PROJECT MUSE®

From Stories to Salt Cairns: Uncovering Indigenous Influence
in the Formative Years of the Oregon Historical Society,
1898-1905

Sarah Keyes

Oregon Historical Quarterly, Volume 121, Number 2, Summer 2020, pp.
186-211 (Article)

Published by Oregon Historical Society
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1353/ohq.2020.0050>

➔ *For additional information about this article*
<https://muse.jhu.edu/article/830158/summary>

From Stories to Salt Cairns

*Uncovering Indigenous Influence in the
Formative Years of the Oregon Historical Society,
1898–1905*

SARAH KEYES

So he called for the birds. The first that came was a little wren. She pecked, and broke her bill, but could not make a hole. Then came the lark, and the robin, and the blue jay, and black bird, and many others that tried, but could do nothing. But as each came and did what it could Tallapus listened and gave it a name.¹

SOMETIME IN THE LATE NINETEENTH CENTURY the Reverend Horace S. Lyman transcribed what he called the story of “Tallapus and the Cedar Tree” for preservation by the Oregon Historical Society (OHS). Now contained within the Horace Lyman papers in the OHS archives, this story presents researchers and OHS staff with the opportunity to explore Indigenous pasts, presents, and futures. When Lyman recorded the tale, he believed it would help offset a dangerous curricular bias toward the places and people of the eastern United States. In Lyman’s view, these “‘Indians’ stories” were important because they “make a basis for studying our history.” So too did they “introduce our own scenery and geography. . . . At present our children are easternized, or almost Europeanized, by our school books.” Lyman, a second-generation Oregonian who had gone east to Oberlin for college before returning to his native state, likely felt that he himself had been in danger of becoming “easternized.” After his return to Oregon, he dedicated himself to preaching the sacred gospel of the Congregational Church as a practicing reverend and to preaching the secular gospel of Oregon history as a member

Sarah Keyes was awarded a 2011 Donald J. Sterling, Jr., Graduate Research Fellowship in Pacific Northwest History, which supported this work.

IN THIS IMAGE FROM 1897, Jennie Martineau, seated, center, is shown surrounded by her neighbors, Joe and Grace Swahaw to her left, and Jennie and Nina Lane to her right (Nina is seated). Jennie was a Clatsop woman who influenced historical practice at the Oregon Historical Society (OHS). This multi-generational neighbor group defies the pernicious White trope of “disappearing Indians” that shaped many non-Natives’ views of Native Oregonians. Preserved in the OHS Research Library archives, this photograph vividly depicts Native persistence and Native community.

of OHS. Just as the birds came pecking, hoping to free Tallapus, so did Lyman hope that stories like that of Tallapus and the Cedar tree would free the youth of Oregon from their dependence on eastern materials.²

SILAS B. SMITH is pictured here as a young man. Smith went east to be educated and later returned to the Clatsop Plains to practice law. He was the first Native member of the Oregon Historical Society and was well-respected for his historical work.

And yet, neither Lyman nor his fellow OHS practitioners of history could do this alone. Indeed, the close connection between Lyman and his Native informants is characteristic of OHS's early years. Lyman credited Silas B. Smith with sharing the Tallapus story in his published history of Oregon, but in his manuscript notes, he credited Louis Labonte. It is possible that Lyman heard versions of the story from both men. Both Smith and Labonte traced their heritage to Clatsop leader Coboway, who had played a pivotal role in guiding his people through European and American incursions into Oregon. That Lyman could have heard this story from both men indicates his close connection with a number of Native informants. These connections are significant because they undercut narratives of a simplistic division between non-Natives and Natives in the formative years of historical societies such as OHS.

At OHS, Native Americans and people of mixed racial heritage such as Silas B. Smith donated artifacts, conducted and granted interviews, and wrote and presented Oregon history.³ Through their participation in the formative years of OHS, Native Americans shaped the archival and material collections as well as interpretive documents that continue to serve as the primary organs of preserving and disseminating Oregon history.

Moreover, Indigenous participation in the formative years of OHS helped to put a local spin on the leading national interpretation of the history of the U.S. West in the turn-of-the-twentieth-century United States. Lyman voiced his concern about the easternization or even the Europeanization of White Oregon schoolchildren less than a decade after historian Frederick Jackson

Turner had declared the frontier closed and, with it, the end of the process that made European immigrants into Americans. OHS historical practitioners did not question Turner's prevailing interpretation of American and western history as the meeting of civilization and savagery and the ultimate triumph of the former over the latter.⁴ But, motivated by their shared commitment to Oregon history, they did localize it. By the late nineteenth century, Whites had seized control of Oregon through brutal military conquest and political finagling: the "savagery" that Turner identified as the pre-history phase of the frontier process no longer held sway. Yet nor did the "civilization" that Turner envisioned emerging from the frontier process. Nowhere in Oregon did the state approximate the industrial development that had been reached in the East. Thus, while the Turner thesis declared the frontier officially "closed," and White Oregonians passed laws to excise Native people from politics and voting rights, historical practice at OHS highlighted Indigenous presence and persistence. Moving from the national scale of Turner's *The Significance of the Frontier in American History* (1893) to the local scale of Oregon state history shows how, in attempting to force Oregon history into a Turnerian narrative, practitioners at OHS inadvertently revealed the limits of this historical interpretation. Because constructing Oregon's past depended on Native participation, the very process of historical practice defied the interpretive lens through which Lyman and others understood Native knowledge, history, and culture.

In examining these early, close connections between Native and non-Native practitioners as well as non-Natives' use of Native stories and objects to establish the significance of Oregon in opposition to the East and Europe, this article contributes to our understanding of OHS and settler-colonialism in Oregon. This article builds on existing scholarship on historical societies in the U.S. West that has established their three-pronged goal of excluding people of color, remaking Native lands into White settler space, and appearing as civilized as the states in the East from which they had migrated. While the latter goal was unique to societies in the West, turn-of-the-century historical societies across the nation erased people of color from active roles in historical events while relegating them to a past that preceded a White present and future. Looking specifically at New England, historian Jean O'Brien has summed up settler-colonial historical practice as a series of "replacement narratives," in which Whites embrace Indigenous people as part of their past while physically and imaginatively replacing them on the landscape.⁵ Recent scholarship on history, race, and identity in Oregon has outlined a similar settler-colonial attempt at erasure, while also highlighting Indigenous persistence.⁶ By focusing on the first seven years of OHS, during

which time practitioners worked to get the society up and running and to prepare for the 1905 Lewis and Clark Exposition, this article contributes to our understanding of this persistence and sheds light on early cross-racial and cross-cultural conflict and collaboration within OHS.

Taking this view adds nuance to our current understanding of the work and impact of nineteenth-century historical societies. In the United States, historical societies first sprung up in centers of White American population along the East Coast. Designed to collect and record relics and mementos of the exclusively White colonial past, their practitioners created imbalanced collections of materials that continue to challenge scholars working to tell inclusive histories.⁷ This division only worsened over the course of the century. By the late nineteenth century, the professionalization of history coupled with the rise of larger, urban museums, created a new divide that strictly distinguished between White “history” and Native “tradition.” Historian Steven Conn has described how, by the end of the century, history museums had shifted from displaying both American and Native American artifacts to displaying only American artifacts. Native American relics and history became relegated to natural history museums. By assigning “Indians” to natural history, Americans attempted to portray Native Americans as members of a vanishing or static culture more synonymous with the natural world than the human world.⁸

This trajectory, however, was predominantly limited to large, urban institutions in the East, not smaller, regional operations such as OHS. Organizations such as OHS were part of a flurry of historical activity that accompanied westward settler-colonial expansion. The missions and collecting practices of these western historical societies reflected an urgent desire to create and preserve collections *in situ* and to claim ownership over stories of their places and communities.⁹ Because of these high stakes, non-Natives quickly jumped into the fray of historical collecting as they migrated westward. Thus, in many western states the historical society is often as old as the state or territory whose history it is designed to record. These western societies focused on the “golden age” of the “pioneer period” even as they worked to prove themselves the cultural equals of eastern states.¹⁰

While founders and promoters of these societies celebrated White civilization and saw Native society as inferior, those at OHS (and likely at other smaller western historical societies) did not construct a strict divide between history, supposedly defined by historical change caused by Whites, and “Indian” traditions, supposedly defined by everything that existed outside that chronology. Lyman, for instance, prized place-based knowledge over an exclusive emphasis on historical change. As he put it, stories like that of

Tallapus “make a basis for studying our history . . . history should begin by local events, and nowhere is there better material than here for philosophic study of this science.”¹¹ Lyman’s vision of history as a scientific discipline was one widely shared by White contemporaries in the United States and the western world.¹² But his contemporaries likely would have balked at his contention that Native stories made for great historical material. In focusing on place as central to OHS historical practice, Lyman and other early practitioners of history at OHS bridged the ostensible divide between history and natural history. To know history, they had to know place, thus making natural history a natural ally. For OHS practitioners, Native Americans and people of mixed heritage such as Smith and Labonte were important sources of historical and geographic knowledge. Their participation in the process of establishing OHS complicates our understanding of the history of the institution’s founding.¹³

From its inception, OHS’s founders conceived of their organization as one that would collect texts, oral histories, and objects that contained information related to Europeans, White Americans, and Indigenous people. The twenty-six Oregonians who gathered to form OHS charged the organization with the mission to “collect and preserve a library of historical material related to the history of the state,” including “the gathering and preservation of Indians’ traditions.”¹⁴ In his first report to OHS in December 1899, a year after its founding, Frederick G. Young, University of Oregon Professor of History and OHS secretary, underscored this expansive approach to collecting. In the report, Young lauded Oregon as a place of “Great diversity,” a young state that had been the home of numerous American Indians as well as different European groups who had attempted to colonize it. OHS must, he continued, “collect into its museum the remains of all these forms of life and civilization.”¹⁵ This commitment to expansive collecting distinguished OHS from most historical societies in the East.¹⁶ Throughout the nineteenth century, only a handful of historical societies, including the American Antiquarian Society, had purposefully pursued collecting beyond the sources of White Americans and former European (primarily British) colonists.¹⁷ In calling for diverse collecting practices, Young created a place for Native American materials that did not exist in historical societies in the East.

Diversity of collecting, however, did not signify equality of collecting. Young’s statement distinguished between “Indians,” who had “forms of life,” and Europeans and Americans, who had civilization.¹⁸ Notwithstanding its inclusive approach, OHS favored collecting sources related to Euro-American “pioneers.” Indeed, the society owed much of its beginnings to people who had been and were active in the Oregon Pioneer Association (OPA), as many OPA members also became members of OHS. George Himes, who

was probably the most notable of these OPA/OHS historical practitioners, had been the secretary of OPA since its founding in 1873 and became the assistant secretary of OHS when it was founded in 1898. Himes used his existing OPA network to pursue historical work required of him in his position with the new OHS.¹⁹

Himes also cultivated his personal identity as a pioneer to facilitate his mission to collect members, stories, and objects for OHS.²⁰ In the more than forty years Himes served as assistant secretary he personally interviewed over 7,000 Oregonians, traversing the state by wagon and train to visit residents in their homes.²¹ Entries in his daily diary suggest that the people with whom Himes met and from whom he collected may have been less interested in adding their piece of family history to the broader public collection than they were in sitting on the porch and passing the time reminiscing with a fellow “pioneer.” Living in rural outposts of the Oregon country and drawing closer to old age, men and women begged Himes to stay for lunch, dinner, or overnight.²² Himes visited, but he also collected artifacts and memories — and encouraged his contacts to join OHS.

Many of the non-Native Oregonians who joined OHS contributed personal historical narratives for publication in the *The Quarterly of the Oregon Historical Society* (now known as the *Oregon Historical Quarterly*, this journal was and is the primary publication of OHS). These personal narratives attempted to replicate Turner’s imaginary divide between Oregon’s complicated racial past and its White present and future. Writing of “Life in Early Oregon” in the *Quarterly*’s second issue, published in June 1900, Velina Pauline Molson acknowledged that many male residents had married Indigenous wives: “Sometimes the housewife was of another nationality, and claimed a prior right to this beautiful valley.”²³ A similar statement is found in the “Reminiscences of F.X. Matthieu” published in the first edition of the *Quarterly*. The reminiscence begins by identifying Matthieu as a French Canadian of “pure French descent.” Matthieu then recalled how when he arrived in Oregon and met “the settlers of the prairie” he found that “most of them had native wives, or at least of mixed blood.” Despite this explicit reference to cross-racial families, the reminiscence demurs from identifying Matthieu as the member of a non-Native and Native relationship. But, on April 15, 1846, four years after his arrival in Oregon, Matthieu had married Rose Osant, the daughter of French Prairie resident and Hudson’s Bay Company trader Louis Osant and an unidentified Native American woman. This lack of identification of Rose’s mother, combined with the earlier statement that most male French Prairie residents had married women of Indigenous descent, passively identifies Rose as Indigenous. The absence of an explicit identification of Rose’s mother in Matthieu’s reminiscence (edited by none other than Horace Lyman)

To Pioneers of Oregon

Please fill out the following blanks and forward to GEO. H. HIMES, Assistant Secretary Oregon Historical Society,
PORTLAND, OREGON, at your earliest convenience. This will be used in perfecting a Register of Pioneers.

Name David John Lowe
(Spell out Christian name in full)

Place and date of birth Baltimore County Maryland Born November 10th 1823
(Town, County, State, or County, if from abroad.)

Father John Lowe. Born March 25th A.D. 1785 - Baltimore Co. Md.
(Give name and place and date of birth)

Mother Ann Lave Born April A.D. 1802 - Baltimore Co. Maryland
(Give name and place and date of birth)

Paternal Grandparents John Lave Born March 5th 1757 Hannah Lave Jan 17th 1757
(Give name and place and date of birth in each case)

John Lowe & Hannah Hewitt married 17th Sept 1778.

Maternal Grandparents Greenberry Gosnell & Ruth Pemberton my mother's
(Give name and place and date of birth in each case)

Parents were both Born in Baltimore Co. Md. Grandfather served in

Paternal Great Grandparents great-grand parents - William Gosnell & John
(Give name and place and date of birth in each case)

Lowe, 12th all came to America - with Count Balgout afterward

Made Lord Baltimore and Settled in Baltimore Co. Md.

on Grant Lands from King of England. Grandfather was in

Maternal Great Grandparents the Revolutionary war served under Washington
(Give name and place and date of birth in each case)

they all came together in the year A.D. 1634 - my

Father and 3 uncles served the war of 1812 - I served in the

Mexican war - and served the plains in 49 to California

Your Brothers and Sisters (names, ages and addresses) Came to Oregon 56 by rail
Settled on the Coquille River - Married Evilla Ann Shafack
In Folsom Cal. in 57. Brought her to Corvallis - our oldest child
Anna - the first white child Born in Coquille Valley - She married

Date of Your Marriage and to Whom Allen D Wolcott - & has 3 Sons all grown
and all was Born in Corvallis Oregon - your paper is too
small for me to give much of a history - but I hope you
can some thing worth recording Excuse me for such a jumble
I am now 81st year so you cant expect much

GEORGE HIMES used preprinted forms, such as the one pictured above for David John Lowe, to collect pioneer memories. The form provided space for the primary member as well as his or her spouse to enter specific information, such as name, place and date of birth, and the names, ages, and addresses of their family members. This data, intended for a "Register of Pioneers," had both institutional and historical import: to identify individual members and to contact them for future events and fundraising opportunities as well as for historical data.

THE DISPLAY ROOMS of the Oregon Historical Society in downtown Portland blurred the divide between White “pioneer” and Native objects. In this image, a panoply of Native objects including baskets and vessels face pioneer portraits on the opposite wall. Notwithstanding this attempt at separation, the closeness of the space makes it appear as if they are part of the same, tight display.

obscures both Osant’s identity and Matthieu’s cross-racial family. So too does the edited reminiscence obscure the Indigenous source of Matthieu’s wealth. Following his marriage, Matthieu received a donation land claim in the amount of 640 acres, 320 of which was claimed in his wife’s name.²⁴ In omitting Matthieu’s familial and economic history, his reminiscence in the society’s quarterly purposefully obscures the commingling of Indigenous and White history.

It proved more difficult to obscure the connections between Native and non-Native history in OHS display rooms. While there are no known photographs of the display rooms before 1913, when OHS moved to 207 Second Street in downtown Portland, images of its physical spaces from after this move show that the display room blurred the distinction between Native and non-Native materials. OHS practitioners designed the display to provide a

representative sample of Oregon history, a way to see in aggregate what had shaped the entire state. Financially strapped, the leaders of the society debated for years about whether to relocate out of Portland. But the society persisted in remaining downtown.²⁵ This decision made it impossible to physically separate Native and non-Native materials.

The small size of the display room also likely served as a physical reminder of OHS's disadvantages compared to those of more established historical societies in the East. OHS practitioners were certainly aware of how their fledgling organization measured up against established eastern historical societies. For his part, Himes put a positive spin on OHS's position within the national community of historical societies. He celebrated the times when visitors from out of state came to see and admire the display rooms of OHS, and he wrote and met with historical practitioners in California as well as from places in the East, including with members of the Massachusetts Historical Society (MHS), one of the oldest and most prestigious societies in the United States. Charles Francis Adams, Jr., a Harvard historian who became president of the MHS in 1895 (and the American Historical Association in 1901), even met with Himes briefly at the Portland Hotel on November 20, 1899. Himes did not record details of the meeting, writing only that the interview was "very interesting, and I think later on will prove helpful to the Society."²⁶ In 1900, John Fiske, historian and member of the MHS, wrote to Himes describing his philosophy of historical collecting, impressing on him the belief that even an object that might be "often despised" could in fact "furnish information of the most valuable sort."²⁷ Fiske's comments expressed the idea that seemingly ordinary and inconsequential items might prove significant to historical research in the future. In western places such as Oregon, pioneers still lived and breathed, and data could be collected more readily from them. This proximity of the past was an advantage, a chance to practice more modern forms of collection and preservation with a greater diversity of sources, what one historian has described as a more democratic approach to collecting.²⁸ Given this perspective, OHS and other western historical societies had opportunities to create stronger, richer archives than those of the East, to surpass rather than simply emulate the societies that had come before. But this newness was a double-edged sword, allowing non-Native Oregonians to practice the most modern form of collecting but also underscoring how little non-Natives in the West had accomplished in comparison to their counterparts in the East.

While Himes seemed to welcome these visits and advice, other non-Native Oregonians chafed against what they perceived as eastern historical snobbery. In 1901, OHS member John Minto applauded Young for his recent

paper on the Oregon Trail which, Minto declared, should “have extensive circulation East of the Rockies.” Circulating the paper, Minto continued, would educate easterners on overlanders’ interaction with Native Americans as well as their varied motives for migrating West, a process of which easterners seemed to have too many misconceptions. Minto, however, also doubted that easterners would accept Young’s interpretation, telling him “I am inclined to think you will have to meet the charge of ‘too much red in the bush’ from eastern critics who were born too far away from the time and sene [sic] of glorious action.”²⁹ Minto expressed a widely held belief that the historical and life experiences of self-identified westerners like himself and those of residents of the East represented an unbreachable divide.³⁰ Such a divide meant that for many members of OHS, any interaction with easterners was perceived as interference.

Lyman’s campaign to create a local Oregon history is Exhibit one of OHS members’ negative perceptions of easterners’ outside influence. Born on a farm near Dallas, Polk County, Oregon, in December 1855, Lyman was a second-generation non-Native like the schoolchildren who he believed needed to learn Oregon history. In the 1880s, after returning home from finishing his education in the East, Lyman dedicated himself to collecting and writing the history of Oregon.³¹ His second-generation Oregonian perspective seems to have enhanced his sense that the schoolchildren of his native state needed more local materials that made sense to their lived experiences.

Lyman’s historical work also exemplifies how non-Native Oregonians’ efforts to combat the privileging of eastern historical perspectives depended on Indigenous people. While Lyman collected a variety of materials as part of his historical practice, he focused much attention on what he called “Indian Traditions.” Lyman, of course, would not have described what he was doing as dependence on Native Americans. Blinded by the strict racial hierarchy of his era, Lyman described Indians as childlike and barbaric. Notwithstanding this prejudice, Lyman (who was educated at progressive Oberlin College) also described Indigenous people as having played “a vitally important part in the making of our nation.” This historical significance was especially true in Oregon where, Lyman declared, Indigenous people had played a “more noticeable” role than they had in other states.³² Moreover, Lyman tempered the Euro-American belief in a strict distinction between White “history” and Indian “tradition.” In his introduction to the Cedar Tree story, he described his “Indian Tales” as a collection of “myths” that “were verging toward true history.”³³

It is possible that Lyman’s assessment of these stories was determined as much by who told the tales as it was by their content. In his *History of*

Oregon: The Growth of an American State, Lyman informed would-be readers that the story of Tallapus had been related to him by “an educated gentleman.” That gentleman was none other than Silas B. Smith, the son of a Clatsop woman, Celiast (or Helen) Smith, and the grandson of Clatsop leader Coboway.³⁴ While Lyman applauded Smith for his accomplishments, he expressed admiration of Coboway (which he spelled Kobaiway) for being “favorably mentioned” by Meriwether Lewis and William Clark. But, he shied away from detailing non-Native violence against the Clatsop. As historians of Oregon, including Gray Whaley, have shown, the Clatsops had faced the violence of John McLoughlin and the Hudson’s Bay Company in the spring of 1829, when a punitive expedition sent by McLoughlin burned their village.³⁵ Lyman committed his own act of violence against the Clatsop when he highlighted their cultural assimilation as opposed to their cultural persistence. During the fur trade era, many Clatsop people became economically and socially entangled with French-Canadian fur traders. Multiethnic and multiracial families became a hallmark of Oregon society during these years. As in other regions across North America, the economy of the fur trade depended on the participation of Indigenous people and created a social world comprising both Indigenous people and Europeans. Through cohabitation and more formal marriage unions, Native and non-Native Oregonians created cross-cultural families.³⁶ For Lyman, métis people such as Smith, who had “merged into our own people,” deserved to “be given a place in our literature.”³⁷ Lyman’s choice of phrasing here is telling, as it identifies Indigenous assimilation as a prerequisite for claiming their

OHS Research Library, Org. Lot 500, box 4, folder 686-1

REV. HORACE S. LYMAN is pictured here in about 1865. A graduate of Oberlin College, Lyman had more progressive ideas about Native American populations than many of his White contemporaries. He reserved his highest praise, however, for métis people such as Silas B. Smith who, as he saw it, had “merged into our people.”

tales as part of Oregon materials. But there were limits to this assimilation as there were limits to Lyman's understanding of the "Indian Tales" he collected and promoted. Lyman likely would have been shocked to learn of the sexual undertones of the tale of Tallapus. It is even possible that Smith as well as Labonte, who also told Lyman the story, enjoyed Lyman's enthusiastic conviction that the story would make excellent reading material for young children.³⁸ The possibility that Smith and Labonte purposefully withheld this information from Lyman reveals the limits of White appropriation of Indigenous materials as well as the powerful roles men such as Labonte and Smith played during the formative years of OHS.

While Labonte and Smith exhibited agency and power when they chose to share the Tallapus story with White Oregonians, at other times OHS collecting practices revealed Whites' increasing social and political dominance in Oregon. After every collecting visit Himes made with fellow Oregon pioneers, he recorded the outcome in terms of the quantity and the quality of objects acquired. Many of these recordings reveal that Himes often gathered both "Indians curios" as well as pioneer items from the same collector.³⁹ On October 11, 1899, for example, he collected a "bayonet, stirrup, 2 indian relics" from a Mrs. Harris.⁴⁰ In some cases Himes was also able to gather information about how these White Oregonians obtained those objects. On November 9, 1900, he wrote, "Mrs. M. [Munson] gave some Indian beads, exhumed from the grave of an Indian squaw buried 50 years ago."⁴¹ Time and again, Himes's collecting notes tell a story of White theft of Indigenous objects. The beads Munson donated were among a countless number of sacred objects that Whites stole from Indigenous gravesites. As historians Whaley and Ann Fabian have argued, ideas of scientific racism, the belief in innate differences between humans, and a conviction in Native inferiority all helped to inspire fascination with Native sacred objects and people and to prompt a quest to collect and study their skulls.⁴²

These thefts did not concern Himes, who wrote jubilantly in his diary whenever he was able to secure donations of "Indian relics." Even without a full-time archaeologist on staff, OHS managed to collect a wide array of Native American artifacts. "Young Mr. C[arson]," whom Himes noted on Christmas Day 1899 had recently relocated from Kansas, "has loaned a number of stone implements to the Society which he has found near St. Johns."⁴³ Himes considered himself even luckier the following year when he visited W.H. Garrett and "secured a fine lot of arrow points, a few spear points, beads, bracelets, etc, besides mortars and pestles, sinkers, war clubs." Garrett's donation was, Himes declared, "more than all I have gathered before."⁴⁴ Euro-Americans such as Himes, who were convinced

GEORGE HIMES'S DIARY entry for November 9, 1900, where he describes Mrs. Munson's donation. The banality of the entry belies the egregious violence of grave-robbing that had resulted in Munson's possession of "some Indian beads." With the passage of the Native American Graves and Repatriation Act in 1990, Native people gained some protection for their sacred tombs. Nonetheless, they have to remain vigilant to protect their sacred sites from robbers.

of the value of Native relics as well as of their supposed inferiority, viewed Native graves as their own personal sources of high-value goods rather than what they were: the sacred tombs of humans, memorials created by their relatives and communities.

The frequency with which Himes collected "Indian" and "pioneer" relics from the same donor shows that ordinary Oregonians actively participated in stealing and collecting Native artifacts. The White pioneers from whom Himes collected appear to have been just as likely to have "Indian" relics to donate as they were to have pioneer relics associated with their personal and family histories. Evidence for the provenance of these items comes from Himes's notes as well as published OHS annual reports listing recent accessions. In keeping with OHS's joint goal of creating a "historical" and an "ethnological" museum, OHS listed two categories for these objects:

“Pioneer Relics” and “Archaeological Relics.” And yet, objects of Indigenous people frequently appeared in the “Pioneer relics” category. For instance, the first of the pioneer relics listed in the first *Proceedings of the Oregon Historical Society* included “35. Indian Basket — Obtained from Salmon River Indians in 1866. Donated by Mrs. Mary Harris, North Yamhill.”⁴⁵ While the note “obtained from” suggests that Harris may have purchased or traded for the basket, other donated objects were likely stolen. In recording and itemizing the provenance of these donations, OHS staff also inadvertently preserved the memory of White theft. Thus, without directly acknowledging these thefts, OHS *Proceedings* memorialize them.

The same cultural and economic structures that inspired individuals to steal Native artifacts also deterred them from donating the stolen items to OHS. Himes had limited success in persuading potential donors to give up their “Indian relics.” In the summer of 1900, he spent three and a half hours with Mrs. J.H. Kinzie, admiring her “fine collection of Indian curios.” Kinzie, he wrote, had many rare things, but whether she would part with them for OHS “remains to be seen.” Himes expressed a similar hope the following month that David Rafferty would “donate a portion” of his vast collection to OHS.⁴⁶ In other instances, non-Native Oregonians agreed to temporarily loan Indigenous artifacts but not to donate them to OHS. This was the case for Carson, mentioned above, who had taken Indigenous objects from near St. Johns. These loans allowed OHS to create temporary exhibits of Indigenous materials such as that of a “bead exhibit” personally curated by a non-Native woman (who Himes only identified as a “Mrs. J.D.V.J.”) who claimed ownership of the items and temporarily lent them to OHS. These loans occasionally caused some confusion.⁴⁷ In at least one case Himes obtained what he thought was a permanent donation of Indian relics only to have the donor ask for them back. In June 1900, Himes visited with the daughter and son-in-law of Sara Evans to see and learn about her collection of “Indian relics.” Although documentation of what happened next is sparse, the objects eventually made their way to OHS display rooms. By May 1902, however, Evans had written to a surprised Himes to ask him to return the items to her son, telling him that she was “getting them together for a purpose.”⁴⁸

Other non-Native Oregonians refused even to loan their “Indian relics” because they wanted to display the items themselves. A Mr. Gillihams, for instance, told Himes that he would not loan the Indian artifacts he had dug up, as “he intends fixing up a place to put them in so his friends can see them.”⁴⁹ Although it is not known whether Gillihams created his in-house museum, if he had done so, it likely would have been popular. At the turn of the century, amateurs across the nation continued to participate in fields

such as natural history as well as in history. In the U.S. West, the role of the self-trained amateur collector was even more important. For instance, in Colorado, according to Victoria Cain, the collection of self-trained naturalist and miner Edwin Carter became the talk of local Coloradans as well as eastern tourists, who made a point to visit his museum cabin on pleasure trips through the western countryside. Carter's collection also became the object of aggressive collecting efforts by the state's natural history museum.⁵⁰ Carter's story suggests how state historical organizations across the West competed with private citizens for control of Native American artifacts. The fetishization of Indigenous culture as the prehistory of their new state meant that non-Native Oregonians were often more reluctant to part with what they called "Indian relics" than they were with items from their own pioneer and familial histories.

Frustrated with the reluctance of private citizens who desired to retain "Indian relics" for their own purposes and concerned that outsiders would seize the objects before OHS could, Himes looked to move this collecting in-house. He hired W.A. Raymond to conduct archaeological digs that would help OHS fulfill its ethnological mission. Himes wanted to make Raymond a full-time employee, but a lack of funds prohibited him from doing so. In the fall of 1899 Himes lamented the lack of a permanent position for Raymond, declaring that not only would this direction be "very fruitful" but also that it was "distinctly within the range of our work as a historical society."⁵¹ He then lamented that "if we do not hasten ourselves others will come in and rob the state of that which our own negligence has itself deprived us of." Himes's concern that anthropologists, ethnologists, and relic hunters from other parts of the country, and possibly the world, would seize "Indian relics" and remove them from Oregon was not unfounded. A few weeks later, he went on a collecting visit to a non-Native Oregonian on Sauvie's Island who had found a number of Indian relics; but the man "was loth [sic] to part with them, the most interesting ones having been stolen."⁵² Thefts such as this one, layered on the initial theft by the man who had "found" the relics on Sauvie's Island, made White Oregonians feel like vulnerable victims. Non-natives stole objects from Indigenous peoples whose diminishing political and demographic power hindered their ability to protect their artifacts and sacred sites. But like Himes, who lamented OHS's lack of funding, they also doubted their ability to obtain as well as maintain their possession. This feeling of vulnerability was amplified by what the relics represented to non-Native Oregonians. As Susan Sleeper-Smith and other historians have shown, in possessing the relics that were not rightly theirs, non-Natives laid claim to a deeper Native Oregon history and thereby to the very land of Oregon.⁵³

THIS UNDATED PORTRAIT is of Mary Swain Smith. Mary met Silas Smith when he was practicing law in New Hampshire. The young couple relocated first to Missouri. Soon after Mary gave birth to their first child, and they relocated permanently to the Clatsop Plains.

While theft was an important component of OHS's historical practice, the society still depended on close connections to Indigenous people. During the society's formative years, men such as Labonte and Smith as well as women such as Jennie Michel contributed their knowledge and labor to OHS historical practice. Labonte, Smith, and Michel played essential roles in crafting the materials and narratives collected and disseminated by OHS. Of all the Native Americans who participated in OHS historical practice, Smith seems to have had the most impact. He was a founding member of OHS as well as a key player in OHS preparations for the 1905 Lewis and Clark Exposition. His father, Solomon, played a prominent role in early non-Native Oregon politics, participating in the 1843 Champoeg conference that founded Oregon's provisional government and later serving as representative of the north coast in the state legislature. Silas was born in 1839 and spent his childhood in Oregon, first near what is now Seaside and then on a farm on the banks of the Skipanon River. When Silas was older, he relocated to New Hampshire, where he studied law and met

and married Mary Hannah Swain, a Euro-American woman. Eventually the Smith family returned to the family farm in Oregon. Silas began practicing law in Oregon after passing the bar in 1876. In that capacity, he brought multiple Indigenous land claims to court, including the successful 1897 case for the Nehalem-Tillamook, which was the first such tribal group victory in the Pacific Northwest. At the time of his death from tuberculosis in 1902, Smith was also working on a land-claims case for the Lower Band of Chinooks. After his death, that work resulted in Congressional payments

for earlier land cessions to the Nehalem-Tillamook, Clatsops, and several bands of Chinooks.⁵⁴

Like his legal work, Smith's historical work emphasized Indigenous presence, activism, and claims to land in what had become Oregon. Smith inserted himself into OHS historical practice from the organization's very beginning. In December 1899, he delivered a historical lecture on the first encounters between Clatsops and Europeans. He also published numerous essays in the *Quarterly*. White members of OHS expressed nothing but admiration and respect for Smith. After visiting with Smith in August 1899, for example, Himes declared him to be "a man of considerable force and much intelligence, and withal of excellent character and reputation."⁵⁵ Smith did not simply join OHS, he became a key, active player, incorporating a historical record of the Clatsop, one that included their perspective, into the society's earliest historical collections and narratives. Smith's work provided knowledge about Clatsop history to non-Natives and also helped to ensure that his people would have a visible place in Oregon in the future.

Notwithstanding Smith's contributions and accomplishments, non-Native Oregonians frequently assessed Native knowledge of Oregon through the lens of racism. In a 1903 article published in the *Quarterly* on the Minto Pass in the Willamette Valley, author John Minto opened by citing "a tradition among the Indians" that they had commonly used this pass until a conflict between the Mollalas and Cayuses had eliminated the need to travel through the mountains. Minto disparagingly declared it surprising that they had not cited some "superstitious" reason for ceasing to use the path. After accompanying surveyors to the road, however, Minto changed his tone. In the end, he concluded that the discovery of "an old and deeply worn trail" at the site "gives some support to the Indian tradition."⁵⁶ Minto's begrudging reflects the desire of OHS historical practitioners to understand and record the histories of the places they had seized through violence and now occupied as permanent residents. To know the past of Oregon's landscapes required some dependence on Indigenous knowledge.

Other White Oregonians unequivocally privileged Native knowledge of their state over that of Whites. In Chapter 3 of his "Recollections" published in the *Quarterly*, Peter Burnett, former overlander and Oregon political leader, declared that when he first arrived in Oregon in 1843, he heard an Indian tradition that "a hundred years before the Cascades did not exist." Rather, there had been a series of rapids on the Columbia River from The Dalles to the Cascades that had eventually backed up, causing the river to expand and cover ground that it had not before. To support the tradition, Burnett cited the appearance of trees partially covered by water. In the mid nineteenth cen-

tury, United States surveyor and explorer John Charles Frémont suggested that these stumps had slid into the river during a mountain slide, but Burnett disagreed with his assessment, declaring it “more rational” to agree that “the Indian tradition is true.”⁵⁷ In coming to this conclusion, Burnett condoned Native authority in Oregon. While it is surprising that Burnett privileged the Native perspective over that of Frémont, this privileging is less surprising if we reclassify Indigenous people as locals and Frémont as an easterner who was simply passing through. While historians have tended to describe late-nineteenth-century easterners as more sympathetic to Native issues and White westerners as more opposed to them, in the case of quest for local identity and the creation of local history, White Oregonians could sometimes privilege “Indians” over Whites whom they perceived to be outsiders.⁵⁸

The Indigenous people who participated in OHS historical practice had their own thoughts, of course, about OHS and the history its members were creating. Throughout the late nineteenth century, Native Oregonians received White visitors, answered their queries, accompanied them to identify places of interest to White Oregon history and, in some cases, performed songs for them. In settler-colonial Oregon, playing Indian for tourists as well as historical practitioners could help lead to economic solvency, whether through direct exchange of cash or through the accretion of social capital.⁵⁹ At the same time, Indigenous participants also included their perspective in the creation of Oregon history.

This was likely the case for Tsin-is-tum and Michel Martineau. White Oregonians referred to Tsin-is-tum, who was of Clatsop descent, as Jennie Michel or “The Last Clatsop.” This term held attempts to confine Natives to the past, erasing their present and future. In labeling Native people “last of,” Whites declared themselves ascendant. In August 1899, Himes visited Tsin-is-tum and her husband, Michel, who was originally from Minnesota, was of Chippewa and French descent, and had been part of the fur trade in Oregon during the early nineteenth century. During the visit at their home, Himes asked the Martineaus to contribute to OHS historical materials by asking questions about their personal histories as well as Oregon history more generally. He also prevailed on “Michel to sing one of the old-time Canadian boat songs.”⁶⁰ In his written account of these exchanges, Himes described himself as controlling the Martineaus’ contributions to OHS historical materials.

But surviving photographic evidence suggests that the Martineaus also shaped this historical exchange. After singing, Michel provided Himes with pictures for OHS collections. Approximately eight of these images are still held by OHS today. A search for “Martineau” returns nine images, but one of them is clearly not part of the original group. Of the eight images, four

have been captioned by an OHS staff member or volunteer as depicting Jennie, “the last of the Clatsops.” This language attempted to portray Jennie as a type, a representative of her race rather than an individual. Yet, the images that Jennie and Michel gifted to Himes defy the idea of a disappearing Jennie. Evidently taken for personal purpose before they were gifted to OHS, the images (later re-cataloged as evidence of the “last Indian”) retain their humanity as personal, family mementos. They depict Jennie individually as well as with her husband and neighbors, Joe and Grace Swahaw and Jennie and Nina Lane.⁶¹ About halfway through the undated shoot, Jennie must have grown cold. Some of the images depict her in a floral dress with buttons down the front, typical of Oregon fashion amongst non-Natives as well, but others show her wearing the same dress with a sweater over the top.

The images of the multigenerational neighbor group also defy the idea of disappearing “Indians.” In one photograph, Jennie is seated on what appears to be the same log, now surrounded by younger residents of Indian Place near Seaside, Oregon. This group shot captures three generations of people with Native heritage (see p. 187). They gaze directly at the camera, captured in a moment in the yard of Jennie’s house: there is nothing about death or disappearance here. In the corner is a partial view of a dog, as one of the family pets evidently wandered into the shot while the people sat still to pose. Likely an accident, the mistake adds a bit of movement to what is otherwise a still image typical of those created during this period because of the technological limitations of the camera.⁶²

It is not clear why Michel and Jennie would have given these private family photos to Himes. Perhaps Himes promised to preserve them for

IN THIS CASUAL PORTRAIT taken in the yard of her home in Seaside, Oregon, Jennie Martineau appears relaxed and happy. A small smile lights up her face, and her hands are placed lightly on her knees.

SILAS SMITH is seated on the remains of the salt maker's oven. Here he marks the site with his body. In other images of the society's expedition to the location (near Seaside, Oregon) Smith is shown pointing to the location. Taken together, the series of photographs imbue Smith with the authority of place knowledge.

posterity. Or perhaps the Martineaus thought that sending their own images rather than ones taken at the direction of Whites would create a more representative trace of their photographic presence in the archive. That Himes accepted them for OHS collection demonstrates that Native Americans as well as Whites shaped the society's holdings.

Jennie shaped the society's historical practice in other ways as well. In the early twentieth century she worked alongside Smith and his mother Celiast to identify two key sites along the Lewis and Clark Trail: Fort Clatsop and the salt cairns where Lewis and Clark made salt to preserve their food before returning to the East. In their collaboration, Smith took on the role of interviewer and translator while his mother and Jennie served as primary informants. Celiast provided the first authoritative account of where

Lewis and Clark made salt. Judge (and presumed OHS member) Thomas A. McBride accepted Celiast's story completely. He noted that he was not sure whether "she spoke from actual presence at that time or from common knowledge amongst the Indians," but he did not question her authority or that of the other Native informants.⁶³ Next Smith interviewed Jennie, who corroborated Celiast's identification of the salt-making location.⁶⁴ In reaching out to Clatsops such as Jennie and Celiast, OHS leaders sought to mark the correct site for posterity. Yet in participating in the process of identifying these sites of American exploration, these Indigenous informants also claimed roles in OHS's foundational historical practice.

That practice included marking the landscape itself, an activity in which the Smiths and Jennie also participated. Photographs of an official OHS visit to the site of Fort Clatsop and the salt cairns reveal the multiple, active roles the Smiths and Jennie played in identifying and marking these sites. One shows Silas pointing to the site of Fort Clatsop while Himes and OHS member Judge George Noland look on. By showing Silas pointing, the image imbues him with the authority of place knowledge. Photographs of Jennie and Silas at the Lewis and Clark salt works also link authority of place with Native knowledge. An image of Jennie standing next to the place of the salt-making and looking directly at the camera shows her marking the site with her body as Silas marked the site of Fort Clatsop with his finger. In another image, Silas sits on the remains of the salt maker's oven. This image is held in OHS collections and was published in Olin D. Wheeler's history of the Lewis and Clark trail.⁶⁵ The administrative history of Fort Clatsop on the National Park Service's (NPS) website credits Silas's involvement but not Jennie's. Moreover, the NPS narrative emphasizes the role that two White settlers played in identifying the site. Records at OHS, however, suggest that Silas and Jennie played a pivotal role in identifying and marking the salt works.

The work that Silas, Jennie, and Celiast did to mark the salt cairns is still commemorated today. When the Seaside Lions Club erected a plaque at the site in 1955, the group explicitly credited Jennie with identifying the location. Today, the website for the Lewis and Clark Trail also commemorates Silas and Celiast.⁶⁶ White celebration of their role is, of course, circumscribed. But the fact remains that Jennie, Silas, and Celiast are visible in Oregon history to this day because of their participation in historical work at OHS during the beginning of the twentieth century. Their names and their faces are visible and accessible, signs of Native presence in the settler-colonial landscape. While historians have focused more attention on the 1905 Lewis and Clark Exposition — a temporary installation designed to attract and entertain visitors from around the globe — they should also turn attention to

the local places such as the salt works and Fort Clatsop, places that White Oregonians were able to mark and memorialize only because they solicited Indigenous participation.

Turning attention from such grandiose, dramatic gestures of empire as the Lewis and Clark Exposition to the inner workings, cluttered backrooms, and display areas of OHS has provided another perspective on the role of Indigenous and White people in the making of Oregon history at the turn of the century. Historians and members of OHS realized that their ability to preserve and collect the relics of Indigenous societies depended on talking with Natives and others. They did not simply erase the connections between people and objects, instead they lived in the contradiction that was the conceit of the Vanishing Indian. Namely, non-Native OHS members declared Indigenous people to be vanishing and past even as they depended on those same people — and their knowledge and material culture — to cement their own historic narrative and significance. During OHS's early years, non-Natives' historical practice intertwined themselves with Native Americans and métis people.

While OHS was initially crafted around the categories of Natives and non-Natives, OHS's new permanent exhibit, Experience Oregon, displays Oregonians of a wide range of identities.⁶⁷ Visitors to this exhibit would do well to remember how much has changed since OHS was founded in 1898. But they would also do well to think about how these contemporary displays were constructed and objects categorized.⁶⁸ Too often, the making of museum meanings and other arenas of history are not socially transparent. Non-Natives depended on Native knowledge and objects to create their historical narratives and displays. Although they did not always see it this way, in the process of collecting, preserving, and displaying the texts and objects of Indigenous "traditions" and pioneer "history," non-Native Oregonians inadvertently revealed the limits of their own categorical designations. We would do well to remember the same about our current categories.

NOTES

The author would like to thank the anonymous peer reviewers and all of the staff at the *Oregon Historical Quarterly* for their assistance.

1. "Indian Legends," folder 2, Horace Sumner Lyman Papers, Mss 722, Oregon Historical Society Research Library, Portland,

Oregon [hereafter OHS Research Library]. The Tallapus story also became one of a number of Native American tales that Lyman included in his four volume *The History of Oregon: The Growth of an American State* (1903), 92–96.

2. Ibid.

3. Non-Native Oregonians at the time sometimes referred to Silas and other men of mixed heritage as *métis*. In this article I endeavor to use the specific tribal group to identify historical actors of Native heritage. When that is not possible I use the term Native Americans or Indigenous. When identifying people of mixed White and Native heritage I also endeavor for specificity. At times I use the term *métis*, a term used at the time to describe people of both Native and European heritage, people who today might simply be considered Native. When referring to settler-colonists of European descent I use the terms *non-Native*, *White*, or *Euro-American*.

4. On the Turner thesis and the history of the U.S. West, see “‘A Nation Thrown Back Upon Itself’: Frederick Jackson Turner and the Frontier,” in *Rereading Frederick Jackson Turner: ‘The Significance of the Frontier in American History’ and Other Essays*, ed., John Mack Faragher (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1998).

5. Jean O’Brien, *Firsting and Lasting: Writing Indians out of Existence in New England* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2010), 55. For examples that are specific to the American West, see David Wrobel, *Promised Lands: Promotion, Memory, and the Creation of the American West* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2002), 122.

6. On the attempt at erasure and Indigenous persistence see, Katrine Barber, *In Defense of Wyman: Native-White Alliances and the Struggle for Celilo Village* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2018), 49–54; and Melinda Marie Jetté, “Betwixt and Between the Official Story: Tracing the History and Memory of a Family of French-Indian Ancestry in the Pacific Northwest,” *Oregon Historical Quarterly* 111:2 (Summer 2010): 145.

7. For a discussion of the near total exclusion of people of color from nineteenth-centu-

ry White historical practice, see Anne A. Verplanck, “Making History: Antiquarian Culture in Mid-Nineteenth-Century Philadelphia,” *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 138:4 (October 2014): 396, 401. On silences in archives see Michel-Rolph Trouillot, *Silencing the Past: Power and the Production of History* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1995).

8. Steven Conn, *History’s Shadow: Native Americans and Historical Consciousness in the Nineteenth Century* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004).

9. Alea Henle, “Preserving the Past, Making History: Historical Societies in the Early United States,” (Ph.D. diss., University of Connecticut, 2012), 169–70.

10. David D. Van Tassel, *Recording America’s Past: An Interpretation of the Development of Historical Studies in America, 1607–1884*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960), 96–97, 100.

11. “Indian Legends,” folder 2, Horace Sumner Lyman Papers, Mss 722, OHS Research Library.

12. Peter Novick, *That Noble Dream: The “Objectivity Question” and the American Historical Profession* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1988).

13. For a similar take on nineteenth-century historical societies see Christine DeLucia, “Fugitive Collections in New England Indian Country: Indigenous Material Culture and Early American History Making at Ezra Stiles’s Yale Museum” *William and Mary Quarterly* 75:1 (January 2018): 109–150.

14. “Proceedings of the Oregon Historical Society Including the Meeting for the Organization held December 17, 1898, . . .” (Salem, Ore., 1900), 16–17).

15. Frederick G. Young, “Report of the Secretary,” in *Proceedings of the Oregon Historical Society* (1899), 41.

16. Adam Waterman, “The Anatomy of a Haunting,” in *Phantom Past, Indigenous Presence: Native Ghosts in North American Culture and History* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2011), 86.

17. Henle, “Preserving the Past, Making History,” 62–65; and Christine DeLucia,

- "Antiquarian Collecting and the Transits of Indigenous Material Culture: Rethinking 'Indian Relics' and Tribal Histories," *Commonplace* 17:2 (Winter 2017), <http://commonplace.online/article/antiquarian-collecting-and-the-transits-of-indigenous-material-culture> (accessed April 10, 2020).
18. Frederick G. Young, "Report of the Secretary," in *Proceedings of the Oregon Historical Society* (1899), 41.
 19. Amanda Laugesen, "George Himes, F.G. Young, and the Early Years of the Oregon Historical Society," *Oregon Historical Quarterly* 101:1 (Spring, 2000): 21–23.
 20. Ibid.
 21. K. Keith Richard, "Of 'Gingham,' 'Barn Doors,' and 'Exquisites': George H. Himes on Pioneer Fashion," *Oregon Historical Quarterly* 90:4 (Winter 1989): 386.
 22. Various entries, George H. Himes Diary, 1899–1900, Mss 1462, OHS Research Library.
 23. Mrs. William Markland Molson, "Glimpses of Life in Early Oregon," *The Quarterly of the Oregon Historical Society* 1:2 (June 1900): 158–64.
 24. H.S. Lyman, "Reminiscences of F.X. Matthieu," *The Quarterly of the Oregon Historical Society* 1:1 (March 1900): 73, 90–91, 96–98.
 25. Laugesen, "George Himes," 27–29.
 26. George H. Himes, Diary, November 20, 1899, Mss 1462, OHS Research Library.
 27. John Fiske to George H. Himes, March 20, 1900, Internal Archives, box 3, OHS Research Library.
 28. Robert B. Townsend, *History's Babel: Scholarship, Professionalization, and the Historical Enterprise in the United States, 1880–1940* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2013), 41.
 29. John Minto to Prof. F.G. Young, May 3, 1901, box 1, John Minto Papers, Mss 752, OHS Research Library.
 30. Flannery Burke, "The Arrogance of the East: How Westerners Created a Region," *Western Historical Quarterly* 49:4 (Winter 2018): 383–407.
 31. "Horace S. Lyman," *The Quarterly of the Oregon Historical Society* 6:1 (March 1905): 105–107.
 32. Horace S. Lyman, *History of Oregon: The Growth of An American State*, vol. 1, (New York: The North Pacific Publishing Society, 1903), 75.
 33. Ibid., 90.
 34. Ibid., 91.
 35. Gray H. Whaley, *Oregon and the Collapse of Illahee: U.S. Empire and the Transformation of an Indigenous World, 1792–1859* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2010), 86.
 36. Anne F. Hyde, *Empires, Nations, and Families: A New History of the American West, 1800–1860* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2011).
 37. "Indian Legends," folder 2, Horace Sumner Lyman Papers, Mss 722, OHS Research Library.
 38. Some versions of the story have reference to masturbation. The author and editors are grateful to one of the manuscript's peer-reviewers for sharing these insights regarding the Tallapus story.
 39. September 27, 1899, George Himes, Diary, 1899–1900, Mss 1462, OHS Research Library.
 40. October 11, 1899, George Himes Diary, 1899–1900, Mss 1462, OHS Research Library.
 41. November 9, 1900, George Himes Diary, Mss 1462, OHS Research Library. On grave robbing, see Ann Fabian, *The Skull Collectors: Race, Science, and America's Unburied Dead* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2010).
 42. Ann Fabian, "A Native Among the Headhunters," chap. 2 in *The Skull Collectors*, "A Native Among the Head Hunters," 47–78; Whaley, *Oregon and the Collapse of Illahee*, 144–46.
 43. December 25, 1899, Himes Diary, Mss, 1462, OHS Research Library.
 44. Jan 3, 1900, Himes Diary, Mss 1462, OHS Research Library.

45. *Proceedings of the Oregon Historical Society* (1900), 66
46. July 16 and August 25, 1900, Himes Diary, Mss 1462, OHS Research Library.
47. Himes, Friday December 15, 1899, Himes Diary, folder 7, Mss 1462, OHS Research Library.
48. June 1, 1900, Himes Diary, Mss 1462, OHS Research Library; Sara Evans to George H. Himes, May 13, 1902, Internal Archives, box 3, OHS Research Library.
49. August 29, 1900, Himes Diary, Mss 1462, OHS Research Library.
50. Victoria Cain, "Professor Carter's Collection: Amateur Naturalists and their Museums" *Common-place* 2:12 (January 2012), (<http://commonplace.online/article/professor-carters-collection> (accessed May 19, 2020)).
51. November 14, 1899, George Himes Diary, Mss 1462, OHS Research Library.
52. George Himes, November 14, 1899, and December 6, 1899, Himes Diary, Mss 1462, OHS Research Library. For later concerns about eastern archives' taking western archival materials, see Burke, "Arrogance of the East," 391–92.
53. Susan Sleeper-Smith, ed., *Contesting Knowledge: Museums and Indigenous Perspectives* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2009).
54. Cameron La Follette and Douglas Deur, "Silas Bryant Smith (1839–1902)," *The Oregon Encyclopedia*, <https://oregonencyclopedia.org/articles/smith-silas-b/#.XPqYb9NKglV> (accessed June 6, 2019); and David Peterson-del Mar, "Intermarriage and Agency: A Chinookan Case Study," *Ethnohistory* 42:1 (Winter 1995): 1–30.
55. Himes Diary Entry Tuesday August 29th, 1899, Himes Diary, Mss 1462, OHS Research Library.
56. John Minto, "Minto Pass: Its History, and an Indian Tradition," *The Quarterly of the Oregon Historical Society* 4:3 (September 1903): 241, 245.
57. Peter H. Burnett, "'Recollections and Opinions of an Old Pioneer.' Chapter III," *The Quarterly of the Oregon Historical Society* 5:1 (March 1904): 88–89.
58. On this East-West split see Brian W. Dippie, *The Vanishing American: White Attitudes and U.S. Indian Policy* (Lawrence, Kan.: University of Kansas Press, 1982), 132–34; and Robert Winston Mardock, *The Reformers the American Indian* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1971), 6.
59. On this phenomenon in a different context, see Philip J. Deloria, *Playing Indian*, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998), 122–25.
60. August 29, 1900, George Himes Diary, box 1, Mss 1462, OHS Research Library.
61. Douglas Deur, "The Making of Seaside's 'Indian Place': Contested and Enduring Native Spaces on the Nineteenth Century Oregon Coast," *Oregon Historical Quarterly* 117:4 (Winter 2016): 537.
62. ORHI65384, OHS Research Library.
63. Thomas A. McBride, *Proceedings of the Oregon Historical Society* (1900), 20–1.
64. Tsin-is-tum, *Proceedings of the Oregon Historical Society*, 22–3; "Tsin-is-tum (Jennie Michel), Oregon History Project, <https://oregonhistoryproject.org/articles/biographies/tsin-is-tum-jennie-michel-biography/#.Xs2NutNKjOQ> (accessed May 19, 2020); "Museum Exhibits," Seaside Historical Museum, <http://www.seasideoregonmuseum.org/museum/exhibits.cfm>, (accessed May 19, 2020).
65. Olin D. Wheeler, *The Trail of Lewis and Clark, 1804–1904: A Story of the Great Exploration . . .* vol. 2 (New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1904), 207.
66. "The Salt Works," *Discovering Lewis & Clark*, <http://www.lewis-clark.org/article/725>, (accessed June 7, 2019).
67. "Experience Oregon," Oregon Historical Society, <https://www.ohs.org/museum/exhibits/experience-oregon.cfm> (accessed April 8, 2019).
68. Susan Pearce, *Museums, Objects and Collections: A Cultural Study* (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Books, 1993), 258.