initial data collection has occurred I can move on to data analysis.

**Data Analysis**

I will employ several qualitative methods when analyzing the Wa.zha.zhe descriptions found during data collection. Coding seems appropriate in the initial analyses of the Wa.zha.zhe data. Once data collecting has been completed, coding emerges as not only a method of collection, but also a method for analysis. After looking over the Wa.zha.zhe descriptions available I will separate them into like categories. Common themes are sure to emerge during the study and perhaps alternative methods for evaluating that data can be created. The descriptions are separated into a variety ways depending on their relationships. The data will be coded several times to either strengthen initial findings or explore new relationships within the data set. Once I have divided the Wa.zha.zhe descriptions into themes and sub-themes, I can move on to the next method, which is content analysis.

Content analysis examines a variety of modes of communication to analyze their content, in this case textual and visual descriptions of the Wa.zha.zhe People (wiki/Content analysis). By examining the descriptions of the Wa.zha.zhe found in the text and museum exhibits I can analyze the description based on content as well as context. These analyses include looking for the main theme in each passage, key words, and how they are used by the writer or museum.
Though historians and anthropologists are supposed to be objective in their collection and presentation of data, the manner which they use to describe things and the way primary data is used is very subjective. Studying the content of the passages I can check for trends in the written descriptions of the Wa.zha.zhe that occur more frequently in the writings of history, anthropology, and museum exhibits. After collecting the primary data, I will examine the primary data sources for content, purpose of message, and the context used by the authors in the secondary works. The analysis of the primary data will be minimal as I am mainly interested in its impact on the secondary and tertiary sources used for the written texts and information on the museum exhibit placards.
Chapter 5

Results of the Study
In my study, I visited a total of seven museums in three states, with a total of ten exhibits that contained Wa.zha.zhe material. The museums consisted of two art museums, the Gilcrease Museum and the Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art, and five history/anthropology museums, the Historic Arkansas Museum, the Bartlesville Area History Museum, The Osage Tribal Museum, Missouri’s American Indian Cultural Center, and the Fort Osage Education Center. I split the two groups up and will discuss them separately below because each type of museum brings its own theoretical baggage with it in terms of the way items are presented. The grouping of the first two museums is obvious enough. I grouped the last five together as many listed themselves as history museums yet each contained a great deal of anthropological/archeological material in their exhibits as well. In a museum setting it appears hard to separate history from anthropology while presenting items in an informative manner.

**Art Museums**

The Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art provided the sparsest examples of Wa.zha.zhe material for the study. I visited the museum on March 1, 2013 and despite my many trips to the museum needed a map to locate the museums’ exhibit. The “Art of North America” exhibit is located in the northwest corner on the second floor. The total exhibit is comprised of approximately 209 items from American Indian groups across the United States. I originally thought that there were two Wa.zha.zhe items on display. One is a catlinite (pipestone) pipe bowl and stem. The other is a wool trade blanket decorated with applique’ ribbonwork that Wa.zha.zhe women sometimes wear. The placard next to the blanket claims that the item may either be Wa.zha.zhe or Oto. The Oto are a neighboring tribe, both in present day Oklahoma and in historic times. I must identify it as the latter due to the floral ribbonwork pattern that decorates the blanket. The Wa.zha.zhe women saved the use of floral designs for beadwork. Wa.zha.zhe ribbonwork designs were always geometric. The placard on both the pipe and the blanket
actually gave very little information on either piece. Neither placard told who made the items or their cultural significance. And besides tribal identification there was no additional information about the tribe. Besides being items of aesthetic beauty, visitors wanting more information about the items are left with many questions and few answers.

The Gilcrease museum provided a lot of information for my study. I visited the museum on February 28\textsuperscript{th}, 2013 and was treated to a large amount of Wa.zha.zhe items that far exceeded the 5 items the museum staff had told me they had on display over the phone. The exhibit I had traveled to see, “Enduring Spirit: Native American Artistic Traditions”, consists of approximately 230 items from tribes across the United States, much like that at the Nelson-Atkins. This exhibit contained eight Wa.zha.zhe items including a photo of a Wa.zha.zhe boy, three paintings by various artists, a hair roach and spreader, otter turban, and a pair of girl’s moccasins. The exhibit is located to the right of the main entrance and is hard for museum patrons to miss. The placards that accompanied these items tell little about the items. They state the tribe and year they were made but nothing else. The photo of the Wa.zha.zhe boy is displayed alongside the roach and spreader to show how the item is worn. There is no information about the tribe or cultural significance of the items on display.

I happened on three Wa.zha.zhe roach feathers in the “Bending, Weaving, Dancing: The Art of Woody Crumbo” exhibit. The exhibit is located on the first floor in the far left corner gallery from the main entrance. Crumbo was a Potawatomi artist so finding these items associated with his work was unusual. The roach feathers were merely there to bring some reality to his paintings which were often of American Indian dancers and Native American Church ceremonies. The Wa.zha.zhe People are closely associated with both.
The Kravis Discovery Center located in the Gilcrease museums basement provides visitors with a unique experience. Any visitor to the Gilcrease can follow the steps down to the basement that bring them into a room full of drawers and display cases. Computers are available to allow museum visitors to search a database of this collection of 5,000 items and receive that items location by drawer. The Kravis Discovery Center had 13 Wa.zha.zhe items on display. These items ranged from necklaces to moccasins to quilled bags. None of the items had placards with them and there was no information available with the Wa.zha.zhe items in the database.

Both museums can be applauded for including American Indian items in their art collections at all. Most American Indian art usually ends up in history or anthropology museums, prematurely separated through a western lens as to what does and does not qualify as art. But what both of these museums have done is to remove the Wa.zha.zhe items from their cultural context. Besides aesthetic value what will museum patrons get out of the exhibit besides that they look cool? The absence of additional information, via placards from museum curators, as to the why and how these items were made, does not allow these pieces to be totally appreciated for what they represent and just as important, what they do not. They are Wa.zha.zhe pieces and are unique to that culture, but paired with other items from other tribes they become just mere artifacts. Many of the items on display are very old placing the objects and the people that made them into objects of a distant past.

The theme of the Wa.zha.zhe being relics of the past stands out above all else at these two art museums. There is so little information on the items or the Wa.zha.zhe People. Neither art museum had many Wa.zha.zhe items that were newer than the 1920’s. The Gilcrease displayed three paintings that were from 1950-1980. That’s three items out of 23. However, the subject matter of each of those paintings was from the early part of the 20th century or before,
again placing the Wa.zha.zhe People in the past. The structure of these exhibits places the Wa.zha.zhe People in a static past with no place for them in the present. As a result, it contributes to views that the present-day Wa.zha.zhe People are not real Indians in the minds of non-Wa.zha.zhe because of the static nature of their existence placed on them by a colonial viewpoint that dominates the way they are being presented. The reality that many of these items are still in use by the Wa.zha.zhe People today is lost to the visitor.

**History/ Anthropology Museums**

I visited the Bartlesville Area History Museum on March 19, 2013. The first exhibit I came to was located in the rear of the museum titled “Oil and the Osage”. It was primarily seven pictures, five of which were of Wa.zha.zhe men. This display focused on the discovery of oil on the Osage reservation located west of Bartlesville and the auctioning of mineral leases on reservation land. Near the entrance of the museum was a display of Wa.zha.zhe materials with no apparent title. It consisted of three mannequins dressed in Wa.zha.zhe clothing, 2 dolls, 1 painting, a blanket, shawl, and purse. Despite consultation with a Wa.zha.zhe family there were no placards describing any of the items. A stack of quarter fold pamphlets were nearby that told a brief history of the Wa.zha.zhe People settling in the area, up to their current status. But a majority of the text is about the oil under the reservation. Both exhibits focused on the early 1900’s, the time when oil exploration and leases were being sold on the Wa.zha.zhe reservation.

The Fort Osage Education Center was visited on February 24, 2013. The exhibit is located in the back of the basement, opposite the stairs. It was hard to tell, but it appeared that the exhibit covered the time period 1673-2007, when the exhibit opened. There was definitely focus on the time period between 1808-1822, when Fort Osage then named Fort Clark, was occupied. There were 15 Wa.zha.zhe items in the exhibit that include a partial replica of a Wa.zha.zhe home, two mannequins, cradle board, dice game, pipe, club, shell necklace,
fingerweaving, shield, beaded strip, and two contemporary bowls. The home replica was filled with pictures of the Wa.zha.zhe people from the 1800’s and early 1900’s as well as a timeline of known Wa.zha.zhe history. There was information on the Wa.zha.zhe People present and it described them in the present tense. The placards did not tell who made the items or their cultural significance.

There was also a film entitled Finding Missouri: Our History and Heritage that mentions the Wa.zha.zhe. Visitors can watch this 10 minute movie as they enter the museum’s main entrance. It mostly talks about the fort, but there is a section where an actor is narrating the words of a Wa.zha.zhe leader and he speaks slowly and hesitantly. While an adult may understand that the Wa.zha.zhe leader is speaking a second language, many school age children are shown this film and it is easy for a young mind to assume the person speaking is slow witted and not intelligent. At a young age, because of a 20 second clip, their impression of the Wa.zha.zhe People has already been marred. Because they heard it with their own ears no matter how many times they read differing views about the Wa.zha.zhe People that first impression will stick with them.

The Historic Arkansas Museum was visited on February 18, 2013. The museums’ permanent exhibit “We Walk in Two Worlds” showcases the Wa.zha.zhe, Quapaw, and Caddo Peoples that lived in the area that is present day Arkansas. It is found on the second floor of the main building. The museum used consultants from all three tribes assist them with its design and curation. Even with the generous space provided it was hard to fit a significant amount of items from any one tribe due to the large amount of time the exhibit was trying to cover, approximately 1200 c.e. to 2009 when the exhibit opened. There was a total of 128 items on display, 28 of these were from the Wa.zha.zhe People. Items ranged from a mannequin, moccasins, jewelry, blanket,
games, and war implements. Some placards told who made the items as well as the cultural significance. There was information about the Wa.zha.zhe People from several time periods. The Wa.zha.zhe People were talked about in both present and past tense depending on the time period being discussed.

The Missouri American Indian Cultural Center also has a museum that pays tribute to nine tribes that once lived in the state of Missouri. I visited the museum on March 3, 2013. The museum display covered prehistory to the present. There were over 130 items in the exhibit with only six being Wa.zha.zhe. Five of those were reproductions of paintings from the 1800’s. The last was a mannequin dressed in the Wa.zha.zhe clothing of the late Wa.zha.zhe historian, Louis Burns. Placards next to the paintings identified them as being from famed artist Carl Bodmer who traveled the US painting people from various tribes. There was no placard for the mannequin, but a three ring bound book with pictures of individual items and their significance. It didn’t seem as clean as a wall placard, but I must admit, it did the job of describing each item’s use. Some of the pages told who made the item and its significance, but not always. There were no descriptions of any of the tribes present. Most of the exhibit consisted of these large prints of Bodmer paintings. At first glance I was lead to believe that past representations were all that was available of the Wa.zha.zhe People, but was then given an audio device by a museum staff member that told of the tribe’s history up through present day.

I visited the Osage Tribal Museum on March 19, 2013. This museum is unique from the others in that its content is primarily Wa.zha.zhe. An exhibit with photos of the 2,229 original allottees from the 1906 tribal roll fills most of the front gallery. Items associated with hunting, the fur trade, the Wa.zha.zhe ceremonial dance I’n.lon.schka, family life, and Native American Church (NAC) items fill the rest of the front gallery. The second gallery contains a model NAC
church house, paintings of former chiefs and council members, and the busts of the first ten allottees. There are over 6,000 items housed at the museum, many donated by Wa.zha.zhe families. Approximately 2,500 are on display. While there is information about the Wa.zha.zhe People on display, it was a surprise to find no information on who made the items or their cultural significance.

Naturally some museums did a better job at displaying items, while others did a better job of describing the Wa.zha.zhe people. Because I am looking at them collectively a couple themes really stood out in every museum exhibit. The first is the Wa.zha.zhe People as relics of the past. The second is the Wa.zha.zhe People as savage warriors. These two themes are based on written descriptions of the Wa.zha.zhe People as well as the visual items on display at each museum.

The portrayal of the Wa.zha.zhe People as relics of the past dominated these museum exhibits. While some museums such as the Osage Tribal museum and the Fort Osage Education Center used descriptive language that used present tense when discussing the Wa.zha.zhe, the majority of presentation topics, imagery, and items displayed where from the late 1800’s to early 1900’s. Only in a few cases were contemporary items on display. Imagery of present day Wa.zha.zhe was used at three of the museums and paled in comparison the vast majority of distant historical references, images, and items presented to the museum visitor. While using present tense in Wa.zha.zhe descriptors, or giving at most a single paragraph of where the Wa.zha.zhe People are today was helpful, neither effort overcame the overall message of each exhibit. That message being, with the exception of the Osage Tribal Museum, that the Wa.zha.zhe People were here, now they are not.

The second theme that emerged was the Wa.zha.zhe as savage warriors. Museum texts had numerous references to acts of violence committed by the Wa.zha.zhe in response to
incursions from Indians and non-Indian intruders. But the many stories relayed in the museum exhibits as well as the abundance of items associated with war in the exhibits portray a side of the Wa.zha.zhe People that is but a fraction of the whole picture. Significantly fewer passages mentioned the friendly relations the Wa.zha.zhe had with neighboring tribes and the Americans. A majority of the museum exhibits give the visitor the idea that Wa.zha.zhe men did little else but fight with other tribes and Europeans.

**Anthropology texts**

I examined eight anthropology texts on the Wa.zha.zhe in all. Four were books, one was a dissertation, one was a book chapter and two were articles. In total there were 413 textual representations of the Wa.zha.zhe People and 192 visual representations of Wa.zha.zhe people. The anthropological studies tended to be more recent than the historical ones, the majority having taken place in the later part of the 20th century. What stood out first and foremost is the lack of representation about Wa.zha.zhe children. Several of the authors mentioned the importance of children to the Wa.zha.zhe People, yet there were only 11 pictures of Wa.zha.zhe youth and only slight number more textual references. Another area that was lacking was the subject of Wa.zha.zhe women. Most references to women were about their clothing and the amount of work they did. There were only 38 images of Wa.zha.zhe women used in the anthropological texts compared to 123 of men. The remaining 20 images were mixed images of men, women, and children. Three other aspects stood out in the collective anthropological text on the Wa.zha.zhe. One was that they are a highly adaptive People, the other is the existence of a complex social system, and the third, because of the time period of the studies, is that they are, to a certain point, relics of the past.
The adaptive nature of the Wa.zha.zhe People has helped them to thrive in a variety of situations rather than vanish. What appears to have aided the Wa.zha.zhe in their survival is that their culture allowed for easy adaptations to certain situations and new customs were readily incorporated into the social structure in full or in part. A common theme in Indigenous Studies is that of the vanishing Indian. While the anthropological literature would initially support such a hypothesis, one only need delve further to discover for the Wa.zha.zhe People it is quite the opposite. Evidence of this is found in the incorporation of the Native American Church religion and even the adoption of ribbonwork as a tribal art form. In both cases the Wa.zha.zhe People took from what others brought to them and made it their own. In the case of the incorporation of NAC, they developed the West facing altar (Swan 113). With ribbonwork Wa.zha.zhe women took European trade goods and developed an art form that has been closely associated with the tribe ever since.

Another theme is the complex social structure of the Wa.zha.zhe People. At times it was problematic for them. If it were not for their adaptive nature, it could have been there undoing many times. American Indians have been stereotyped at times as simple creatures of nature with simple ways and no religion. This was not the case for the Wa.zha.zhe whose social structure was filled with classes of individuals that determined one’s future status within the tribe, who they could marry, and positions individuals could fill within Wa.zha.zhe society. Their social structure allowed them to resist unwanted influence from outsiders and deal with new ways on their own terms. The Wa.zha.zhe never accepted the American concept of blood quantum in relation to tribal identity. It has never been used to determine tribal membership since the creation of their first constitution. Earlier determinations of belonging were based on residency and community involvement (Dennison 128-132). The current 2006 Osage Constitution
determines that current membership is based on lineal decent from the 1906 census. Despite pressure from the United States government and even other tribes they only met such actions as removal, allotment, and termination on Wa.zha.zhe terms.

Because a majority of the studies have examined Wa.zha.zhe social or cultural change in past periods the relics of the past theme emerged again. With the exception of Dennison’s dissertation that looked at the 2006 Wa.zha.zhe constitution and Powell’s revitalization of ribbonwork among the Wa.zha.zhe, all the other studies have taken place nearly 40 years ago or more. Most of the imagery is of older Wa.zha.zhe items or pictures. The combination of the two presents the Wa.zha.zhe People as relics of the past once again. If not for Dennison’s work a reader would have no idea that the Wa.zha.zhe People are still around. Major social changes had to have occurred to the Wa.zha.zhe People after their move to Oklahoma other than receiving the I’n.lon.schka drum and adopting NAC. But that period remains underrepresented.

**History texts**

The history texts consisted of ten books, one dissertation, and two articles. There were 1,223 textual representations and 101 occurrences of visual representations located in the thirteen historical texts. There were 61 images of men, 19 images of women, and 20 images that were a mixture of men, women and children. There was only one image of children. The historical texts, with the exception of two books, concentrated on the Wa.zha.zhe Peoples history from White contact in 1673 just after their removal to their present day reservation in Oklahoma in 1872. The majority of those books focused on the Wa.zha.zhe during the contact and fur trade eras. The historical texts reiterated those of the anthropological text in regard to the importance of children in Wa.zha.zhe society. Any discussion of children’s roles in Wa.zha.zhe history was not just ignored by anthropologists, but by historians as well. The presence of Wa.zha.zhe
women is also underplayed in the historical texts even with one work by Tai Edwards that specifically examined gender roles. One theme that emerged was the Wa.zha.zhe People as relics of the past. Another was the Static Indian. The Wa.zha.zhe as shrewd businessmen was a surprising theme that existed in almost every one of the historical texts. Much of the historical literature on the Wa.zha.zhe included descriptions of how their financial benefits have set them apart from other tribes.

The Wa.zha.zhe as relics of the past is a prevalent representation in the history texts. Over use of pre-1900 imagery along with the over study of the Wa.zha.zhe during the fur trade era disconnects the reader with the present day Wa.zha.zhe People. As a result it was easy for them to just fade away in the minds of readers. With little representation of the Wa.zha.zhe People after 1950 readers are left with the idea that there are no more Wa.zha.zhe People alive. Most of the pictures that are used are from the trade era, which support the bias of the reader that that is what the Wa.zha.zhe look like. And when they do not see people looking like that on the street then they naturally assume that there are no more Wa.zha.zhe People left. Some of the texts gave little more than a page of information about the present day Wa.zha.zhe People. These seemed like poor attempts to avoid having their work labeled as presenting the people only in the past tense. The fact that only three of the works were written in the early 21st century means that what little information there was, is now more outdated than ever.

Another theme that emerged is that Wa.zha.zhe culture is static. This was largely due to the time period that was covered in a majority of the studies. While some texts included present day descriptions of the Wa.zha.zhe in their conclusions, they fail to mention that Wa.zha.zhe culture is alive and well and very different from Wa.zha.zhe culture a hundred years ago. Again the overuse of 1800’s images of Wa.zha.zhe People only supports this misrepresentation. Such
conclusions may avoid misrepresenting the Wa.zha.zhe as relics of the past, but the image of the static Indian is still out there. Even texts that include more recent topics still manage to use older pictures and descriptions of Wa.zha.zhe men, women, and children at the time of contact. It’s almost as if it were some sort of requirement to include those outdated images and descriptions if a scholar is going to write about the Wa.zha.zhe People. While it may connect the Wa.zha.zhe with their past, it comes at the price of disassociating the reader with their present.

The last theme that stood out in the history texts was the Wa.zha.zhe as shrewd businessmen. Almost every text that covered the trade era spent considerable time stressing this idea. It was the Wa.zha.zhe business sense that gave them control over much of the lower Missouri and Arkansas River Valleys during the colonial fur trade era. And it was this same shrewdness that gave the Wa.zha.zhe People the upper hand in the 1870’s because they insisted on buying their Oklahoma reservation. They never picked up a plow except to sell it to white settlers and instead of becoming farmers sold grazing leases to White ranchers. Many Wa.zha.zhe were already financially well off before oil was discovered on their reservation. The same shrewd business sense remained apparent when the Wa.zha.zhe leadership had the foresight to retain mineral rights to their land. It remains one of the best business decisions the Wa.zha.zhe people could have made at the time.

Each academic field has its own set of representations that it seemed to embrace in this collection of data. Based on this collection of Wa.zha.zhe data all three fields seem to have left the Wa.zha.zhe People in the distant past. Museums focused on the warrior side of past Wa.zha.zhe culture. Perhaps this is what brings in visitors to the museum. Anthropology has brought to light the highly adaptive nature of the Wa.zha.zhe People that helped them survive and succeed in an ever-changing world. And it seems the historians in the effort to record the
past, leave readers with the impression that the Wa.zha.zhe People have changed very little and seemingly faded away. I initially thought that museums would have changed the quickest since it is much easier to correct an exhibit placard than it is rewrite a book. That was not the case, however. Based on this evidence it appears that Anthropologists have paid more recent attention to the Wa.zha.zhe People. This leads me to believe that the museums I visited relied far more on the historical data and less on the Anthropological data when gathering information for their exhibits.

The examination of the primary data allowed me to determine that past descriptions were being recycled, which lead to the outdated and stereotyped impressions of the Wa.zha.zhe People by readers. Many sources were used in various texts which possibly led to the collective themes. An absence of primary Wa.zha.zhe sources plagued most of the texts. Non-Wa.zha.zhe sources dominated the primary data used in all three disciplines. Over reliance on non-Wa.zha.zhe sources leads me question the accuracy of those representations, but it would seem that we are left with little else to go by. Bias of primary investigators has limited the amount of information available for future studies of early Wa.zha.zhe history. Due an unavailability of primary Wa.zha.zhe sources for certain time periods some research questions are no longer answerable.
Chapter 6

Conclusions
Summary

A number of studies have been conducted on American Indian stereotypes and imagery. Such studies tend to rely on overgeneralized ideas that add to the stereotype that all Indians are the same. In order to avoid such a misconception, this study was guided by the question: How do historical and anthropological texts written between 1960 and 2010 and current museum exhibits differ in the ways in which they present the Wa.zha.zhe People? There was no current research that examined those works collectively. I used Wa.zha.zhe representations and images as tools for discovering themes that describe the Wa.zha.zhe People that were not apparent in the reviews of individual works. The collective examination I conducted uncovered themes that were not evident as being problematic through individual reviews. The examination of the primary data showed that the sources used were not only being used in multiple texts, but they relied heavily on non-Wa.zha.zhe sources for their descriptions. Through this collective study of Wa.zha.zhe materials I was able to determine where the strengths, weaknesses, and gaps exist. If the only representations of the Wa.zha.zhe are from the distant past then that is how they will be viewed. Further examinations of the Wa.zha.zhe are needed to fill gaps in the informative research about the tribe.

Interpretation of Findings

New themes emerged from the data that were Wa.zha.zhe specific, which lead to alternative representations of the Wa.zha.zhe People for the rest of the world. The discovery of social adaptability among the Wa.zha.zhe is an unusual descriptor for any American Indian group. The discovery of the shrewd Wa.zha.zhe businessman is also a unique theme to come out of the data. Both of these are a surprise and yet have the ability to break other misrepresentations about American Indians. The realization that the Wa.zha.zhe People are portrayed as being static and relics of the past by all three disciplines is concerning. Especially
since those fields claim authority over knowledge about American Indian Peoples. Suggestions for combating this are made below.

My study can help future scholars determine where the strengths, weaknesses, and gaps exist in the research concerning the tribe. This should aid future scholars in choosing studies that contribute to the scholarship on the Wa.zha.zhe People. The examination of the primary data the authors used aids in determining if descriptions of the Wa.zha.zhe People from the past are being recycled. With this knowledge, future Wa.zha.zhe scholars can be more aware of their source materials and attempt to balance out the source materials when possible.

My study contributes to the current discussion of American Indian stereotypes that is occurring in Indigenous Studies. My study removes the overgeneralizations that occur through the use of the term “American Indian” by examining the representations of one particular tribe, the Wa.zha.zhe. Studies such as this are important for future discussions on American Indian stereotypes. As Indigenous Studies scholars, we can now shift the general conversation to more focused ones that may begin to reveal the origins of these misguided viewpoints. Now that we have the attention of non-Natives through general conversations on Native stereotyping, we can begin to discuss the stereotyping of Native Peoples on our own terms.

**Limitations**

There are some obvious limitations to my study, the first of which is the limited scope of my study. I chose a period of only 50 years of writing about the Wa.zha.zhe People. There is a good deal of data prior to 1960; however, a majority of it carries a great deal of bias toward the Wa.zha.zhe and American Indians in general. Other studies have brought out the ethnocentric nature of the researchers in that time period which was evident when I examined the bibliographies of the works in my study. I am considering doing another study of that time period and comparing the two data sets.
The sample size of my study was also limited. To avoid being overwhelmed by the data I cut off data collection at 20 textual sources. I also noticed that some authors had turned several of their smaller studies into a book. To avoid repetition I went with the book, which is also why I used fewer articles in my study compared to books. A larger study that consists of more Wa.zha.zhe texts may yield different results. I plan to follow up on this research and collect the rest of the data within my time frame and combine the data sets.

Due to the nature of museum exhibits I was limited to museums that displayed Wa.zha.zhe objects at the time of the study. And because of limited financial resources I conducted a regional search of exhibits opposed to a national one. A study over a longer time period would give me more data. And a national search of Wa.zha.zhe exhibits may also provide further data. In contrast, a study that chose to examine one type of museum instead of several could affect my results as well. American Indian Art and the issue of museums has been the topic of many books on its own. The inclusion of art museums was problematic when compared with the history and anthropology museums because there were times when I felt like I was comparing apples to oranges. Exclusion of American Indian Art in fine art museums has more to do with the Art industry and less to do with the relationship those museums have with the fields of History and Anthropology.

The most important limitation of the study is that it is only a study of information about the Wa.zha.zhe People. Therefore the results only apply to them. While this is considered an advantage through an Indigenous Studies perspective, it is a limitation of the data, but in this particular case the limitation is made to avoid generalization. While the results are not applicable to other tribes, this study itself could serve as a model for the study of other tribes.
My own inexperience is also a limitation. My field is in Indigenous Studies, while I attempted to take a historical approach, I am not a historian, anthropologists, or museologist. My knowledge of those fields and their associated theories is very limited. The collection and examination of my data by a scholar in one of those three fields may produce different results. My inexperience with coding data is another obvious problem. During analysis some passages were removed because they were not representations of the Wa.zha.zhe People, but of individuals.

**Suggestions for Further Research**

One purpose of this study was to identify gaps in the research on the Wa.zha.zhe People. There is much to be done in Wa.zha.zhe studies as it seems that the tribe was heavily studied during the fur trade era and slowly trickled off as time went on. First, I believe a more comprehensive study needs to be done that examines books for children and other informative texts about the Wa.zha.zhe People, not just the historical and anthropological text. Researchers on the Wa.zha.zhe most likely will use whatever information they can find. So a more comprehensive study could lead to the discovery of more representation of the Wa.zha.zhe People.

A comparative study of the Wa.zha.zhe information in the writings before 1960 could yield some interesting results. If anything, it may lend more credibility to my initial analysis that those writings tend to be more biased. A combination of the two studies could show how the writings about the Wa.zha.zhe have changed over time. Or a study could examine the cause of those changes within the various fields of Anthropology, History, or Museum Studies.

Another idea worthy of a comparative study would be how the Wa.zha.zhe People have been portrayed in the media over time. A majority of that coverage, I imagine, would be through
written media such as newspapers. It may be surprising to see exactly what has or has not been
deemed newsworthy and how the Wa.zha.zhe People are represented in those stories. It would
also be interesting to see the patterns to those stories in regards to not just how the Wa.zha.zhe
People have been represented in them, but if there is a correlation to how far reaching those
stories have been carried through various media outlets. Most news stories concerning American
Indians are covered via social media outlets and tribal newspapers. There may not be enough
media coverage of the tribe to support such a study.

A study on artifact selection with history and anthropology museum exhibits would be
worthy as well. The selection of what Wa.zha.zhe items go into an exhibit is filtered through
several lenses and therefore has an effect on what may be shown to curators and consultants.
Based on that selection alone what visitors are exposed to during a museum exhibit has passed
through a variety of filters. An examination that explores alternative relationships between
museum pieces could produce museum exhibits that present items through a variety of lenses.

Studies on Wa.zha.zhe children could give insight to family life among the Wa.zha.zhe. All the historians in the works I examined stated that children were an important part of
Wa.zha.zhe life, yet there has never been a study on them because they were not important to
past researchers. I found it remarkably odd that they reported on their importance, but family life
does not support the savage warrior stereotype that plagues those works. What was life like for
Wa.zha.zhe children during the fur trade era? Have the roles of children changed over time?
What led to those changes?

Another group that is largely overlooked is Wa.zha.zhe women. Gendered studies of the
Wa.zha.zhe People are needed to produce a complete picture of the Wa.zha.zhe People. Most
accounts of Wa.zha.zhe women are from an outsider perspective and only discuss how much
work they did or how they supported their husbands in gathering the necessary items to become a clan priest. The Wa.zha.zhe People do not do those things anymore. How have the roles of women changed in Wa.zha.zhe culture over time? Did achieving the right to vote for Wa.zha.zhe women have an effect on Wa.zha.zhe elections? These are some of many questions that an analysis of Wa.zha.zhe representations reveals as being in need of answers.

As I write about the representations of the Wa.zha.zhe, I become an active participant in their representation. I hope this project is an accurate depiction of the Wa.zha.zhe data, based on the works I examined. What led to my initial investigation was a belief that the Wa.zha.zhe People have been largely ignored over the past hundred years. My desire is for readers to focus as much on what has not been said about the Wa.zha.zhe People in the collective research as what lies in the above pages. While my study analyzes data about the Wa.zha.zhe rather than the people themselves, I hope my findings are well received by them. My intent is that this study leads to further research that is useful to present day Wa.zha.zhe People.
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