



Muriel Wright, 1968

Photo courtesy Archives & Manuscript Division, Oklahoma Historical Society



Angie Debo

Photo courtesy Special Collections, Oklahoma State University

THE BATTLE OF THE HISTORIANS OF ROUND MOUNTAIN: AN EXAMINATION OF MURIEL WRIGHT AND ANGIE DEBO

by
Patricia Loughlin

What Oklahoma historians know as the "Battle of Round Mountain Controversy" has served as an intriguing reminder of lively debate and feuding parties within the historical profession at large.¹ In this case, two groups squared off over the location of the first battle of the Civil War in Indian Territory. Muriel Wright, editor of the *Chronicles of Oklahoma*, commanded an active historic sites marker program on behalf of the Oklahoma Historical Society. Angie Debo, prominent historian of American Indians, also worked in historical preservation with the Payne County Historical Society. Both historians agreed that the first battle of the Civil War in Indian Territory occurred on November 19, 1861, between the Union Creeks headed for Kansas and Confederate troops, including a Creek regiment, Choctaw-Chickasaw and Creek-Seminole regiments, and a detachment of Texas cavalry. The point of contention, however, pivots over place. Documentary evidence corroborates the correct date of the battle, but exact location within the territory remains ambiguous. In fact, two markers presently exist, at the "Keystone site" near Tulsa, and the "Round Mountain" site in Yale, near Stillwater.²

The controversy, now as then, was more than a historical turf war. Two women historians played central roles in this local duel. Muriel Wright headed the charge for the Tulsa County Historical Society under the auspices of the Oklahoma Historical Society. Angie Debo defended the Yale site on behalf of the Payne County Historical Society. Although both historians recognized the larger goal of educating the public on serious issues that held personal meaning for them, at times their personal differences and strong convictions interfered with their professional responses. Their differences, however, do not diminish their contributions to Oklahoma and Great Plains history. Perhaps the

Patricia Loughlin is a graduate student in history at Oklahoma State University. She received a M.A. in history at Pepperdine University. Her research interests include the American West, women's history, and Indian history.

competitive spirit between them, combined with historical inquiry, spurred them on to seek regional and national recognition for their respective talents. Regardless of the reasons, Wright and Debo represent state and regional women historians who produced invaluable history.

During the 1940s most Oklahoma historians agreed that the Battle of Round Mountain site was located in the Keystone area between the confluence of the Cimarron and Arkansas rivers. The Payne County Historical Society revisited the issue in 1949, when an amateur historian, Stillwater real estate agent John Melton, revealed new evidence supporting the Yale site. Melton collected affidavits from older Yale settlers and battlefield artifacts.³ In addition, Berlin Basil Chapman, Oklahoma State University history professor, and Angie Debo, an active member of the Payne County Historical Society, secured a photocopied statement made by Confederate Creek leaders in 1868 regarding the events of 1861 and 1862, from the National Archives in Washington, D.C.⁴ Debo reviewed the battle in light of this new information and in the early 1960s wrote an article in support of the Yale site for the *Chronicles of Oklahoma*. Debo closed this article with the statement: "To this one historian at least, the evidence is conclusive."⁵ Unabashedly, Muriel Wright continued her support for the Keystone site, declaring that the Yale site, "has never been accepted by the Oklahoma Historical Society in its statewide program of marking historic sites" since 1949.⁶ Thus began the battle of the historians of Round Mountain.

In this public controversy, Wright and Debo touched the public pulse and engaged their audience in the narrative. Both historians, in fact, presaged the "new" Indian history, carving a distinct place for themselves in Great Plains and Native American history.⁷ Both women chronicled the history of Oklahoma, particularly Native American topics, with scholarly rigor and ingenuity. Their passion for recording Oklahoma's past stemmed in part from their strong ties to the region.

Born in 1889 at Lehigh, Choctaw Nation, Indian Territory, to a notable Choctaw family, Muriel Hazel Wright's heritage and education provided the solid foundation for her future work. Her Choctaw father, Dr. Eliphalet Nott Wright, a graduate of Union College and Albany Medical College in New York, returned to the Choctaw Nation in 1895 to establish his private practice and serve as company physician for the Missouri-Pacific Coal Mines at Lehigh. Her mother, Ida Belle Richards, educated at Lindenwood College of St. Charles, Missouri, came to the Indian Territory in 1887 as a Presbyterian

missionary teacher. On both sides of the family tree, Wright traced her heritage to descendants aboard the *Mayflower* in 1620 and the *Anne* in 1623. The pursuit and preservation of heritage remained everpresent in Wright's personal life, career, and historical interpretation.⁸ In an autobiographical sketch, Wright described her identity as "one-fourth Choctaw" and "also from distinguished colonial ancestry."⁹ A member of the Daughters of the American Revolution and the Colonial Dames, Wright maintained these commitments in addition to active participation in Choctaw Nation politics.

Wright's most distinguished relative, and her favorite to discuss, was her Choctaw grandfather, the Reverend Allen Wright. A graduate of Union College and Union Theological Seminary in New York, he served as principal chief of the Choctaw Nation from 1866 to 1870. As Wright recalled with pride, her grandfather was the "first Indian from Indian Territory to have earned the master's degree."¹⁰ In 1866 during the Choctaw-Chickasaw Reconstruction Treaty delegation's visit to Washington, D.C., this learned man offered the name "Oklahoma" for Indian Territory. Muriel Wright remembered the story vividly:

My grandfather was sitting at the desk. As a linguist, he knew Choctaw. On one side of the sheet he was writing Choctaw and on the other English. One of the officials, probably the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, said what would you call the territory? Grandfather was sitting absentmindedly, writing around, and he said immediately, Oklahoma. Well that Choctaw name is synonymous with Indian, there isn't any word in the Choctaw language for Indian. Oklahoma means "red people."¹¹

Wright recalled that her grandfather used to laugh when he told this story, because he had spoken out of turn in the eyes of the "older, dignified Indian delegates."¹² The name "Oklahoma" quickly gained popularity among Indians and other settlers alike. When the twin territories merged as one state in 1907, the natural name of choice was the name offered by Muriel Wright's grandfather, Allen Wright, back in 1866.¹³ The Wright family roots run deep within the state's history. "I don't own Oklahoma," Wright insisted, "but I have a deep feeling because of being in the historical field." She took hold of this history in a personal almost proprietary way, carefully preserving her familial

and Choctaw ties with the state's development.

Beginning in 1897 with the Atoka Agreement and continuing with the Curtis Act of 1898, the Dawes Commission systematically sectioned the Choctaw National landscape into individual allotments in severalty. Such federal government interference dramatically altered the organization of Choctaw institutions, including education. During this transition, formerly reputable tribal schools deteriorated in the hands of the federal government. As a result, Wright received the majority of her primary education at home instructed by her mother. Boarding school was not an option, Wright noted, for her mother said she was "too small" to attend Indian boarding school. Following a family tradition of Eastern education extending back to her grandfather, Wright attended Wheaton Seminary in Norton, Massachusetts. Two years later in 1908, she joined her parents in Washington, D.C., where her father served a two-year term as resident delegate of the Choctaw Nation. Upon return to the family allotment in Lehigh, Wright prepared for a career in teaching as she completed her bachelor's degree at the newly founded East Central State Normal School in Ada, Oklahoma.¹⁴

During the next two years she taught history and English in Johnston County with a beginning salary of \$50 a month. By 1914, not only had Wright risen to high school principal, but she was also earning \$95 a month. For a brief period beginning in 1916, she attended Barnard College, the women's college of Columbia University, to pursue a master's degree in history and English. As Wright recalled, World War I interfered with her education at Barnard and she returned home. From 1918 to 1924, Wright was principal of Hardwood District School in Coal County near the family home.¹⁵

In addition to teaching, Wright actively participated in Choctaw Nation politics. Beginning in 1922, while her father served as chair of the Choctaw Committee, Wright held the office of secretary. In addition, she successfully implemented a program to restore and preserve the Choctaw Council House at Tuskahoma, defeating an initiative to move the house to Southeastern State College in Durant. Such efforts proved a natural springboard for her future involvement in Choctaw politics. Regarded as "one of the most accomplished women in the Choctaw nation," Wright became a candidate for principal chief of the Choctaws in 1930.¹⁶ Four years later, Wright helped create the Choctaw Advisory Council and served as the Choctaw delegate from Oklahoma City until 1944. During this period the Council worked to secure final settlement of Choctaw properties still outstanding.¹⁷

In the midst of teaching and Choctaw political involvement, Wright began a textbook project with historian Joseph B. Thoburn. Introduced to Thoburn through her father, Wright collaborated with Thoburn on a four-volume compendium of Oklahoma history entitled *Oklahoma: A History of the State and Its People*. Written for an adult audience, this series supplied an overview of Oklahoma history. Wright's interest in the subject heightened as she delved into the extensive fieldwork required for the book.¹⁸

Along with this intensified interest in historical writing, and with Thoburn's assistance, Wright produced a second work in 1929, *The Story of Oklahoma*, a textbook for public school children. This book, and others that followed, provided balanced accounts of Native American participation in shaping Oklahoma's history. In addition, supplemental workbooks required active student participation in piecing together Oklahoma's extensive history. As more and more public schools across the state adopted her textbooks, Wright became more involved with the Oklahoma Historical Society. In fact, when her father died in 1931, Wright moved to Oklahoma City to work at the historical society on a special research project on the Five Tribes, and continued her freelance writing.¹⁹

For thirty years Wright guided and protected the *Chronicles of Oklahoma*, shaping the journal's content through her many scholarly contributions and as editor. A member of the historical society from its inception in 1922, Wright contributed her first book review in the journal's third issue. Appointed associate editor in 1943, she held this position for twelve years prior to her promotion to editor in 1955. At the editorial helm, Wright produced well over one-hundred issues, which also included sixty-six of her own articles. Wright's contributions to the journal emphasized local topics such as military history and Indians of Oklahoma. As editor, Wright claimed she "practically rewrote" many of the articles submitted by other historians.²⁰ Imperious in disposition, she ruled the *Chronicles* with an iron fist. She served as editor until her retirement in 1973 at eighty-four years of age.²¹ In 1994, *Chronicles'* editor Bob L. Blackburn wrote that Muriel Wright was "the heart and soul" of the Oklahoma Historical Society during her thirty-year tenure as editor.²² And perhaps this is where the conflict arose between Wright and Debo, a conflict of personal concerns entangled in historical scholarship.

In contrast to Wright's affluent upbringing, Angie Debo arrived in Oklahoma Territory by covered wagon in 1899 with her parents and younger brother. Born to tenant farmers in Beattie, Kansas in 1890, Debo experienced

the quest for land settlement and opportunity firsthand in her family's relocation to Marshall, Oklahoma. "We arrived on November 8, 1899," she wrote, "and I have a distinct memory of the warm, sunny day, the lively little new town, and the greening wheat fields we passed as we lumbered slowly down the road to our new home."²³ When she was sixteen, Debo taught in the nearby rural schools and waited in anticipation for the new high school to open. She graduated from Marshall High School at the "advanced age" of twenty-three.²⁴ After two more years of teaching, Debo attended the University of Oklahoma and graduated with a bachelor's degree in history in 1918. Encouraged by historian Edward Everett Dale, one of her professors, Debo earned a master's degree in history from the University of Chicago in 1924.²⁵ Graduate programs in history at the time prepared women for historical writing and a future in women's colleges.²⁶ Although Debo felt no discrimination while attending Chicago, the job search clearly sent the message that university teaching positions were for men. History departments actively solicited male students from Chicago, but they politely did not request women. This surprised Debo. When she realized she would not secure the university position she desired, she consulted a woman on the history faculty at the University of Chicago. Debo recalled:

"Women are sometimes on history faculties. How do they get there?" She said, "When in time of war or some other situation where it's impossible to get a man they had to take a woman - temporarily." And then she acquitted herself so brilliantly that they had to keep her. And so that's the only way that a woman ever does get a position.²⁷

For the next ten years, Debo taught at West Texas State Teachers College in Canyon, Texas.

Debo was discouraged by the job market in the 1930s and by the historical profession's general lack of interest in American Indian history.²⁸ For example, between 1920 and 1960, the *American Historical Review* published only four articles on American Indian topics.²⁹ "Native Americans remained marginalized in American history," historian R. David Edmunds wrote in 1995, "and many academic historians considered Native American history to be 'popular history' or 'cowboys and Indians,' not worth of serious research."³⁰ In her own work, Debo combated this general apathy within the profession and developed her

methodological approach of writing history from an Indian perspective. Working on her doctorate at the University of Oklahoma with Dale, she examined the history of the Choctaws from the Choctaw viewpoint.³¹ At a time when most historians of Native Americans wrote from a "non-Indian perspective" based largely on government documents, Debo included the traditional sources but also incorporated oral history, tribal records, and anthropological studies. In selecting a topic, Dale pointed her to the university's recent acquisition of the Choctaw Council manuscript collection dating from 1869-1910, sources that had never been previously examined.³² Admitting that she "didn't know anything about the history of the Choctaws,"³³ she began poring over the council papers and learning the intricacies of the Choctaw National history and its relationship to the federal government. The result was an invaluable contribution to the new series, "The Civilization of the American Indian" at the University of Oklahoma Press. Her dissertation, published in 1934 as *The Rise and Fall of the Choctaw Republic*, received the John H. Dunning Prize of the American Historical Association.

In general, *The Rise and Fall of the Choctaw Republic* received glowing reviews. One stinging exception was Muriel Wright's response in *Chronicles of Oklahoma*. Due to "errors in statement, half-truths and refutation," Wright argued, the work could not be called an "authentic history" of the Choctaws. Continuing in this vein, Wright attacked Debo's "hurried research" and "prejudiced viewpoints" making for a "superficial" study of Choctaw affairs.³⁴ Moreover, Wright disputed Debo's claim that Wright's grandfather, Allen Wright, accepted "kickbacks" from his treaty negotiations in Washington, D.C. According to historian LeRoy Fischer, kickbacks of this kind were routine matters; county commissioners received them as well.³⁵ With reference to the scathing book review, historian David Baird commented that many reasons explain the animosity. "Wright believed she was most qualified to deal with Choctaw, almost family matters," Baird explained, "and she was probably a bit intimidated by Debo's academic credentials."³⁶ An interesting juxtaposition becomes clear in this relationship. Whereas Debo possessed the doctorate but lacked an institutional affiliation. Wright did not hold such academic credentials but her strong institutional affiliation with the Oklahoma Historical Society, in fact, legitimized Wright as an historian. This episode was the genesis of the professional conflict between Wright and Debo.

Debo continued publishing other important studies on Native Americans, including the controversial, and to Debo, "most important" work, *And Still the*

Waters Run, an examination of the effects of forced liquidation of tribal lands and government on Oklahoma's Five Tribes.³⁷ Not only did Debo expose the schemes of grafters to profit from the Five Tribes' resources, but she went one step further and "named names" of the grafters. Threatened by libel suits from prominent Oklahoma businesspeople and politicians mentioned in the book, the University of Oklahoma Press deemed publication too risky.³⁸ When director Joseph Brandt left Oklahoma to become director of Princeton University Press, this important work found a willing publisher. When the book came out in 1940, once again Muriel Wright took a strong position against Debo's work—this time through lack of acknowledgment. While national journals such as the *American Historical Review*, the *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, and the *Journal of Southern History* reviewed Debo's book, the *Chronicles* did not. The name of the president of the historical society, Robert Williams, former governor of the state and federal judge, appeared in *And Still the Waters Run*. Perhaps Wright did not review it in the *Chronicles* out of deference to Judge Williams.³⁹

With positive reviews coming in from other journals across the country, Debo made a swift career move. Sources conflict regarding Debo's decision to leave West Texas at this time. Records indicate departmental budget cuts forced Debo's resignation, for she had repeatedly been passed over for promotion by recent additions to the department. Debo maintained that she chose to resign her position and devote her full energies to writing. After a one-year position as curator of the Panhandle-Plains Historical Museum in Canyon, Texas, Debo returned to her home in Marshall.⁴⁰ In the following years she authored books on the Five Tribes, Geronimo, and Oklahoma. From 1947 to 1955 she worked as curator of maps at Oklahoma A & M, later Oklahoma State University. Debo also filled a temporary one-year position in the history department for a professor on leave. After retirement in 1955 she continued to write, lecture, and research. She served as a board member of the Oklahoma chapter of the American Civil Liberties Union and the Association on American Indian Affairs.⁴¹

What can one learn from this entanglement between two historians? Although they did not usually agree, to say the least, they did respect each other's work as historians. Mutual professional respect emerges within their limited correspondence. For example, in a letter addressed "Dear Angie," dated May 3, 1950, Wright referred to a historical conference that they both attended in the recent past in Oklahoma City. In a session on American Indians, Debo

presented a paper on the social and economic conditions of the Five Tribes and Wright was in attendance:

That day of the meeting during the Mississippi Valley convention, I tried to get to you before you left. I hope that I did not seem critical in my remarks for I did not intend them that way. But somehow those politicians "kinda roused" me; they always have the same "poor Indian" story but never seem to get anywhere except to be on hand at campaign time.⁴²

In the same letter, Wright evaluated Debo's 1951 report on the social and economic conditions of the Five Tribes, calling it a "fine report" that demonstrates "insight and knowledge of the subject."⁴³ Continuing in this vein, Wright wrote that "You have done a wonderful piece of work in this report and I hope that much good will come in solving the problems of our full-blood Cherokee and Choctaw who are in the main worthy of consideration and trust."⁴⁴

On the other hand, the same report on the Five Tribes forced Debo and Wright to take opposing sides. A relative of Wright, J.B. Wright, a Choctaw who had served in the U.S. Indian Service in Oklahoma for sixteen years, reacted negatively to the report, in the "Notes and Documents" section of the *Chronicles*.⁴⁵ In Debo's response to the *Chronicles*, she wrote:

In all my career as a writer I have never replied to a review of one of my books. A reviewer is supposed to be a scholar in his own right, and his judgment is entitled to respect. If he makes a mistake, it is his own reputation that suffers. Thus if Miss Wright had reviewed my Report unfavorably, I should have made no objection, because she is a distinguished historical writer who has earned the right to criticize. But this is different. It is simply a letter from an individual correspondent.⁴⁶

In short, Debo respected Wright's opinion as a fellow historian—Wright had earned her right to critique the work of others in Debo's opinion. But by publishing this particular response to Debo's report in the *Chronicles*, written

by an "individual correspondent," not an historian, Muriel Wright tacitly supported her relative, without raising the issue herself.

Fortunately, Debo spoke of her relationship with Wright in an oral interview. She spoke of three specific topics which came between them: Wright's grandfather, Allen Wright; resentment and misunderstanding stemming from Wright's heritage; and the Battle of Round Mountain.⁴⁷ In comments regarding Allen Wright's receiving kickbacks as a member of the Choctaw delegation following the Civil War, Debo said, "Miss Wright would never have known how shocked and distressed I was when I found out" that Allen Wright did, in fact, receive kickbacks as part of the attorney's fees.⁴⁸

Secondly, while the majority of Oklahoma's Indian population was receptive to Debo's work, she believed that Wright's heritage caused her to resent Debo's research. Debo explained Wright's position in one of her interviews:

I forgot about Miss Wright's case, and perhaps I don't know of anyone except Miss Wright and her relations, but perhaps there might have been other Indians like her, who were extremely successful leaders of the white mans' society, who resented any allusion to the unhappy situation of the full-bloods who were cheated out of their property and who lived in remote places, on land that nobody wanted, who suffered from actual hunger and lack of educational opportunities, and everything else. Miss Wright resented that; and I know that some of her relatives did.⁴⁹

Unfortunately, Wright chose not to comment on her association with Debo during her oral history interview in 1965. To put this in perspective, Wright's interview was one hour and forty-five minutes in length, compared to Debo's seventeen oral interviews over a four-year period. Perhaps Wright chose to refrain from commenting on Angie Debo, given the limited time to record her history.

To commemorate the Civil War centennial both Wright and Debo produced articles on the Battle of Round Mountain for *Chronicles*. Not much new evidence emerged as a result, and the stalemate persisted. Wright used her editorial authority to reject Debo's article, only to be overturned by the O.H.S. Board of Directors. The location of Round Mountain remains unconfirmed to

this day. In an effort to end the controversy, National Park Service historians and local historians held a conference in 1993 but unfortunately reached no consensus regarding the exact location of the battle. Thus, the two markers in Keystone and Yale remain intact, and the Battle of Round Mountain controversy continues to divide local historians.⁵⁰

Personal disagreements between Wright and Debo became public knowledge through public discourse regarding the Battle of Round Mountain. Round Mountain enthusiasts dismiss it as an academic duel, several local historians point to jealousy, and milder interpretations call it a difference of opinion.⁵¹

Muriel Wright wrote Oklahoma history textbooks for the secondary level and served as editor of the *Chronicles of Oklahoma* for over thirty years. Angie Debo's books engaged historians and a national public readership alike in her narratives on the conditions of Native Americans from the Native American perspective. Both women died without heirs, but their legacy of historical writings remains preserved within Oklahoma and regional history. Whether criticized for literary license or dictatorial editorship, these two women, nevertheless, contributed to the wealth of Oklahoma historical sources. Their living presence exists in the twin "Battle of Round Mountain" historical markers, in Debo's portrait in the state Capitol, and in the Oklahoma Historical Society's continuation of Wright's editorial excellence.

NOTES

1. Angie Debo, "The Site of the Battle of Round Mountain, 1861," *Chronicles of Oklahoma* 27 (Summer 1949): 187-206; Muriel H. Wright, "Colonel Cooper's Civil War Report on the Battle of Round Mountain," *Chronicles of Oklahoma* 39 (Winter 1961-1962): 352-397; Angie Debo, "The Location of the Battle of Round Mountain," *Chronicles of Oklahoma* 41 (Spring 1963): 70-104.
2. LeRoy Fischer, interview by author, 22 September 1996; Dale Chlouber, interview by author, 20 October 1996.
3. Dale Chlouber, "Revisiting the Battle of Red Fork," 1, unpublished manuscript in author's possession, 1996.
4. Debo, "Battle of Round Mountain," 190.
5. *Ibid.*, 206.
6. Wright, "Colonel Cooper's Civil War Report," 356.
7. For a discussion of Native American historiography and women historians and the profession, see R. David Edmunds, "Native Americans, New Voices: American Indian History, 1895-1995," *American Historical Review* 100 (June 1995): 717-740, and Jacqueline Goggin, "Challenging Sexual Discrimination in the Historical Profession: Women Historians and the American

Historical Association, 1890-1940," *American Historical Review* 97 (June 1992): 769-802. Both Wright's and Debo's careers must be considered in light of such work on historiographical trends and women historians.

8. For a detailed biographical sketch on Wright, see LeRoy Fischer, "Muriel H. Wright, Historian of Oklahoma," *Chronicles of Oklahoma* 52 (Spring 1974): 3-29. See also Ruth Arrington, "Muriel Hazel Wright," in *Notable American Women: The Modern Period* ed. Barbara Sicheman and Carol Hurd Green (Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University, 1980), 751-752; and Daniel F. Littlefield, Jr., "Muriel Hazel Wright," in *Native American Women: A Biographical Dictionary* (New York: Garland Publishing, 1993), 286-287.

9. Wright, typed document, [n.d.], Muriel H. Wright Collection, 83-18, Indian Archives Division, Oklahoma Historical Society, Oklahoma City [hereafter cited as Wright Collection, OHS].

10. Muriel H. Wright, interview by Frank Doyle, 8 March 1965, tape recording, Indian Archives Division, Oklahoma Historical Society, Oklahoma City [hereafter cited as Wright OH].

11. Ibid.

12. Ibid.

13. Regarding Allen Wright and the naming of Oklahoma, see Angie Debo, *The Rise and Fall of the Choctaw Republic* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1934; reprint, 1961), 214; W. David Baird and Danney Goble, *The Story of Oklahoma* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1994), 309.

14. Francis Paul Prucha, *The Great Father: The United States Government and the American Indians* vol. 2 (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1984), 753; Fischer, "Muriel Wright," Wright OH.

15. Fischer, "Muriel Wright," 9-11.

16. Article, "Miss Muriel Wright May Be Appointed Chief of Choctaws," *The Colgate Courier*, 23 January 1930, Wright Collection, OHS.

17. Fischer, "Muriel Wright," 12; Wright OH.

18. Muriel H. Wright and Joseph B. Thoburn, *Oklahoma: A History of the State and Its People* 4 vols. (New York: Lewis Historical Publishing, 1929); Wright OH; Fischer, "Muriel Wright," 18.

19. Muriel H. Wright and editorially assisted by Joseph B. Thoburn, *The Story of Oklahoma* (Oklahoma City: Webb Publishing Company, 1929); Muriel H. Wright with Lucyl Shirk, *The Story of Oklahoma: A Work Book* (Guthrie, OK: Co-operative Publishing Company, 1951); Muriel H. Wright, *Our Oklahoma* (Guthrie, OK: Co-operative Publishing Company, 1939); Muriel Wright, *Our Oklahoma: Work Book in Oklahoma History* (Guthrie, OK: Co-operative Publishing Company, 1951). See also Wright OH; Fischer, "Muriel Wright," 18. In addition, Wright wrote *A Guide to the Indian Tribes of Oklahoma* (1951), a reference book covering over sixty tribes. This book has become a standard reference among Native American historians studying Oklahoma.

20. Handwritten document, Wright, n.d. [mid-1970s], Wright Collection, OHS.

21. Wright OH.

22. Bob L. Blackburn, "Oklahoma Historians Hall of Fame-Muriel Wright," *Chronicles of Oklahoma* 71 (Winter 1993-1994): 450.

23. "Angie Debo: An Autobiographical Sketch, Eulogy, and Bibliography," (Stillwater, OK: The College of Arts and Sciences and Department of History, Oklahoma State University, 1988), 1.

24. *Ibid.*, 1.
25. Dale was a Frederick Jackson Turner student from Harvard.
26. See Goggin's "Challenging Sexual Discrimination;" Angie Debo, interviews by Glenna Matthews and Gloria Valencia-Webber, from 1981-1985, transcripts, University of Oklahoma, 12 December 1981 [hereafter cited as Debo OH].
27. Debo OH, 12 December 1981, 2.
28. See Edmunds, "Native Americans, New Voices." esp. 721-722.
29. *Ibid.*, 721.
30. *Ibid.*
31. Shirley Leckie, "Angie Debo, Pioneering Historian," 4, unpublished manuscript in author's possession, 1996.
32. Debo OH, 12 December 1981, 4.
33. *Ibid.*
34. Muriel H. Wright, "Book Review on *The Rise and Fall of the Choctaw Republic*," *Chronicles of Oklahoma* 13 (March 1935): 108.
35. LeRoy Fischer, interview by author, 22 September 1996.
36. David Baird, interview by author, 17 September 1996.
37. Debo to Joseph A. Brandt, 19 May 1975, Joseph A. Brandt Collection, Western History Collection, University of Oklahoma; Suzanne H. Schrems and Cynthia J. Wolff, "Politics and Libel: Angie Debo and the Publication of *And Still the Waters Run*," *Chronicles of Oklahoma* 22 (May 1991): 184-203; Leckie, "Angie Debo," 5.
38. Schrems and Wolff, "Politics and Libel," 186.
39. Grant Foreman, review of *And Still the Waters Run*, by Angie Debo, in *American Historical Review* 46 (July 1941): 936-937; Grant Foreman, review of *And Still the Waters Run*, by Angie Debo, in *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 27 (March 1941): 636-637; Dan E. Clark, review of *And Still the Waters Run*, by Angie Debo, in *Journal of Southern History* 7 (August 1941): 574-575; Baird and Goble, *The Story of Oklahoma*, 431; David Baird, interview by author, 26 November 1996.
40. In recent years, Debo has become a feminist symbol among some women historians. In the 1988 PBS film, "Indians, Outlaws, and Angie Debo," the producers Barbara Abrash and Martha Sandlin make the case that Debo was denied access to an academic career in history primarily because she was a woman and her topic of choice, Native Americans, was not popular at the time. Moreover, in an oral history series in the 1980s, two feminist scholars, historian Glenna Matthews and lawyer Gloria Valencia-Webber, interviewed Debo on those poignant questions.
41. "Autobiographical Sketch," 2.
42. Muriel H. Wright to Angie Debo, 3 May 1950, folder 22, box 25.2, Angie Debo Collection, 88-013, Department of Special Collections, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater [hereafter cited as ADC]; Colin B. Goodykoontz, "The Forty-Third Annual Meeting of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 37 (September 1950): 265-288. This panel on American Indians also included Howard H. Peckham of the Indiana Historical Bureau as chair, and fellow panelists Wilbur R. Jacobs of University of California, Santa Barbara, and Dwight L. Smith of Ohio State University. Unfortunately I do not have transcripts of the discussion that followed the papers. However, Goodykoontz notes that "Discussion was initiated by Anna Lewis of the Oklahoma College for Women and continued vigorously, with several persons of Indian blood participating. There was general agreement that the United States has

not yet discharged its obligation to the red man," 284.

43. Ibid.; Angie Debo, *The Five Civilized Tribes of Oklahoma: Report on Social and Economic Conditions* (Philadelphia: Indian Rights Association, 1951).

44. Ibid.

45. J.B. Wright to Mr. W.O. Roberts, "Notes and Documents," *Chronicles of Oklahoma* 29 (Spring 1951): 243-247.

46. Angie Debo to Dr. Charles Evans, 31 January 1952, folder 28, box 31, ADC.

47. Debo OH, 16 December 1981.

48. Ibid., 1.

49. Ibid., 2.

50. Chlouber, "Revisiting the Battle of Red Fork," 2.

51. Dale Chlouber, interview by author, 20 October 1996; LeRoy Fischer, interview by author, 22 September 1996; David Baird, interview by author, 17 September 1996; Mary Jane Warde, interview by author, 24 September 1996.