

OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY

THE EFFECTS OF THE POLITICAL
ECONOMY IN THE CONSTRUCTION
OF RACE CATEGORIES:
CASE STUDY OF THE
OSAGE NATION

By

JACKIE RENE BURNS
Bachelor of Science
University of Oklahoma
Norman, Oklahoma

1986

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for
the degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
July, 1993

THE EFFECTS OF THE POLITICAL
ECONOMY IN THE CONSTRUCTION
OF RACE CATEGORIES:
CASE STUDY OF THE
OSAGE NATION

Thesis Approved:

Patricia A. Bell

Thesis Advisor

David Edg

John R. Cross

Thomas C. Collins

Dean of the Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

It seems that words are never as expressive as our feelings when it comes to gratitude and appreciation. None the less, may these words suffice as a partial expression and our behavior towards one another fill the gap. Thank-you Dr. Patricia Bell for introducing and guiding me through the world of demography. Your advisement continues to assure my confidence and understanding. A gracious thank-you to Dr. John Cross for introducing me to the Osage Cultural Learning Resource Center, and supporting my interests in American Indian studies. Last, and certainly not least, to Dr. Charles Edgley, a deeply felt gratitude for coming on board the thesis committee and contributing to a meaningful defense of the thesis.

A very special acknowledgement goes to the people of the Osage Nation, especially Billie and Carl Ponca, and Marvin Stepson. Your patience, kindness, and friendship will forever remain a part of my being.

In the end, it is our family and friends who truly nurture our journey through the maze of life. A special embrace to my mother who encouraged me to challenge the limitations that a mis-spent youth generated.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. LITERATURE REVIEW	5
Social Categories	5
Race and Ethnicity	13
Government Classification	15
Category verses Group Typology	20
Process of Racial Categorization	21
III. LITERATURE REVIEW OF POLITICAL ECONOMY PARADIGM	23
Political Economy	23
Structural-Functionalism	26
Karl Marx	26
Weberian Model	28
IV. CATEGORY FORMATION AND SOCIAL INEQUALITY	32
Legal Categories	32
Social Inequality	34
The Osage Nation	36
V. POLITICAL HISTORY: UNITED STATES CENSUS BUREAU ..	38
Political Statistics	38
Constitutional Origins	40
Census as Social Control Mechanism	43
VI. CREATION OF AN AMERICAN INDIAN RACE CATEGORY ...	48
Six Phases in Federal Policy	48
Definitions of Indians and Tribes	52
Bureau of the Census Definition	61

Chapter	Page
VII. THE OSAGE NATION OF OKLAHOMA	65
Introduction	65
Pre-Columbian Osage Tribe	67
Government Intervention	69
Full-Blood and Mixed-Blood Osage	72
Indian Territory	75
Oklahoma Territory	77
Dissolution of the Osage Government	78
Allotment	79
VIII. HISTORICAL CASE STUDY ANALYSIS	85
Methodology	85
IX. FINDINGS	97
X. CONCLUSIONS	132
LITERATURE CITED	139

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Ethnic Attributes: Typology of Concepts.....	10
II. Race Attributes: Typology of Concepts	19
III. 1887 Osage Census Summary	98
IV. 1888 Osage Census Summary	99
V. 1890 Osage Census Summary	101
VI. 1891 Osage Census Summary	103
VII. 1892 Osage Census Summary	105
VIII. 1893 Osage Census Summary	107
IX. 1894 Osage Census Summary	109
X. 1895 Osage Census Summary	110
XI. 1896 Osage Census Summary	112
XII. 1897 Osage Census Summary	114
XIII. 1898 Osage Census Summary	115
XIV. 1899 Osage Census Summary	117
XV. 1900 Osage Census Summary	119
XVI. 1901 Osage Census Summary	120
XVII. 1902 Osage Census Summary	122
XVIII. 1903 Osage Census Summary	124
IXX. 1904 Osage Census Summary	125
XX. 1905 Osage Census Summary	127
XXI. 1906 Osage Census Summary	129
XXII. 1907 Osage Census Summary	130

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this research is to examine influences on the process of developing governmental classification of persons. More specifically the research will examine legal classificatory schemes which employ biological and cultural characteristics as criteria for racial category formation. An immediate goal is to understand racial and ethnic inequality. Often racial and ethnic groups experience inequities as a by-product of institutional attempts to manage groups as aggregates rather than naturally occurring groups. It is hoped that this research will lead to a clearer theoretical understanding of the inter-relationship between naturally occurring groups, social institutions, and the political economic milieu of a society.

Research methodologies include historical analysis of secondary data, and the use of a case study to illustrate the specificity in which these ideas can be applied. The phenomenon of category formation will be isolated to government application of categories. This research draws upon the example provided by the United States Government's involvement in establishing criteria for the enumeration of people under the racial category Indian. North American

Indians have no one cultural experience for individuals comprising this category. Individuals affiliate with numerous cultural entities or tribes, and distinguish themselves uniquely different from those of other tribes. When attempting to enumerate people within the racial category of Indian, there is a cultural division of organization that requires first the identification of tribe, and second, the identification of individual members within that tribe.

American Indians can be enumerated as a member of a specific tribe and also as an individual among the aggregate racial category American Indian. This dual enumeration often creates or lends to complication. For instance, an individual may declare themselves as Indian within the general aggregate racial category, but may not be recognized by any tribe as being one of their members. Likewise, an individual may have a clear ancestral history among a tribal group, but may not be recognized among the aggregate racial category due to failure to register on tribal rolls. A third complication is that many tribes, (as many as one-hundred) are not recognized by the United States government. From 1954 through 1966, the United States government sought to assimilate American Indians into mainstream society by terminating tribal affiliations. (Pevar:1991:14) An individual may have clear ancestral affiliation with a tribe, but the tribe having no recognition, does not receive any federal, state, or local aide. These individuals may

receive a few educational benefits from the aggregate racial category American Indian, but our current system requires "roll numbers" from tribal affiliation in order to receive optimum assistance from the government.

The enumeration of American Indians is further complicated by having two distinct agencies with two separate agendas in identifying members of this racial category. Two Acts of Congress (1832 & 1834) established laws giving government broad supervision of Indian people. Later, the Snyder Act of 1921 gave authority to the Bureau of Indian Affairs to be the primary provider in supervising Indian relations. (Kickingbird, 1977:6) The relationship of the Bureau of Indian Affairs with the United States Census Bureau has not been historically consistent. The Census Bureau officially became involved in the enumeration of Indians in 1880. (Shryrock, 1976:16). There are general patterns showing that these two Bureaus pursue two different levels of analysis from their statistical systems. The Bureau of Indian Affairs seeks to enumerate and analyze the data in terms of social welfare programs for individual tribes in condensed geographical regions. The Census Bureau enumerates and analyzes data at the individual level of analysis and combines individual aggregate data into larger political boundaries in order to determine federal policy and spending.

Historically, the criteria for the categorization of American Indians and tribes has been based upon the Bureau

of Indian Affairs identification of tribal affiliation. These are in turn interpreted into federal policy and administrative directives. But, as we shall see in this research, often times federal policies mandate what tribes will be recognized, who shall be considered American Indian, and how they shall be treated.

The primary goal of this research is to examine the inter-relationship between the political economy, the categorization of people, and social inequality. The research accomplishes this by examining the legal constructions of the race category "Osage Indian" in the United States from 1887 to 1906. While the theoretical and social issues addressed here are characteristic of society in general, they are exemplified in the history and experience of the Osage Tribe in the State of Oklahoma.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Social Categories

Understanding the social phenomenon of identifying groups helps to identify the relationship between racial categorization and social inequality. To begin, we must first make one assumption; essentially, "people seek ways of differentiating themselves from others in their society." (Kuvlesky, 1991:4) To argue against this point is sociologically ludicrous. Ideally, maybe we would not, or wish we would not, but the fact remains, people distinguish themselves from others. In this process of distinguishing oneself relative to others, each one is placed in sphere of social position that is either equal, lower, or higher, than one's own social position. Social differentiation, or ranking, logically follows as a consequence from the dominance of one ethnocentric bias to subordinate others. These social positions carry with them a function of distinction that reflect the very fiber of the culture in which they are derived.

In every society, there always emerges at least one dominant sub-group, and these serve as the basis of comparison for all other groups. Whether perceived or real,

people categorize sub-populations based upon biological, social, and political attributes. (Kuvlesky, 1991:4-5) The character and meaning of these social groups are contingent upon the cultural environment. Cultures vary across societies and so too the character and meaning of social categories. Once categories are created to differentiate one group from another, the sentiment attached to creating and recognizing social categories fluctuates within a culture milieu. (Kuvlesky, 1991:4-5)

Social categories then have two necessary features: they mirror societies differentiation tendencies, and the sentiment attached to these categories change or are receptive to cultural transitions. Much of social science research has spent its energy examining the particular distinctions among the various sub-groups of a society. They have either examined the minute anthropological particulars of a group, or they have examined their social status positions relative to other sub-groups both subordinate or dominant to them.

The process of analyzing these various sub-groups of society is where we find the emergence of tangible criteria for defining groups, and development of criteria for categories. The terms group and category symbolically represent broad pre-suppositions regarding subpopulations and their status relative to larger society.

(Kuvlesky: 1991) The distinction between the term group and category must be firmly established in order to substantiate

the argument that racial categorization is directly related to social inequality.

Group, in the social sciences, often refers to naturally occurring aggregates of people who share a common ancestry, language, and geographical location. Categories, differ from groups in that they include in their description the differentiated spheres of social position that the culture has defined for those groups. These social positions are assumed to reflect a distinct social culture, and in essence, society successfully reifies its own cultural construct.

A re-examination of the concept of group is illustrative. Usually when social scientists examine groups, they identify the language, the physical artifacts that particular group may use, their dress, their familial relations, mythologies, etc. It is when social scientists move beyond these descriptions into positioning groups relative to larger society we see the emergence of categories. Categories place less emphasis on the transcendental culture of a sub-group, and more emphasis on the groups relative social and political position to other sub-groups in society.

A specific example of these distinctions is the North American Indians. They have numerous sub-groups referred to as tribes. Each tribe reflects distinct cultural milieus, with very little in common with other tribes. What they do share in commonality is their racial category grouping of Indian. The concept Indian, as a race category, represents a

social category whose character and meaning is shaped by both subjective and objective cultural criteria.

William P. Kuvlesky (1991) has provided a typology of social science research in race and ethnic studies based upon the distinction between category and group. The typology identifies conceptual attributes associated with the term group versus the term category. Kuvlesky's typology sought to clarify conceptual definitions of race and ethnic groups by re-establishing the conceptual term category. The conceptual attributes of a category produces subsequent implications upon attributes used to define groups. Conceptually, categories include some attributes of group or "socially organized entities", i.e., a shared cultural characteristic; but, categories do not assume organized internal dynamics to exist prior to categorization. Groups may form within the categorized subpopulation, but categories do not imply that organized social entities must be present in order for categories to exist. A second important conceptual attribute of categories is the positioning of the subpopulation into a social status relative to the larger society. In fact, many subpopulations are categorized specifically because they are negatively evaluated by a majority in the dominant society. To the extent that this is true, organized social entities do emerge as an outcome of being categorized. Kuvlesky (1991) refers to these emergent groups within categories as "minority groups", and contain within them additional conceptual attributes that distinguish

them a part from non-minority groups.

Four conceptual attributes of category:

1. no precondition of organized social entities
2. positioning of status relative to larger society
3. criteria for categorization mirror societal differentiation tendencies
4. the sentiment attached to these categories change or are receptive to cultural transitions;

are basic attributes that conceptually distinguish between two unique phenomenon occurring within race and ethnic relations. There exists the social phenomenon of organized social entities, referred to as group dynamics, and an additional social phenomenon at the macro level, involving the relations between categorized subpopulations and the larger society.

The distinction between these two levels of phenomenon is critical in establishing the relationship between social categorization and social inequality. In order to explain this relationship clearly, a typology (Table I) is useful to introduce meta-theoretical assumptions associated with the conceptual terms of category versus group. These assumptions reflect not only values and preconceptions within the social sciences but mirror societal views as well. Unfortunately, society does not demand from its members an examination of such large analytical issues. If this were true, the phenomenon of ethnocentric bias would be greatly diminished by challenging preconceptions based on unexamined assumptions.

TABLE I

ETHNIC ATTRIBUTES: TYPOLOGY OF
CONCEPTUAL DEFINITIONS

MACRO	LEVEL OF ANALYSIS	MICRO
Legalistic/Census Bureau (Objective approach to social science)		Tribal/Cultural (Subjective approach to social science)
OBJECTIVE Realsim Positivistic Nomothetic	META-THEORETICAL ASSUMPTIONS Burrell and Morgan, 1979	SUBJECTIVE Nominalism Anti-Positivistic Idiographic
METHODOLOGY ETIC VERSES EMIC DEFINITIONS Robert M. Emerson, 1983		
Etic: Concepts construed from outside of the culture being studied to define attributes of race and ethnicity		Emic: Concepts construed from within the culture being studied that are used and recognized by its members
DEFINITIONS CATEGORIES VERSES GROUPS		
Categories: Kuvlesky, 1991 In addition to "group" attributes, categories are defined as distinctive social entities by those outside of the culture being studied, and includes their concomitant status relative a larger social system. ***** Little sense of membership and internal interaction. Marger (1991) & Williams (1964) *****		Groups: Schermerhorn, 1970 A collectivity within a larger society, having real or putative ancestry, memories of a shared historical past, and a focus on one or more symbolic elements defined as the epitome of their peoplehood. ***** Internal interaction and strong group loyalty. Marger (1991) & Williams (1964) ***** Kuvlesky (1991) also includes groups as being internally organized.

The typology (Table I) clearly illustrates that conceptual attributes of category are associated with a macro level of analysis that assumes an objective view of social reality. Conceptual attributes of group are associated with a micro level of analysis that assumes a more subjective view of social reality. It is important to remember that conceptual ideas in science are heuristic devices used to understand larger society, they mirror and often are products of larger social sentiment. Objective conceptual attributes are analogous to the social ideology of human rationalism; the belief that a society becomes more civilized by its increased exercise of rationalism by its members. Subjective conceptual attributes are analogous to the social ideology of secular individualism; the belief that individuals have the inalienable right to pursue happiness, whatever they perceive happiness to be.

These analogies are of course very broad generalizations, but they serve to illustrate the connectedness between the social sciences and the "real world". Too often, academicians are accused of being removed from quote the "real world". In some instances, this may be true in the application of academic ideas, but the ideas themselves stem from society and are often direct outcomes of larger social issues.

In the case of group categorization, much of the social science research is based upon societal views regarding the group under scrutiny. After all, academics did not create

the distinction between American Indians and Europeans, they merely generate post facto, a series of propositions to explain the distinction already being made in the "real world". The value of these propositions is that they seek to explain underlying motivations of human behavior and their consequences upon social relations.

By reviewing race and ethnic studies at a conceptual level, and distinguishing between the terms category and group, basic societal values in the real world have been uncovered. In daily living, these values are often obscure, unnoticed, or taken for granted. Values such as objectivity, rationalism, positivistic science, eugenics and biological superiority, all weave a web of interconnected beliefs that make up our culture. What is also uncovered in this conceptual pursuit is the disparity between the ideology of pluralistic democracy and the existence of structural racism. Pluralistic democracy assumes that all interest groups will be politically represented; structural racism is defined as the exclusion of groups from political, social, and economic participation based upon racial attributes.

Before this connection can be made fully, societal values must first be identified. This is done heuristically by exploring the conceptual development of race and ethnicity in the social sciences. The remaining chapter is devoted to further establishing the distinction between categories and groups. Once the distinctions and their concomitant value systems are made clear, we then turn to

government classificatory schemes used to define race and ethnic categories. It is at this level, government constructed categories, that we see the implementation of structural racism based upon the ethnocentric bias of the dominant population.

Race and Ethnicity

Probably the most conceptually elusive category in the social sciences is race. Definitions of race vary considerably and include both objective and subjective criteria in their definitions. Objective definitions, which are derived primarily in the domain of category formation, are those for which the criteria of inclusion are created by an outside group, or do not arise from within the group itself. Additionally, objective definitions of group membership are similar to other type definitions in social science which are characterized, variously, as positivistic in orientation, nomothetic in style of explanation, and etic in methodological perspective. Objective definitions of race then, are based upon a small set of very exact criteria which lend themselves to some form of quantification, and to some extent must be externally verifiable.

Therefore, blood quantum is more likely to be chosen for such a criteria, than is the subjective feelings of loyalty to the tribe. Objective criteria also contain certain embedded generalizations regarding the status of the group

under observation to the larger society. (Kuvlesky, 1991)
Inherent within the process of defining a group as
distinctively different from the larger social system, by
those outside of the group being defined, a concomitant
social status emerges. (Kuvlesky, 1991)

The use of blood quantum as a criteria, for example, is
based upon the traditional biological classificatory schemes
of phenotype and genotype. These types of schemes stem from
the traditional model of science, i.e. hard science, which
is positivistic, nomothetic and etic. They are not criteria
which are generated within cultures. It is an example of the
differences between law-ways and folk-ways as presented by
William G. Sumner (1906).

For example, prior to Columbus' discovering America, the
indigenous people did not perceive themselves nor organize
themselves according to phenotypical demarcations. The term
"Indian" was introduced to categorically generalize a
phenotypical difference between the indigenous people and the
immigrant European.

Subjective definitions of race, derived primarily in the
domain of group identification, are associated with group or
cultural identity rather than phenotypical differences.
Biological similarities within the group is often a
consequence of historical geographical isolation, and is not
a primary criteria for group identification or organization.
Subjective definitions of groups are characterized as non-
positivistic in orientation, idiographic in style of

explanation, and emic in methodological perspective.

The significance of this subjective definition for group membership is exemplified in the practice by the Osage of inclusion by adoption, persons who previously were not members of the tribe, and who are not necessarily "Indian". Criteria for adoption is based upon the individuals shared values and commitment to the Osage Nation, not blood quantum or biological characteristics.

(Billie Ponca, Interview, 1990)

Government Classification

Governmental categories of race are primarily objective definitions. They must be uniformly applied across all geographical and political boundaries. To the extent that government criteria used in category formation are objective, their definitions serve to reify the status of the group relative to the larger society. (Kuvlesky, 1991)

The purposes of governmental classificatory schemes is to create manageable categories for aggregates of individuals and to facilitate management of the respective population. These governmental categories, in application, create real consequences for those being categorized. The standardization of these classification schemes leads to wide usage across societal organizations which must coordinate their functions to those of the central government. These categories, then, begin to take a life of their own or to be reified. Hicks (1977) observed that

there is a tendency to infer (reify) "group orientations" to social categories. That is, people come to believe that these represent groups with cultural characteristics, such as group identification. What eventually occurs is a situation which is described by Glazer and Monihan (1975) as a reciprocity between those groups which have been "collapsed" into a social category and those who are creating the label: in this case the United States Government and the Osage Nation.

There are many writers (Berreman, 1972; Pierre L. van den Berghe, 1975; Bahr, et al. 1975; Glazer and Monihan, 1975; Peter Rose, 1981; Feagin, 1989; Marger, 1991) who recognize boundaries of the racial category as being set by social agreement. All offer conceptual definitions of race that, " ... start with the idea that you have social categories labelled by the societal members as racial entities" (Kuvinsky, 1991:16).

What has historically been described by social scientists as cultural groups are what one generally thinks of in terms of ethnic group. Racial groups, however, are non-existent to the extent that they are generalizations of racial categories as defined by the government and are not groups in a sociological sense.

A race category is defined as a distinctive entity by those outside the category, and includes its relation to a larger society in its description. An ethnic group or cultural group is defined as an internally organized entity

with idiographic emphasis in its description. The pervasiveness and power of governmental categorization necessitates response throughout the society to any mandates relevant to the categories. It is in the process of labelling an aggregate of individuals as a racial phenotype category that we see the emergence of internal group processes recognizing themselves as a "racial group", and thus organizing themselves as such. This is similar to Kuvlesky's concept of "minority group", where organized social entities emerge from a subpopulation who have been negatively evaluated by others. Ethnic or cultural groups on the other hand do exist prior to the phenomenon of being externally labeled as a social category. Ethnicity includes dimensions of shared meaning in reference to their common descent, real or mythical, and share a common history and experience. (Feagin, 1989:9) Naturally, issues of phenotype distinctions arise, but they are not the primary locus of internal group organization.

When biological issues do arise in the social science, it is usually in a movement away from emic descriptions and toward a more etic approach where the subjects under study are being placed into a status relation relative to a larger society. Berreman (1971) makes this distinction clearer with his statement that,

Race as a basis of social rank is always a socially defined phenomenon which at most only very imperfectly corresponds to genetically transmitted traits and then, of course only to phenotypes rather than genotypes. (Quoted in Bahr, et al 1975:7)

A large majority of "race" research has implicitly made many of the assumptions used in determining objective categories. Race might as well be included as another attribute used in distinguishing a category not an ethnic group. In fact Kuvlesky (1991) states that "A racial group is an ethnic category believed by its members and others to share common phenotypical traits" (1991:10).

An additional typology on racial attributes (Table II) includes meta-theoretical assumptions to provide a clear distinction in the applicability of race attributes at the macro and micro level. It is clear, that race attributes are not applicable at the group level, or micro level of analysis, without contradicting meta-theoretical assumptions of the concept race. One could speculate that the contradiction between pluralistic democracy and structural racism exist due to the fact that the lines of distinction between objective social reality and subjective social reality are violated, and purposefully at times, for the efficiency of government. Scanning the typology (Table II) we can see that research on the issues of race are skewed toward the objective, nominalistic, and positivistic perspective. Kuvlesky implies this skewness by his definition of a "racial category", as being "an ethnic category believed by its members and others to share common phenotypical traits". Where "phenotype" and "ethnic category" allude to the bias of an objective social reality.

TABLE II

RACIAL ATTRIBUTES: TYPOLOGY OF
CONCEPTUAL DEFINITIONS

MACRO Legalistic/Census Bureau (Objective approach to social science)	LEVEL OF ANALYSIS	MICRO Tribal/Cultural (Subjective approach to social science)
OBJECTIVE	META-THEORETICAL ASSUMPTIONS Burrell and Morgan, 1979	SUBJECTIVE
Realism Positivistic Nomothetic		Nominalism Anti-Positivistic Idiographic
<p>METHODOLOGY ETIC VERSES EMIC DEFINITIONS Robert M. Emerson, 1983</p>		
Etic:		Emic:
<p>DEFINITIONS CATEGORIES VERSES GROUPS</p>		
Categories:		Groups:
Defined by government classification. Race construed as biological fact.		Defined by group members Set by social agreement.
A basis for social rank and social positions		A consciousness of kind
Genotypes/phenotypes, sharply distinguishable biological		Ascribed membership

Category Verses Group

Utilizing Kuvlesky's (1991:9) conceptual term category provides an excellent synthesis for organizing the research on the category race that includes meta-theoretical and methodological assumptions. It also allows recognition for the distinctive role that the political economy plays in constructing race "categories". These constructed categories then in turn influence race and ethnic "group" dynamics and social status.

What appears as contradictions between the objective and subjective approach are simply two sides of the same reality. Social reality is represented by both micro level, daily living dynamics of individuals; and the macro level, organized regularities of a society maintaining the status-quo.

Social reality does indeed manifest itself in many material gradations between the most minute particulars of an individual's life, to their primary and secondary social relations, and ultimately to static organizations that seek to stabilize an environment and preserve the minute particulars.

For the purpose of this research, the primary focus will be on the creation of race categories. References to cultural group dynamics will occur in the analysis of the case study. It is necessary to compare these two levels of analysis in order to determine how far removed objective definitions of a racial category are from the actual group

being categorized. If the disparities are sufficient then we are faced with what William Graham Sumner (1906) identifies as lawways not being folkways.

Process of Racial
Categorization

The review of race and ethnic studies has distinguished conceptually between groups and categories, and the relativity of both ethnicity and race according to different levels of analysis. The next step of analysis is to examine administratively defined categories of race, and how systems of legality are inter-related to the political economy of the society. In legal constructions of race categories, particularly American Indians, a subcategory emerges for tribal classification. As mentioned earlier, the race American Indian not only refers to individuals in an aggregate category, but also to their affiliation with unique cultural entities or tribes. Tribes have been systematically categorized through objective criteria such as ancestry, language, lifestyle, geographical place of residence, and degree of western assimilation. Probably the most controversial issue in defining tribes is determining criteria for membership. Often times criteria for tribal citizenship established by others outside of the tribe, are unrelated to tribal reality.

This research will demonstrate the process of administrative categorization of American Indians by the

United States Census Bureau. The case study of the Osage Nation of Oklahoma will demonstrate the relationship between establishing criteria for a race category and how it is applied to the identification of members into a specific tribe. The role of the United States Census Bureau in the management of the United States and its people, via categorization, will be examined and then applied to the case study of tribal membership with the Osage Nation. The case study specifically illustrates the process of categorization, and how categories tend to mirror the ethnocentric bias of a dominant culture.

The political economy paradigm lends identification to those factors that contribute to the social positioning of aggregates of persons that prohibit access to political resources.

CHAPTER III
LITERATURE REVIEW OF
POLITICAL ECONOMY
PARADIGM

Political Economy

One of the primary assumptions of the political economy paradigm is that a societies' economic growth and stability are fundamentally contingent upon the management of it's members through identifiable groups. The management of people becomes an issue of economic distribution and social control with the inherent consequences of resource distribution.

In the United States, economic distribution is based upon competition and the assumption of equal opportunity for those who engage in a market economy. However, in reality, the key to a vital capitalist economy is the need for scarcity of resources to promote competition. Resources that are determined scarce imply a zero-sum competition, where there are "winners" and "losers". Many would contend that this "natural order" of competition is fair and equitable based upon the reliance of individuals having an equal opportunity in accessing the economic market. Unfortunately these proponents failed to include in their analysis the

political nature of creating economic markets and occupational accessibility of those markets once they are made available. For example, during industrial expansionism from 1850 to the 1900's. Many industries were generated from a small pool of capitalist entrepreneurs; labor markets became a tool of economic and social control by first, controlling wage earnings and maximizing profit margins, and second, by creating vertical occupational competition among the labor force to divert a unified labor market coalition. Capitalist entrepreneurs were extremely active politically to minimize federal labor force regulations and allow them free reign in capitalist expansionism.

Coinciding with the development of labor markets is the issue of immigration and "waves" of ethnic immigrants coming into America at different times. Not only were laborers divided among occupation, these occupations generally reflected the tenure of an ethnic group in the migration to America. Those more tenured occupied higher levels of the occupational strata than those ethnic immigrants who recently arrived. Economic compensation by occupation inherently reflected a bias toward specific ethnic immigrants of tenure, and less compensatory to those recently immigrating.

To tie this phenomenon into the American Indian issue becomes a bit more complicated. In the first place, American Indians were not recognized as a viable labor force due to their cultural diversity. From the onset, they were excluded from the opportunity to engage in the mainstream of

industrial economic activity. Compensation for economic exclusion became a divisive political issue in terms of determining how to much to compensate American Indians, what forms compensation should take, and the extent to which compensation should continue to exclude or include them into future economic activities.

These are the issues that underpine the process of categorizing American Indians as individuals and tribes. Their numbers, cultural dictinctions, and geographical locations all played a role in their categorization and subsequent compensation from economic exclusion. Categorizing American Indians from the beginning has been a political and economically charged administrative legality. History reveals that each successive administration in the attempt to enumerate American Indians reflects these political and economic factors and are contingent upon the Nation's needs to sustain and encourage economic development.

The relationship between polity and economy has been examined by a number of social scientists. The theorized relationship between the two can be represented by three major approaches in Sociology. These are the Marxist analysis, a Weberian analysis, and the Structural Functionalist analysis. The political economy paradigm draws upon the characteristics of all three and is concerned with establishing attributes of the relationship between the economics and polity of a society. An inter-relationship

between the two systems is assumed critical to a society whose structure of distribution is dependent upon differential evaluations and competition.

Structural Functionalism

In general terms, when the resources of an economy (a system of resource management) become differentially evaluated, the bases of exchange becomes politicized: the art and practice of exercising influence over people. (Holt, 1969) The structural functionalist influence on the political economy paradigm is evident in its approach to social issues from a systems analogy. While theories have moved beyond the mechanistic and organismic analogies of their predecessors, the structural-functionalist paradigm maintains a heavy dependence on inter-related functions of formal organizations to meet "desired goals". Take, for example, Parsons' view of economy and polity,

The goal or function of the economy is ... income or wealth. The goal or function of the polity I conceive to be ... attainment of collective goals ...
(T. Parsons, Structure and Process, 1960:181)

The political economy paradigm takes this notion of desired goals assumed by the structural functionalist and radicalizes them into a dimension of critical analysis.

Karl Marx

The Marxist component recognizes capitalism as promoting individual wealth and income as the collective goals of the United States. These goals are achieved

through a economic system that differentially evaluates between those who own capital and the means of production, and those whose labor is their only means of capital and, hence, their ability to consume. While there are some gradations of ranks among those who own the capital, the extent of gradations or differentiation becomes more evident among those whose labor is their only source of capital. It is here among the rank of occupations, the unit of analysis Max Weber extensively analyzed , that systems of differentiation and inequality have their most dramatic consequences. Dan Clawson (1980), Anthony Giddens (1975), Richard Edwards (1979) and Mathew Snipp (1986) each show the affects of how an individual is positioned in the stratification system. Positions in the stratification system affects an individuals ability to engage in the political system and the degree that they can participate in the economic system. These researchers have shown the interaction of both the stratification system and the economy being interdependent and therefore influencing political decision making.

It is also at the level of occupational status where government or political intervention is needed to stabilize the disparities of economic inequality among aggregates of individuals. Mosca (1959), Michels (1939), Eckstein (1966), Parenti (1978), and Rousseau (1911), have observed the relationship between economic activities and the activities of the government to stabilize or encourage growth and

stability of a society. These formal organizations of economy and polity are emergent upon basic ideological values (collective goals), these values form the foundations upon which all formal organizations are founded. (Pateman, 1970:pp 1-22)

If the United States collective goals are individual wealth and income then our political and economic systems will organize in a way to make these goals attainable. For instance, rational systems of social control, or value-goal orientations (Weber) are translated into rational-legal systems of regulation to promote individual competitiveness.

Weberian Model

The Weberian model is primarily concerned with the ways in which the state apparatus regulates the economic, political, and social interactions of society. Theories are focused on power relationships and draw many of their propositions from political science. Also addressed within the political economy paradigm is the establishment of a hierarchy and the need for vertical division of status ranks to maintain minimal political and economic coalitions. Establishing hierarchies are essential to the Weberian model of social order. Social action and organization are based upon a hierarchy of authority according to Weber, and in the political economy paradigm, hierarchies are shaped by the cultural value-goal of individual wealth, and the political vying to maintain this wealth.

Michael Parenti (1978) addresses issues of political power processes, and the relationship of power to social structure, political consciousness, and powerlessness. (Parenti, 1978:V) Power becomes defined in terms of both emergent out of relations and contingent upon social structure. The establishment of a hierarchy of inequality is necessary to promote capitalism, democracy, and control in maintaining unequal distribution of resources. Social structure manifests the ideological beliefs of those who possess, in hierarchical proportion, more resources than most. William Dobriner, (1969) posits that stratification, or hierarchical structure, is essentially the organization of inequalities.

The Marxist influence is evident through out the political economy paradigm by its emphasis on the problems inherent in capitalism. Where the Weberian model focuses on power relationships, the Marxist see the economic structure as the key determinant of these power relationships. For example, the bureaucracy of the United States Census Bureau is seen as a empirical manifestation of the underlying structure of monopoly capitalism. It is a tool for economic, political, and social order. Bureaucracies are the legalistic tool to attempt through administrative regulation, to construct identifiable categories of differentially evaluated aggregates of individuals. Once legally identified as a distinct racial or ethnic category,

groups become manageable political entities within the larger society.

The consequences of differentially ranked social positions around an economy can be documented by examining the impact of scarcity of resources to ability to exercise political power. Political power is the pivotal expression of infrastructural differences, political influences condition and express infrastructural differences.

(Giddens, 1975)

The United States' system of differentiation is based upon competition and the ability to influence political decisions and economic trends. Matthew Snipp provides an historical analysis of the status of the American Indian shifting as a function of alternating trends in social policy based upon shifting national resource needs to sustain the economic system. (Yetman, 1991) Snipp maintains that documenting the changing political and economic position of American Indians requires a survey of historical events as evidence. (Yetman, 1991) Examining the changing definitions of the category Osage Indian also documents historically the changing trend in political and economic policy towards the Osage Indian. It will become evident latter in this paper that changing national resource needs and discovered natural resources on the Osage Reservation directly influenced the categorization of Osage Indian and their ability to determine tribal membership.

Administrative law acts to categorize aggregates of individuals according to their accessibility to natural, political, and social resources. Categorization is necessary in order to define the criteria in which these categorized aggregates may pursue compensation for unequal distribution of resources. Creating categories for generalization engages the aggregates in a process of becoming hierarchically stratified as a category within the larger society. This in turn affects the internal group dynamics, and in the case of the American Indian, tribal sovereignty. These conceptual processes of categorization are political and economic outcomes reflecting the need to control dissension among aggregates to stabilize relations economically, politically, and socially.

Administrative regulation is a system of legality bound to the constraints of formal processes and rationality. The character of formalism and rationality are contingent upon the culture from which it stems. For the United States, law attempts to regulate "the individual pursuit of happiness". Happiness usually is translated to accumulation of wealth, power, and prestige. Law provides sanctions to those who do not comply with the appropriate means of achieving these goals.

CHAPTER IV

CATEGORY FORMATION AND SOCIAL INEQUALITY

Legal Categories

The criteria for legal category assignment when applied to race and ethnicity usually includes one or more of the following: biology, ancestry, language, or geographical place of residence. These same factors are employed when a group is sociologically defined as a cultural group. Historically, cultural groups have been definable in these terms because to a large extent, these are shared characteristics of individuals known to embody a distinct cultural experience. Sociologically, a racial group differs from a racial category. Racial groups can be, and often are, multi-cultural and cultural groups can be multi-racial. Racial groups in sociological terms include the transcendental experience of their shared characteristics. An experience that goes beyond any rational-objective definition of the phenomenon based on criteria for classification.

Legal categories assume that cultural boundaries are malleable and can withstand indeterminate strains against its identity. In determining tribal identity and individual

membership, the government has neglected the minute cultural particulars that weave a web of inter-connectedness. This disregard for the "cultural experience" in creating racial categories interrupts and often alters the shared common experiences of the culture. What becomes shared is the legal grouping of people who are similar circumstantially but not culturally. The distinction between race and culture becomes blurred in many governmental definitions.

An example of a legal category is the government's construction of tribes as a legal unit. The Cheyenne-Arapaho tribe is two distinct cultural groups combine into one political unit. The South Dakotas, what were one distinct cultural group, were split into two separate legal entities, and placed on two separate reservations. The Osage Nation Organization (1965), was founded out of a need to re-establish tribal unity from the disruption of the government's legal construction of the tribe, "and it wasn't Osage" (Wilson, 1985:190).

As political and economic circumstances change, both definitions and criteria for legal category assignment also changes. The Bureau of Indian Affairs has repeatedly redefined Osage citizenship along the lines of "mixed-bloods" and "full-bloods". In 1906, the creation of an allotment roll was established along these bifurcated lines, and later in 1921 it was used as a basis for deciding who should be permitted to sell their property without government supervision. Finally in the 1940's, the

distinction of "one-half blood quantum" became necessary from the dwindling numbers of full-blood ancestry (Wilson,1985:180). These changes represent a governmental solution to a political problem; the criteria, therefore the composition of the categories, tends to mirror the conditions of the time. Racial category as legally defined, is not synonymous with cultural group as sociologically defined. Legal definitions lead to identifiable aggregates, while sociological definitions lead to identifiable cultural groups.

Social Inequality

The relationship between the categorization of people and social inequality becomes evident when examining the repercussions of these constructed categories upon actual persons being categorized. Legal definitions of race categories implicates the social order of cultural entities such as American Indian tribes. The infiltration of the Europeans into American Indian cultures created a host of issues for tribal members to resolve. Inter-racial marriages and their offspring became a formidable resolution to achieve. Defining tribal membership and privileges included issues of land and resource allocations, government supervision in managing resources, and member representation in social and political bodies of tribal government. Most tribes however were not given the privilege to resolve this issue among themselves. Government intervention in the form

of classification and enumeration necessitated these issues be reconciled in a manner consistent with their needs to identify total population estimates. Once government intervention ensued, this most critical issue for tribal sovereignty became a moot point. Criteria and inclusion of members into a tribe became an elaborate legal classificatory scheme created by persons outside of the tribal entity. For example, originally European males were encouraged to marry American Indian females in hopes of accelerated assimilation; inter-racial marriages were enumerated non-Indian. Later, when it seemed that their offspring were no nearer to Western assimilation than their Native parent, non-Indian identification was discarded, and the family was enumerated Indian. (Louis Burns, 1989:508) Inter-racial marriages involving European males and American Indian females did not promote assimilation due to the significant role of the mother in the socialization of the young.

Biological assimilation, or amalgamation of American Indians and Europeans altered permanently the social, political, educational, and family relations of original tribal members. Compounding this biological and cultural component as criteria of the racial category Indian, are the legal administrative directives of the Bureau of Indian Affairs identifying and constructing tribal entities for enumeration. Just as inter-racial marriages strained the criteria for inclusion into the race category Indian,

defining tribes into distinct political boundaries interrupted a once fluid interaction between tribal cultures.

The Osage Nation

In the case of the Osage Nation, legal definitions of group membership had a clear and lasting impact upon the tribe as a sovereign nation. The earliest documentation on the effects of changing composition of the tribe was in the 1870's with the removal of the Osage from Kansas to Oklahoma. Many of the Osage "mixed-bloods" opposed the removal from their lands in Kansas to Indian territory. In an attempt to alleviate their fears of losing substantial economic gains, the government assured the mixed-bloods through a "community compact", that those who wish to remain would be treated fairly. Trusting the compact, the mixed-blood members signed the treaty for the removal of the Osage to another reservation (Burns, 1989:425) Without their signatures a consensus could not have been reached and the tribe could not be "legally" relocated. There were approximately thirty "mixed-blood" Osage who chose to remain in Kansas on allotments granted to them through a 1865 treaty, and many filed to become citizens of the State of Kansas. Unfortunately the "community compact" proved to be political rhetoric, and within thirty days they were coerced to rejoin the tribe in Indian Territory (Wilson, 1985:17).

Later, in the early 1900's, changing composition is suggested to have affected the passage of the Osage Allotment Act of 1906 (Baily, 1973; Burns, 1989; Mathews, 1961) The detailed history of this event is the thesis of this research and will be elaborated upon in later chapters. Briefly stated, the legal inclusion or exclusion of persons into Osage tribal membership significantly altered tribal composition and allocation of communal resources.

CHAPTER V

POLITICAL HISTORY: UNITED STATES

CENSUS BUREAU

Political Statistics

A history of the United States Census Bureau provides a clear picture of how deeply embedded the enumeration of persons are in the political economy. The official statistics of the Census Bureau reflect pre-suppositions and theories about the nature of society and are products of social, political, and economic interests. Usually, the indicators used to measure social statistics are key determinants in developing economic policy and private economic decisions. A society's socio-economic milieu, such as images, perceptions, and aspirations, are shaped by the categories, statistical methods, questions asked and not asked, and the data published by Bureau statistics. Political judgements are implicit in the choices made in developing social statistical systems, and are not constructed on purely technical grounds but are inextricably tied to social purpose and policy. (Alonso & Starr, 1987: 1-4)

Otis Dudley Duncan (1984) has observed that official statistics serve an interest in social coordination and

control, and that their origins and operations have a specific relation to the state. Historically, state statistical systems have their origins in the English tradition of "political arithmetic". The predominance of political arithmetic was based on the need of the state to utilize a rational calculation in the understanding, exercise, and enhancement of state power. (Starr, 1986:14) In contemporary society, statistical systems do not reflect the autocratic use of numbers for state control, but the influence of political arithmetic remains a strong characteristic in developing statistical systems and categories used to organize the data.

Kenneth Prewitt (1983) identifies the connection between polity and statistics with his observation that democratic governments rely heavily on quantitative data as a mediating variable of the political culture. Democratic societies are made up of diverse interest groups who through statistical systems, identify issues and lobby for federal support. Max Weber (1919/20) also contended that capitalism demands a quantitative system of accounting, and this demand is inherently met through not only economic statistical systems but also in the enumeration of persons who engage in the economic system. For Weber, economic systems and political developments such as the rise of capitalism, the modern state, and political democracy, are cultural extensions of a society already predisposed toward rational approaches to social order. Social statistics are

a product of these beliefs and serve to reinforce the validity of these values. (Starr, 1986:20-23)

It is important to quote at length Starr's summary of the relationship between the political economy and official statistics.

Changing policy interests and ideologies clearly affect the domain of official statistical inquiry, but here we are in the realm of incremental decision-making ... Once the foundations and framework for official statistics have been established, the decisions about what to measure belong to the everyday world of political conflict and coalition building. (1986:25)

The primary agency used by the government to administratively categorize, and count, persons in the United States is the Census Bureau. Statisticians deliberately create statistical systems to interpret population changes. Categories and classifications are determined by Census statisticians and provide the baseline measures, figures, and categories we use to interpret the social environment. (Anderson, 1988:4)

Constitutional Origins

The census is the mechanism whereby the American political and economic apportionment system is implemented. Article I, section 2 of the U.S. Constitution, adopted in 1787, provided:

Representatives and direct Taxes shall be apportioned among the several States which may be included within this Union, according to their respective Numbers ... The actual Enumeration shall be made within three Years after the first Meeting of the Congress of the United States, and within every subsequent Term of ten Years, in such Manner as they shall by Law direct.

The founding statesmen were clever to include political representation with issues of taxation. It was believed that some states may under-count their population in order to reduce their shares in the war debt, but reducing the population count would also reduce the number of their state representatives in congress. The combination of representation and taxation seemed to provide a mechanism for accurate census enumeration. The implication of this strategy is that population became a measure of power and tax capacity. (Anderson, 1988:11) The original objective of the national census was to measure the relative strength of the population and address proper apportionment of power among states, citizens, and the national government. (Anderson, 1988:8-9). A periodic census was intended provide a method for re-assessment of political representation and taxation. The census would also show shifting power and resources among constituent elements of the polity. Reapportionments based on census enumerations allowed adjustments for shifting political power and burdens among people. (Anderson, 1988:11) From the beginning, the purpose and goal of a national census was designed as a mechanism capable of establishing foundations for

representation in Congress and the allocation of resources for geographic regions.

The measurement of a population necessitates classification of persons and a comparison of their relative demographic status to others. The original criteria for differentiating the various groups was based upon the appointment rule mandating groups to be categorized according to "free, slave, and Indian populations by state". Margo J. Anderson (1988:xi) notes that, "they framed the census inquiries and organized the data that they published in ways that mirrored their notions of contemporary social problems." It is interesting to note that national policy today continues to make these distinctions between three major populations under categories of race.

The creation of this official statistical system was not without serious technical difficulty and usually these difficulties mirrored the political divisions within society. For example in the 1840 census, data showed that there was a higher rate of insanity and idiocy among freed black persons in the North than in the South. Southern politicians eagerly concluded that freeing slaves led them to insanity. Northerners called for an examination of the data, but due to the political and economic conflicts of the time, the dispute was never settled. (Anderson, 1988:28) One can only speculate as to why these findings occurred. Perhaps there were no appropriate categories to enumerate freed slaves and were defaulted into already existing

categories prior to emancipation. These categories probably did not reflect the new social and economic positions emerging to accommodate them into the Northern workforce.

Issues such as freed slaves and the enormous population growth implicated the census and made it a document of political and economic history. Apportionment mechanisms and political conflicts reflected the increasing complexity of political and economic needs. To illustrate the extent of growth in the United States there were 3.9 million people in 1790; in 1890 there were 63 million. Anderson notes that the census reflects "how Americans have interpreted changes and integrated the growing regions and population groups into American society" (Anderson, 1988:2-3). They had obviously not reached a consensus on the status of freed slaves in 1840. Americans were also learning that the census itself could produce incorrect, and politically explosive, results.

Census as Social Control

Mechanism

Rapid population growth had significant implications in the apportionment of Congressional seats and shares in taxation. It was during the 1820's when the patterns of differential population growth had begun to affect the political system. Migrations to the West shifted political power from the established East; the overall population growth for 1820 was 33 percent, but the growth in the West

was 108 percent. The Louisiana Purchase and the acquisition of Florida in 1819 disrupted the thirteen colonies plan for trajectory of power. Originally there were to be only nine additional states added to the union, thereby preserving the thirteen colonies' political power. Differential population growth was becoming a "problem" to be managed, and would affect national politics. Management would come from further legislative efforts at census taking and apportionment. (Anderson, 1988:23-25)

There were six census taken between 1790 and 1840, and each time Congress painstakingly reapportioned political representation. The development of a mathematical formula for apportionment was as politicized as the enumeration of persons. Our forefathers did not possess the statistical prowesses of todays macro computers. Other issues such as the number of total seats for the House and Senate had also not been determined. Each census enumeration confronted them with determining just how large or small the republican democracy should be. Different mathematical formulas gave different representative outcomes. Compounding these problems was the rapid population growth and expansionism that was threatening to undermine the republican government. The census was becoming increasingly sensitive to divisive political and economic issues.

Politicians began to recognize the need for new institutions to support a more complex and integrated economy. By 1850, the United States' government had become

extremely unstable from the extraordinary shifts in power and resources of the new Republic.

The primary cause of this instability was based on the understanding of a balance of power, and this balance required a rough equality of resources, population, and wealth between states. However, the extraordinary growth of the population, their wealth, and resources in the nation, disrupted the balance. Acquisitions of new territory brought with them issues of extension of slavery and sectionalism. Railroad development and the settlement of vast lands of the West created crisis over slavery extensions. In an attempt to solve the increasing factionalism among states, the federal government sought to utilize the census as a scientific tool to identify economic, political, and social transformations.

This is a major shift from the traditional role of the census as strictly an apportionment instrument. The Census was promoted as a nationalizing and centralizing agency to counteract the tenuous stability of societal growth. It was believed that through a more scientific approach and asking of questions that were pertinent to the control and prediction of economic growth, the problem of societal expansionist could be managed. As an outcome of this radical shift in the role of the census, scholars and statisticians pressed for revision of the 1840 census and proposed to change the unit of analysis to individuals and not the family or household. The result of these efforts to

balance political and economic resources came to be known as the "Great Compromise of 1850" (Anderson, 1988: 33-36).

In enacting the Compromise of 1850, Congress was keenly aware of the potential power of statistics. Slavery, unionism, federal power, and prediction of population and economic growth, were all issues that had to be addressed by the revised census. The type of questions asked on the census, the structure of the bureaucracy set up to administer the census, and the character of the reports published from the data had to be carefully considered before final legislation. (Anderson, 1988:38)

The scope of census statistics gathering continued expanding from 1850 until the remainder of the century. At each instance in the expansion of official statistics there were humanitarian social reform movements such as prisons, education, public health reform, temperance, and abolitionism. Reformers and interest groups supported the "new" scientific approach in viewing society. The traditional use of statistics as descriptions gave way to discovering regularities between demographic facts and social circumstances. Reformers began to view problems of individuals as results of dysfunctional environments and believed it was the role of government and legislation to remedy these environmental inequities. (Kelman, 1987:285-286)

The importance of the Census in managing society becomes evident when placed within a historical perspective.

What also becomes evident is the inextricable link between polity, economics, and the enumeration of people. Managing society implicitly requires the management of persons as well as economies. It is the process of managing persons and their social relations that categorization and subsequent evaluation of positions are born. Historically, the most favorable persons categorized and enumerated were the immigrant Europeans; favorable in terms of being involved in the process of creating the statistical systems used for social control. Unfavorable for those who were not involved in creating the statistical systems, such as the freed African slaves and Native Americans. As we shall see in the next chapter, being removed from the process of categorization and enumeration has serious ramifications.

CHAPTER VI

CREATION OF AN AMERICAN INDIAN CATEGORY: THE UNITED STATES CENSUS BUREAU AND THE BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

The categories created by the United States Census Bureau to enumerate American Indians are based upon criteria that fluctuate with federal Indian policy. Each historical phase of federal policy towards American Indians necessitated definitional changes in category assignments. These phases in federal policy represent broad cultural sentiments and mirror economic, social, and political interests of society.

Six Phases in Federal Policy

Peterson (1986) has identified six major phases that federal policy has gone through in regard to enumerating American Indians. The first phase, begins with the initial contact of indigenous persons with the New Republic. Federal policy initiated a series of Congressional laws to reduce the threat of Indian attacks and promote acculturation. First, the Commerce Clause of 1787, established that Indians and their respective tribes were

sovereign nations. The terminology sovereignty and tribal nations provided legal precedence of their political status within the Republic. All subsequent federal and legislative decisions were based upon the recognition of sovereign tribal nations. The federal interpretation of sovereign nation however was not always congruent with the ideas of self-government and autonomy. Forced Indian removal, containment, and termination practices were all construed on the notions of sovereign tribal nations. This issue of interpretation remains today a source of bitter conflict between Indian tribes and the federal government.

In 1824, the Bureau of Indian Affairs was formally organized within the War Department and served as the primary provider in supervising Indian relations with the United States government. To promote acculturation, or the federal response to the lack thereof, the Indian Removal Act was passed in 1830 to remove all tribes to west of the Mississippi; this included the Five Civilized Tribes to or what was then known as Indian Territory. The Indian removal policy instigated a series of forced migrations for tribes, and often under very harsh conditions. The most notable is the Cherokee Trail of Tears, where thousands of Cherokees died in a winter march to Indian Territory.

In 1834, Congress established the Department of Indian Affairs as the federal agency responsible for carrying out the laws with respect to Indians. This did not significantly alter the organization of the Bureau of Indian

Affairs, but it created a system of administrative laws to regulate Indian relations. Most agents employed by the Department of Indian Affairs were enlisted military personnel, and the Department of Indians Affairs remained administratively under the Department of War for federal allocation purposes.

The second phase, approximately from 1850-1885, federal efforts were in establishing reservations and isolating Indians to geographical containment areas. Prior to the beginning of this phase, (1849) the Bureau of Indian Affairs is transferred from the War Department to the Department of Interior. This reflects a political milieu whose main concern on Indian relations were issues of land: the Department of Interior's sole charge was federal land management. The second phase of federal Indian policy ended with tribes loosing government recognition of their sovereign nation status. Congress passed a law in 1871 forbidding the further negotiations of treaties between Indian tribes and the United States, but tribes could enter into agreements.

The third phase, the most critical to this thesis, occurred approximately between 1887 to 1930. Federal policies were aimed to convert Indians from communal land holders to individual landholders through tribal allotment. The most influential federal legislation prior to the 1890 census was the General Allotment Act of 1887 (The Dawes Act). This Act provided for the division of tribally-held

Indian lands into severalty, to be owned by individual Indians whether they consented or not. The idea was to assimilate the Indians by integrating them into the system of private ownership of property. The result was a reduction in Indian owned lands from 138,000,000 acres to 48,000,000 acres when allotment ended in 1934. (Bernard L. Fontana, 1972) The Dawes Act illustrates clearly the inextricable link between polity, economy, Indian enumeration, and social inequality.

It is important to quote at length Senator Henry L. Dawes of Massachusetts at a conference on the Indian "problem" of assimilation in 1886.

The head chief told us that there was not a family in that whole nation (Cherokee) that had not a home of its own. There was not a pauper in that nation, and the nation did not owe a dollar. It built its own capitol, in which we had this examination, and it built its schools and hospitals. Yet the defect of the system is apparent. They have gone as far they can go, because they own their land in common. It is Henry George's system, under that there is no enterprise to make your home any better than that of your neighbors. There is no selfishness, which is at the bottom of civilization. Till this people will consent to give up their lands, and divide them among their citizens so that each can own the land he cultivates, they will not make much more progress (Board of Indian Commissioners, Annual Report, 1885, pp. 90-91).

Definitions for the category "Indian" were shaped in part on whether the policies were aimed to foster assimilation or preserve tribal life. The passage of the Dawes Act in 1887 was clearly to promote assimilation. Those persons enumerated as American Indian or affiliated with some specific tribe were done so with the intent of

then accelerating their assimilation into Western society. In any case, the federal government did not determine a single category of "Indians". Each legal definition of Indian and tribal member has it's own unique legislation and jurisdiction, and varies from tribe to tribe. (Peterson, 1986:213)

Definitions of Indians
and Tribes

Definitions of "Indian" in general, and "Tribes" in particular, were based primarily on the administrative discretion of the Department of Interior, and its agency the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Indian as a race has remained somewhat static and based primarily on phenotypes, with a heavy emphasis on a genotype difference in ancestry from the European. Tribal definitions and membership have historically proven the most inconsistent and the most reflective of a political economy in search of social control. Phenotype and genotype distinctions for Indian are replaced with geographical proximity, language similarities, and cultural similarities, when defining tribal distinctions.

While these may appear to be based on the more subjective realities of ethnic group dynamics, they have been altered into a facsimile of some objective criteria of measurement. Often times enumerators would include European settlers as members of a tribe due to their living within or

near a tribal community. This was an action of subjecting an objectified criteria of "standing within the community" to an ethnocentric bias. Geographical proximity took precedence over language spoken, or cultural affiliation. The ethnocentric bias stemmed from the cultural milieu of the times, which included a loss of hope in accelerating American Indians into western culture through inter-racial marriage. Once the federal government recognized the role of the Osage mother in the socialization process, federal policies abandoned enumerating Euro-Indian mixed-breeds as "White", and emphasized "standing within the community".

This author's initial review of the history of the census failed to include issues regarding the American Indian. This is primarily due to the fact that Indians were not recognized as a viable component of the economy or polity officially until 1890. Before 1890, no one knew just how many Indians there were in North America. James Mooney, an ethnologist for the Smithsonian Institution in the twentieth century, made the first serious attempt to estimate the Indian population. (Alterman, 1969:291) Until 1860 there were no references to the Indian population in any census. The few counted probably were included in the category "free colored". In 1831, Alexis de Tocqueville stated "They (Indians) were isolated in their own country, and the race only constituted a little colony of troublesome strangers in the midst of a numerous and dominate people".

In fact the general consensus among the American settlers were that the Indians would not survive.

To the chagrin of many, the American Indian indeed survived with fierce tenacity. When it became apparent that the "Indian problem" was not going to go away, the government acquiesced to recognize indigenous persons in their continuing attempt to manage societal growth. In the original draft of the census included only American Indians who were "taxed". To the enumerators in 1880, Indians not taxed "meant Indians living on reservations under the care of Government agents, or roaming individually, or in bands, over unsettled tracts of the country" (Alterman, 1969:292-293). Those living among the white population as servants or laborers had to be counted for purposes of apportionment. From 1860 to 1880, enumeration of "Indians taxed" generated data that was highly questionable in accuracy. Alterman (1969) believes that the "... changes are a result of different techniques and emphasis rather than being real changes in the number of 'Indians taxed'" (p. 293).

In 1890, Congress decided all Indians would be enumerated according to tribe. This decision was based primarily on the passage of the Dawes Act mandating allotment of tribal land. One can not allot or compensate tribal members without knowing who they are and how many there are. Originally, establishing who was Indian was not difficult, and there were no urgent economic or political

underpinnings that necessitated accurate counts. But as western expansionism surged, land and resources became scarce commodities. Interests were vested in the "new frontier", and the Indian problem was becoming a nuisance for those consumed with land greed. In addition, identifying who was an Indian for purposes of allotment politicized the enumeration, and many non-Indians conspired to get a piece of the Indian land pie.

Before land became an urgent issue for western migration, the category Indian only involved a basic phenotypical demarcation between the "Mongoloid racial stock" Indian in contrast to the "Caucasian racial background" of the European immigrants. Cultural distinctions between Europeans and the indigenous people were also used as evidence in determining who was Indian. American Indians dressed differently, engaged in other type agricultural practices, spoke a different language from Europeans and even among different tribes. (Oswalt, 1988:4)

Linguists first established relationships among tribes on a sound basis by identifying families of related languages. Three hundred tribes were defined by language differences. Anthropologists made further distinctions among tribes, and reduced their characteristics into fifty-eight units based on environment or culture areas. Culture areas were established by baseline ethnographies of geographical sectors. Occupants were group according to

similarities they shared with each other. This reduction of tribes into "meaningful units" was intended to produce a manageable concept of tribal diversity. (Oswalt, 1988:22-26)

The culture area concept became the standard of organizational basis for discussions of Indians. It was believed that the advantages of describing tribes via a small criteria of socio-cultural factors outweighed the disadvantages of the temporal limitation of the baseline ethnography and the stress on material culture. These culture areas were at best ambiguous. Sometimes they included people with different ways of life, and tribes along the boundaries often shared characteristics of several culture areas. (Oswalt, 1988:28)

Today what constitutes an Indian tribe has several definitions. Each "legal" definition just illuminates the fact that categorization of subpopulations is a socio-political act contingent upon the milieu of societal growth. Ethnologists define a tribe as a group of Indians who share a common heritage and speak a distinct language. The legal definition of tribe is not as resolved. Currently, the federal government does not recognize many groups that claim to be tribes. There are less than three-hundred tribes legally recognized of the more than four-hundred that claim tribal status. (Pevar, 1992:14)

Tribes are recognized by the federal government if Congress or the President at some point created a

reservation for the tribe and the United States has had some continuing political relationship with the tribe. Denial of tribal recognition is based upon historic legislation such as the termination policies from 1954 to 1966; once a tribe has been legally terminated then they are ineligible for federal recognition. The government may have also deemed that the tribe lacked an organized governing body or unifying leadership, and tribal identity no longer viably existed, tribal status would therefore be terminated. Descendants of these tribes who wish to pursue their heritage continue to be denied tribal status from the federal government. This refusal of the government to recognize tribes is a tremendous source of antagonism between American Indians and the United States. (Pevar, 1992:14)

Just because the federal government does not recognize a tribe, they may indeed continue to exist and be recognized by other tribes, but they do not qualify for any benefits from the federal government. In order to qualify as a federally recognized tribe, the Department of Interior has specific criteria that the group must satisfy. There are some federal programs which do assist tribes who are not "federally recognized". Unrecognized tribes can also enforce treaties that their ancestors made with the United States government even though the government refuses to recognize the existence of the tribe. (Pevar, 1992:15)

Political identity is yet another way to define tribal status. Different ethnological tribes have been placed by the federal government on the same reservation and are regarded as one political entity. The Fort Belknap Indian Community in Montana, have two distinct cultural tribes but are treated as one tribe politically. In addition, a single ethnological tribe can be divided and placed on separate reservations with separate political entities. Bands within the Sioux, Chippewa, and Shoshone were treated as different tribes politically and placed on separate reservations. (Pevar, 1992:15)

It is obvious at this point that determining tribal status is quite tenuous and inconsistent. Determining tribal membership is no less tenuous. Both tribes and the federal government have the right to determine membership. A tribe may determine tribal membership for tribal purposes, and the federal government may determine tribal membership for federal purposes. Congress may determine tribal membership for purposes of federal programs, or when they take property from a tribe. Some federal programs for American Indians require tribal affiliation, other programs require some level of tribal blood. A tribal member who is not listed on tribal rolls may not qualify for some programs but may qualify for others which only require tribal blood. In the case of the Osage Nation, the government closed the rolls of tribal annuity membership in 1906 with the Osage Allotment Act. Consequently, all tribal members born after

1906 are not on the tribal annuity roll, and are not allowed to vote in government affairs. However, a person may inherit annuities from their ancestors who were on the original roll and gain an electoral position. (Currently in 1992, the Osage Nation has filed a Class Action suit against the Supreme Court of Oklahoma to re-establish an Osage roll and constitutional government.) The Osage Nation, does recognize persons born after 1906 as tribal members for tribal purposes, but they are excluded from government participation and annuity payments from communal resources.

There are also definitions of who is Indian without reference to tribal affiliation except in determining blood quantum of Indian decent. An ethnological definition of Indian requires a person to have a least one-half Indian blood. There are numerous legal definitions of who is an Indian. Interestingly, "In the history of United States Indian law, a uniform definition of an Indian has not existed" (Oswalt, 1988:5). Different laws invoke different definitions to apply to a myriad of situations. The range of criteria include blood-quantums with as little as one-eighth, anyone of Indian descent, only persons affiliated to "recognized tribes", or at times left undefined so agencies can define Indians in accordance with their own administrative laws. To be considered Indian for federal purposes, an individual must have some Indian blood. Individuals who are included into tribal membership through

adoption are not considered Indian by federal laws. Also, lack of tribal membership does not prevent a person from being recognized as Indian by the federal government. These are contemporary laws; historically, these legal definitions did not exist, and when they did exist, they did not resemble current laws. For example, "legally", via the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Europeans who married Osage Indians were considered tribal members and placed on the tribal roll as "half-breeds". They had no Indian descent and were not recognized by Osage citizens as a tribal member, but were federally recognized as Osage tribal members, and entitled to Osage annuities. They were not federally recognized as Indian, or tribally recognized as members for tribal purposes.

The criteria for inclusion into tribes is further complicated by the United States Census Bureau attempts to create an aggregate category of Indian without regard to tribal affiliation. The increased population growth of Europeans complicated classifying an Indian for enumeration purposes. Children of inter-racial marriages, Indians assimilated into white society, and whites assimilating into Indian society, all served to complicate the classification system. The clarity of Indian identification became an issue of racial and socio-cultural factors. Distinctions between Indian and White remained clear only if individuals consistently lived one life style or the other. Oswalt notes, "The identification of an Indian has become a matter

of definition and is most reasonably considered in a legal sense" (1988:4).

There were several acceptable standards for determining a definition of Indians for census enumeration. The first is the biological principle, where a person with at least one-fourth blood is everywhere considered Indian. However that became more and more difficult to determined with the amalgamation of American Indians into white society. Before self enumeration in 1960, an enumerator could only determine Indian by observation and degrees of blood became an unworkable criteria. A second basis for determination of Indian is legal. Only those listed on official Indian registers would be regarded as Indian. These records were maintained by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and as Alterman notes, if these were complete records the census would not be necessary. The third basis to determine who is an Indian is the cultural approach. These were based upon factors such as Indian language spoken, dress, living within the Indian community, and recognition by the Indian community as Indian, or part of a particular tribe.

Bureau of the Census

Definition

Prior to the Bureau's establishment of a working definition of Indian, there were no instructions given for defining the race category Indian from 1790 to 1860. Each enumerator subjectively determined the race of each person

in his district. Marginal persons of mixed-blood were classified to a large extent upon the respondent's social position. (Peterson, 1986:190) If a mixed-blood Indian was living in tradition with his tribe, then he was enumerated Indian. If, however he was living in "white-man" customs, then he was enumerated "White".

The Bureau of the Census adopted a definition that contains all three criteria:

In addition to full-blooded American Indians, persons of mixed white and Indian blood are included in this category if they are enrolled on an Indian tribal or agency roll or if they are regarded as Indians in their community (Alterman, 1969:294-295).

After 1960, the Census Bureau took a more simplistic approach and lists every person as an Indian who claims to be one. (Pevar, 1992:12-13) Peterson notes, " A less satisfactory way of enumerating members of a minority would be difficult to devise" (Alterman, 1986:218).

When the Census adopted its three part definition of who is to be regarded as Indian, the emphasis on which criteria of the definition should be prioritized, and which should be minimized waxed and waned in conjunction with shifting federal policies. A general criteria was based upon the persons social standing within the community in which they lived. If considered an Indian within the community, then they were legally considered Indian, defining "community" was an issue of enumerator discretion. Blood

quantum became secondary to the socio-cultural standing in the community. An example of this prioritization of criteria is this statute of Federal Indian Law (United States Department of the Interior 1958) stating, "... that a person may, on some reservations, be considered an Indian, even if records show that fifteen of sixteen immediate ancestors were not Indian" (Oswalt, 1988:5)

The emphasis on "standing within the community" would serve as the most significant criteria for the enumeration of Indian. On the surface this seems plausible, and indeed practical, but placed into historical perspective, the outcome was disastrous for Indian tribes. The one glaring deficiency in establishing who indeed was an Indian based on "standing within the community", was the lack of involving the Indians themselves into the process. Granted by 1890 there had been significant amalgamation of Indians into white society, but there remained a sufficient number of full-bloods who could have been helpful in the identification of their people. They were never asked, or no references are mentioned, of utilizing full-blood Indians in defining federal categories of tribes and Indians. This lack of inclusion implies a system of inequality, of ranking of American Indians in such a manner that their input was perceived as having no value or consequence. In addition, the communities defined by the enumerators were relative to the composition of the village. If the village was predominantly Euro-Indian mixed-bloods, then naturally they

were be considered part of that community. But if that same Euro-Indian mixed-blood were enumerated in another old mixed-blood band or full-blood band, "standing within the community" takes on a whole new meaning.

Let us look now to the Osage Nation in Oklahoma as a case history of the outcome of early census enumeration. It will become evident in the next chapter, that federal interpretation of "standing within the community" is as deep of a source of conflict for the American Indians as federal interpretation of "sovereign tribal nation".

CHAPTER VII

THE OSAGE NATION OF OKLAHOMA

Introduction

Three topic areas will be addressed within this chapter. First, a description of the Osage people and their settlement in Oklahoma. Second, a review of the general history of Indian Territory and its movement towards Oklahoma statehood. Third, the issue of statehood and its influence on the establishment of the Osage Roll and allotment. Earlier, the process of categorization was defined as politically influenced by social and economic conditions of society. Categories constructed by the federal government are especially sensitive to these conditions since their intent is to identify pertinent social trends. Examining the process of establishing the Osage roll illustrates these broader issues inherent in the construction of race categories. The federal government sought to identify and categorize Osage tribal members for the purposes of allotment and annuity headrights. The inter-connections between matters of statehood, Osage tribal conflicts, federal intervention in establishment of Osage membership, and the creation of an Osage roll reflect one of

the most contested and controversial tribal rolls ever established. (Burns, 1989:480)

Statehood for the white settlers implied the dissolution of communally held lands and the opening up of "unassigned lands" for settlement. Statehood for the American Indians meant extinction of their traditional communal culture. Allotment required that tribes identify their members expediently and determine the number of tracts to be assigned. The operant word here is expedient, white settlers were restless to begin their "frontier lives", and the process of determining tribal membership came under extreme duress.

Before a history of the Osage Nation, first a clarification of terms: "nation" and "tribe". Both have been used interchangeably in reference to federal Indian policy. Nation refers to a government independent from any other government, possessing the power of absolute dominion over its territory and people. (Pevar, 1992:15) The United States government has technically restricted tribes from being nations having governmental authority. The use of the term nation reflects a belief that the United States has no right to exercise authority over Indian tribes. (Pevar, 1992:15) The Osage people obviously continue to hold this belief with the continuance of their usage of "Osage Nation".

Pre-Columbian Osage Tribe

The Osage have a long history in North America and originally their hunting grounds included vast areas of what is now Kansas, Missouri, Arkansas, and Oklahoma. The French were the first to approach the Osage in the last third of the seventeenth century. They occupied a series of villages along the Osage River in what is presently southwestern Missouri. It is believed at one time that the Osage once belonged to a much larger political entity, the Dhegiha Siouans. Linguistically related tribes include the Kansas (Kaws), Quapaws, and Poncas, but contact was gradually lost through the force migrations westward.

(Wilson, 1985:2-7)

They lived in wooded river valleys and had permanent villages that closely resembled their Algonquian neighbors. Originally the Osage subsisted on hunting and farming, but later joined in the momentum of fur trading and expanded their borders south and west; including territory of now Oklahoma, Arkansas, and Kansas. With the introduction of the horse from the French, the Osages engaged in Buffalo hunting and established semi-permanent camps along the Arkansas River in Oklahoma. (Wilson, 1985:3)

Throughout the 18th century the Osages were known as formidable warriors and had established complete military control of Missouri, Arkansas, eastern Oklahoma, and Kansas. The French and later the Spanish solicited goodwill towards the Osage in order to further promote lucrative fur trade

profits. Their incursions upon their neighbors became so fierce that the Spanish gave permission to two French fur traders (Chouteaus) to build a fort to keep the Osage under control. The Chouteaus gradually wielded a monopoly of fur trade exchanges over the Osage and hence influence over tribal leaders. In 1802, the Chouteaus convinced nearly half of the Osages to move south to Three Forks in Arkansas. (Wilson, 1985:2-4)

The geographical separation of the tribe threatened with the hereditary position of ranking chief Claremore in favor of Paw-hiu-Skah. Fortunately, through a series of events, the Osage tribal tradition remained intact, but continuous attempts to factionalize the traditional Osage government continued by encroaching fur traders. (Wilson, 1985:6)

The political structure of the tribe beginning in the 19th century was quite distinct. There had always been two major groups; The Little Osages who occupied one village, and The Great Osages, who occupied four separate but related villages. Each village was divided into the Tzi-Sho (Sky People) and the Hunkah (Land People). Each group had an acting chief who shared civil authority over all five villages. Two hereditary chiefs of the Upland Forest Village, part of the Great Osage Band, acted as tribal leaders for the Osage in relations with outsiders. (Wilson, 1985:6)

In addition to these tribal leaders there were twenty-four patrilineal clans who exercised considerable influence in their role of religious leaders. Each clan occupied a specific area within the village, and acted autonomously in times of war, and raids against enemy tribes. The governmental structure of the Osage promoted a diffusion of power and allowed great flexibility and individual freedom. (Wilson, 1985:6-7)

Government Intervention

In May 1808, Thomas Jefferson met with the Cherokee Chiefs and offered them land in the Louisiana Territory in exchange for their removal from the Georgia-North Carolina area. They over-looked the fact that these lands offered were the original hunting domains of the Osage Tribe. Chief Claremore was absent from the treaty negotiations, and the Osages ceded seven-eighths of their land of Missouri and over half the future state of Arkansas north of the Arkansas River to the Cherokee. (Wilson, 1985:7)

In 1818, the Osage were confronted with a second demand for land cession. At this time the Osage found themselves increasingly surrounded by white settlers, traditional tribal foes, and the new coming eastern tribes such as the Cherokees. Chief Claremore agreed to the cession of additional 1,800,000 acres without contest. The United States government immediately turned around and sold the land to the Cherokees for 2,000,000 dollars. (Wilson, 1985:8)

The United States, in 1825, informed the Osages that they had been assigned to a permanent reservation west of the Mississippi. They were to relinquish claim to 45,000,000 acres in exchange for 25,000 dollars. They were assured the removal was in their best interest with the encroaching white settlements and the re-location of the Cherokees. These three treaties, spanning a 17 year period, forced Osage cession of nearly 100,000,000 acres in exchange for \$166,300 in cash and other in-kind merchandise. This would not be the last of Osage removal acts. Finally in 1870, the Osage were again approached for removal further south into Indian Territory. This would prove to be their final relocation. (Wilson, 1985:10-11)

After the Civil War, and the resurgence of immigrants westward, there were increasing pressures to remove Indians from fertile farmlands. A letter to a Kansas Congressman from a U.S. citizen exemplifies the antagonism white settlers felt toward the Osage.

Mr. Clark, hurry up with the removal of these lazy, dirty vagabonds It is folly to talk longer of a handful of wandering savages holding possession of land so fair and rich as this. We want this land to make our homes. Let us have it (Wilson, 1985:11).

A treaty was signed in 1865 to cede another 8,000,000 acres for \$300,000 to be held in trust by the government. By 1869, with each cessation of lands, the Osage were becoming increasingly dependent on the federal government. The government had failed to open any trust account for the

disbursement of annuity monies from land sales and tribal foes had successfully excluded them from bison herds. The Osage were looking for a permanent home and the Cherokees had land for sale in Indian Territory. The final settlement was 1,470,559 acres in Indian Territory, with 102,400 acres going to the Kansa (Kaws) in the northwestern corner of the reservation. With the sale of their Kansas land both in 1865 and 1870, the Osage purchased the land from the Cherokees, and the remaining monies were to be held in trust by the government and annuities of interest dispersed to members quarterly. (Wilson, 1985:11-22)

There is a much "thicker" historical description of the Osage by numerous anthropologists, historians, and tribal members. I have only included a brief history of their settlement in Indian Territory to set the stage for the years 1887 to 1906. The Osage people are a culturally rich tribe, and it would take months of reading to understand fully the significance of their customs and traditions.

The Department of Interior and its sub-agency, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, were the primary enumerators of the Osage from 1887 to 1906. The first systematic count of the Osage was 1887, and continued thereafter each June of every year, up to and beyond 1906. The district area officer of the Indian Territory was in charge of the enumeration and originally these were indeed officers of infantry divisions within the Department of War.

Full-Blood and Mixed-Blood Osage

From the first enumeration, Osage citizens were distinguished along the bifurcated lines of "full-bloods" verses "half-breeds". Determining the status of "half-breeds" and "full-bloods" is the central problem of this thesis. When enumerating persons for tribal membership upon the criteria of "standing within the community", a host of issues arise as to tribal status of the "half-breeds". For federal purposes, "half-breeds" were included in the enumeration as Osage members. For purposes of the tribe, Euro-Indian "half-breeds" were not regarded with much sympathy by Osage citizens.

There is yet another distinction to make regarding the "half-breeds". There were three distinct groups of mixed-bloods by 1898. "First, there were those who were traditional Osages such as James Big Heart who led the full-blood faction although he was a mixed-blood. Secondly, there were the old French mixed-blood families which had evolved as an Osage band. Finally, there were the recent American mixed-bloods (after 1865) who were rapidly increasing" (Burns, 1989:516).

The distinction between half-breeds and full-bloods has a significant history for the Osage Nation. Isaac T. Gibson, the Department of Interior's agent for the Osage, was the first to identify the "Half-Breed Band". He noted that they were socially, politically, and economically

different than the other Osage bands. They lived much more like the whites, farmed their own fields, and lived in log cabins. There is no evidence that these mixed-bloods lived separately from the rest of the tribe, but they may have had different interests in their own well-being than that of other Osages. (Wilson, 1985:17)

There was mention that in the removal of 1825, "the more acculturated ones asked for individual land holdings" (Wilson, 1985:13). Forty-four "reservations" the size of 640 acres was set aside for certain mixed-blood families. The first significant role in tribal government began with the removal of the Osage from Kansas to Oklahoma (Aprx. 1865-1874). In order to reach tribal consensus on the removal of Osages from Kansas to Indian Territory, the half-breeds were sought out by the Department of Interior. In exchange for patents on allotments, becoming Kansas citizens, and a "community pact" that white settlers would aid the small group, the half-breeds agreed to the removal of the Osage tribe. Unfortunately, the white settlers did not keep their word, and all but one returned to the tribe by 1872. (Wilson, 1985:18) Wilson also notes that in 1874 a sizable portion of the Osage tribe was composed of the "Half-Breed Band"; 280 mixed-blood persons verses 3,000 full-blood. These inter-married citizens were white men married to Osage women. Most of these Osage women were widows, or women born of unwed parents who were ineligible for marriage among the more prestigious Osage families. The

men were mostly trappers and traders residing within the community and were frequently made citizens. Children born to "inter-married citizens" were typically bilingual, bicultural, and always resided within Osage tribal society. The mixed-bloods acted as cultural brokers for the tribe in peace treaties and land negotiations. (Wilson, 1986:12)

The Osage continue to hold ambiguous feelings toward the Euro-Indian mixed-blood band. References by Osage members and even by mixed-blood members, do not always hold benevolent the historical role of the mixed-blood citizens. Louis Burns, refers to the mixed-blood's role in tribal affairs as only one factor in many that led to the Osage Allotment Act of 1906. Burns contended that the degree of amalgamation, or inter-married citizens had reached such proportions, that even by 1898, reducing the fate of the tribe along these lines is unrealistic. However, he conceded that "white spouses had more to gain with allotment than without it" (Burns, 1989:516).

Terri Wilson is a bit more critical of the loyalties held by the Euro-Indian mixed-bloods. It is his opinion that they took advantage of their bicultural heritage, and used the conflict between the races for their own economic advantage. (Wilson, 1985:12)

The distinction between "full-blood", "old-mixed-blood" and "Euro-Indian-mixed-blood", reached its pinnacle in the dispute over establishing the Osage Roll and its subsequent use for allotment and oil annuities. Louis Burns (1989)

comments that it was not the issue of allotting or not allotting, but the fact of protecting the tribe as a whole from what it had seen allotment do to other tribes. The mineral and oil resources were of vital concern for all three groups, and it is here where the source of contention lies. Who was to be placed on the Osage Roll as citizens and receive land and annuity compensation. Millions of dollars were at stake and the future of the Osage Nation as a sovereign entity. It was becoming increasingly evident that allotment was inevitable but who was to benefit?

Indian Territory

The pressure for allotment stems from the encroaching white settlers and the need for additional land. Originally, the area of today's Oklahoma was acquired through the Louisiana Purchase and was intended to be opened for statehood in a few years. Initially, Congress placed the entire Louisiana Purchase under the administration of the governor of Indian Territory. (Morgan et al, 1991:36)

In 1830, President Jackson signed the Removal Act, which began the removal of eastern tribes west to Indian Territory, and was completed by 1840. Treaties were signed by each of the tribes and Oklahoma was divided among them. Any white settlers on the land during the forced migration were themselves removed and forbidden to reside without permission, within the respective Indian Republics. (Morgan, et al, 1991:36) This coincides with the Osage's second

cessation of land to the federal government in exchange for monies and federal protection from whites.

In the early years of Indian Territory, there was a remarkable resurgence of Indian self-government. Tribal republics held representative posts in Washington, D.C., had negotiations with white settlers over navigatable waters and fur trading, and inter-racial marriages occurred much more frequently. Major roads were constructed through Indian Territory during the California Gold Rush (1840's), and stage coach stations were established throughout the Indian republics. (Martin, et al, 1991:31) Once again the relations between Indians and white settlers turned sour from the clamor of land greed.

Based on the alleged alliances of some of the members of the Five Civilized tribes with the Confederates during the Civil War, Union reconstruction plans were aimed at punishing them for their "treason". Treating them as defeated nations, Congress demanded that all five of the Civilized Tribes in Indian Territory to cede most of their land to tribes from the Kansas Territory, which included the Osage. Congress also consented to the building of railroads through Indian territory, and increased military control for the now "kaleidoscope of tribal cultures". Texas cattle ranchers increased their leases for grazing land from the Cherokees and by the middle of the 1880's white settlers outnumbered the American Indians. Federal Indian service agencies offered opportunities for employment through a

multitude of positions. Field men who came as government agents stayed on to make their contribution to statehood. (Scales and Goble, 1982: 6) This increased activity of white settlers in Indian Territory lead to the inevitable. In March of 1889, Congress announced that a land run would begin at noon on April 22, 1889 for "unassigned lands" in Indian Territory. It has been estimated that nearly fifty-thousand persons participated in the land rush, and such towns as Guthrie, Oklahoma City, Stillwater, and Norman were established. No government existed for these new settlers until the Organic Act of 1890 which established a political system that governed Oklahoma Territory until 1907. It is important to note that the land run included areas that lie contiguous to the newly formed (1870's) Osage Reservation. (Martin, et al, 1991:40-44)

Oklahoma Territory

Until the passage of Oklahoma statehood in 1906, there existed two territories within the speculated boundary of the new state. The problem of single or dual statehood for the twin territories became the primary concern for both Indians and white settlers. The most critical issue being the holdings of communal land verses individual allotments. In 1893, The Dawes Commission was re-established for the explicit purpose of ending communal land holdings in Indian Territory. On June 16th, 1906, President Theodore Roosevelt signed into law The Hamilton Statehood Bill, recognizing

Oklahoma as a state. Unification of Indian Territory and Oklahoma Territory had finally been achieved. (Martin, et al, 1991:44) The Osage Allotment Act was signed June 28, 1906, but had been under revision since February, 1906. (Chapman, 1942, Part Two:377)

There were many factors which lead to the passage of the Osage Allotment Act. Prior to the Land rush of April 1889, the Osages were experiencing a loss of traditional tribal government, encroachment of white settlers upon their lands, and increases in rates of Euro-Indian mixed-marriages. Between 1861 and 1881 the Society of Little Old Men and the division Chiefs had dissolved. These were two significant losses in Osage traditional government. The Society of Little Old Men were considered the culture bearers of the tribe, and were consulted on matters grave to the continuance of tribal tradition. The division chiefs had acted as social and political leaders for the various bands and clans of the villages, and represented them in tribal matters. (Burns, 1989)

Dissolution of the Osage Government

In 1881, government intervention occurred with the dissolution of the Osage tribal government and replaced by a National Council and an Osage Constitution. The Osage were no longer regarded as a tribal entity but as a nation of "citizen" affiliations. The National Council was appointed

by the Department of Interior and the Constitution drafted more along western democratic lines. This action terminated the use of ancestral lineage in the appointment of tribal leaders and destroyed traditional tribal government. Louis Burns has noted, however, that the constitution was welcomed by the Osage people. Their traditional forms of government had no provisions for the protection of private property, and dealt only with crimes against one person. (Burns, 1989:504)

In 1884, the Heart Stays and Little Osage Band ceased to exist and the surviving members of these bands had been incorporated into the Thorny Thicket Band. (Baily, 1973:101) The traditional Osage government was quickly disintegrating and unable to manage the white man invasion. From as early as 1885, it was reported that a large number of whites were illegally on the Osage Reservation. (RCIA, 1885:91)

Allotment

The Dawes Severalty Act was passed in 1887, but the Osage remained exempt from allotment until the early 1900's. In 1897, oil was discovered on the Osage reservation, a discovery that has changed the Osages' lives forever. (Wilson, 1985:1) In April of 1889, the infamous land run with its subsequent 50,000 settlers surrounded the Osage Reservation. (McReynolds, 1954:291) From 1891 to 1893, the Sac and Fox, Iowa, Potawatomi, Shawnee, Cheyenne and Arapaho, Pawnee, and the Cherokee Outlet reservations were

allotted and unassigned land were open for settlement. Many of these reservation were contiguous or very near the Osage Reservation. (McReynolds, 1954: 297-301)

To summarize, between 1870 and 1906, there were a series of historical events influencing the relations between the federal government and the Osage Nation. Oklahoma Territory was striving to become a state, the Dawes Act was successfully carried out with most of the contiguous tribes surrounding the Osage Reservation, and white settlers were increasing their farm and grazing leases with the Osage nation. Oil was discovered on the reservation, and potential annuities from the oil made for great expectations among "squatters" in Indian Territory. Last but not least, the traditional Osage government was abolished in 1881, and the Euro-Indian mixed-bloods were reaching significant proportions. In 1889, the ratio of the full-blood Osage and mixed-blood Osage was exactly fifty percent; compared to 71 percent full-blood Osage in 1887.

Federal efforts to negotiate with Osages for allotment began with the Cherokee Commission on June 22, 1893. At that time the half or mixed-bloods expressed willingness to adopt allotment. However, the full-bloods would not even discuss the matter; instead the full-bloods sought to settle prior "unsettled differences". These included provisions in the treaty of 1865 for education, interests accrued on certain investments, and the purging of the annuity roll of

the names of persons illegally placed. (Chapman, 1942, Part One:244-245)

The annuity rolls became the biggest source of full-blood resistance to allotment. Annuity rolls were to be used to establish a formal Osage roll of citizenship. This roll would determine not only citizenship but annuity and allotment privileges. (Chapman, 1942, Part One:244-247)

Unfortunately, the full-bloods who demanded the investigation of the formal Osage roll were handicapped from to their records being lost in a fire when the Council House burned in 1893. What they did have in their favor was an Act on August 9, 1888, it stated;

.... that no white man, not otherwise a member of any tribe of Indians, who might thereafter marry an Indian woman, member of any tribe in the United States, or any of its Territories, except the Five Civilized tribes, should by such marriage thereafter acquire any right to any tribal property, privilege or interest to which any member of the tribe was entitled. The wife should become by such marriage a citizen of the United States, but the act did not impair her right or title to any tribal property. (25 Statutes, 392)

In that same year (1888), the Secretary of Interior also decided that children of such marriages were deprived from participating in the benefits of lands and other property belonging to the tribe. (Armstrong to H.B. Freeman, November 23, 1894, OIA, L. Letter Book 292, pp.49-50)

From 1893 to February 1906, a series of critical maneuvers took place between the Osage Nation and the

federal government. In 1900, the Bureau of Indian Affairs abolished the Osage Constitutional government established in 1881. The federal government deemed that their current systems of government were inefficient, riddled with internal conflict between full-bloods and mixed-bloods, and that they selected ignorant men as office holders. Louis Burns (1989) probably has the clearer motivation behind the BIA actions, stating "....the Osage government probably would not have been suspended if such large sums of money had not been involved. Furthermore, the Osage Constitutional government kept the BIA from having a free hand in managing these funds" (Burns, 1989:506-507).

There were three interim governments that followed the dissolution of the Osage Constitution; the first contained a chief and assistant chief appointed by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The second government was created through carefully held elections by the BIA, and included a chief, an assistant chief, and a council. The third interim government, made permanent by the Osage Allotment Act, provided for a council to administer the mineral estate. Today, the United States government will not recognize any other Osage government except the one created in 1906. (Burns, 1989:507) In February 1906, an agreement was reached on the allotment of lands, and all oil and mineral rights were to be held communally. Annuities from these communal resources would be dispersed to Osage citizens

appearing on the roll January 1, 1906. (Chapman, 1942, Part Two:320)

The Osage Allotment Act, June 28, 1906, provided;

that the roll of the Osage tribe of Indians, as shown by the records of the United States in the office of the United States Indian Agent at Osage Agency, Oklahoma Territory, as it existed" January 1, 1906, etc., should constitute the roll of the tribe. (B.B. Chapman Part two p381 citing an opinion brief, August 10, 1906, Indian Office, L. 70, 694-1906)

The Act also allowed for proper correction up to July 1, 1907, and should not exclude any persons placed on the roll after December 31, 1881, when the Osage Constitution was adopted. It also provided for the addition of any children born into the tribe between January 1, 1907 and July 1, 1907.

Traditional full-blood Osage members presented to the National Council 244 persons charged with fraudulent enrollment. One year later the National Council submitted their findings on the Osage roll. The Secretary of Interior examined their conclusions and stated that the full-blood Osage had failed to establish their claims of fraud and all "contestees" were sustained. The Osage Roll was closed April 11, 1908, with the inclusion of all 244 contested individuals and an additional 128 individuals who had filed for enrollment before the July 1, 1907 deadline. (Chapman, 1942, Part Two:382-392) Louis Burns (1989), has

conflicting numbers with those of Chapman. Burns identified about 300 challenges, and of these only half were enrolled. (1989:514) But, even at this reduced number, he conceded the value of their annuities were several million dollars. Regardless, the Osage roll was officially closed containing 2,230 persons; 926 were full-blood and 1,303 were mixed-blood or adopted persons. (Chapman, 1942, Part Two:383)

The following chapters analyze the actual census data of the Osage Nation from 1887 to 1907. The analyses traces the shifting composition of full-blood and not-full-blood Osage members. Demographic changes in Osage tribal composition are provided to illustrate the rate of Euro-Indian-mixed-blood members included in each successive year of the Osage enumeration. The rates are not assumed to reflect any one particular congressional act or administrative directive, but serve more as a reflection of changing social relations between the Osage and non-Indian population. The specific linkages between federal Indian policy and the inclusion of persons for tribal membership will be examined in the concluding chapter.

CHAPTER VIII

HISTORICAL CASE STUDY ANALYSIS

THE OSAGE NATION OF OKLAHOMA:

AMERICAN INDIAN ENUMERATION

1887 thru 1907

Methodology

The 1887 to 1907 Osage census data was provided by the Oklahoma Historical Society. The archival records were made available through the Whitehair Memorial Cultural Learning and Resource Center, Ralston, Oklahoma. Hard copies of the census data were microfilmed and consist of three microfilm tapes identified by the Whitehair Memorial Center as MICROCOPY 595-Roll 317: Years 1887-1896, Roll 318: Years 1897-1905, Roll 319: Years 1906-1912.

The Osage census years 1887 through 1907 were chosen for three methodological necessities: First, 1887 is the first systematic attempt by the United States federal government to enumerate American Indians. Second, The General Allotment Act of 1887 established congressional laws to enact administrative directives for the purposes of allotment. The Department of Interior subsequently initiated directives to comply and provided a standardized format for the enumeration of American Indians. Third, the

year 1907 served as the historical time parameter signifying the closure of Osage tribal membership whose members are entitled to tribal annuities. The Osage Allotment Act, June 28, 1906, included a time extension on the closure of the Osage roll to July 1, 1907 to allow for "proper correction" of the membership roll. Any children born into the tribe between January 1, 1907 and July 1, 1907 were also to be included in the corrected roll. (Chapman, 1942, Part Two:320)

I refer to these historical events as methodological necessities in terms of providing some degree of consistency and resolve. Consistency in terms of longitudinally collecting data with explicit purposes in utilizing the data. The Dawes Act of 1887 represented the general consensus of the Nation's need for privatization of land and dissolution of tribal ownership. The ideology of private ownership of land and individualism became Congressional law and provided the Department of Interior with an explicit agenda in enumerating American Indians. Coincidentally, 1887 is also the first systematic federal enumeration of American Indians, including the Osage Nation.

The data collected from the Osage Nation have a unique beginning (June 1887) and end (July 1, 1907) point and contain measurable characteristics of comparison. The assumption that "data being analyzed have been systematically collected to stabilize the randomness of collection error" is greatly increased when established

parameters of time for collection are considered. The statistical system being created to manage the data sets have explicit intent. They are intended to provide meaningful information to inquiries regarding the data. The Department of Interior and Indian Agents were to accurately identify the American Indian tribal population in order to allocate tribal land in a meaningful way to tribal members. Hence, the categories to include and count tribal members emerged. For the Osage Nation these categories were; Full-blood and mixed-blood ancestry, band, age, sex, and relation to the household. The time parameter June 1887 to July 1, 1907, served the federal government as a criteria for the establishment of Osage Annuity rolls. Both the federal agenda and the time parameter used in collecting Osage census provides a degree of resolve to methodological assumptions needed to interpret observations.

Osage enumerations were conducted by a United States Indian Agent employed by the Department of Interior's Indian Affairs Agency. Pawhuska, Oklahoma served as the district field office for the Osage Indian Agent and all Osage tribal correspondence with the federal government took place at the district field office. The data collected by Indian Agent enumerators from 1887 to 1907 were to a large extent consistent in reporting data in a standardized format. Instructions for enumerations were provided to each Agent and the annual Osage census was to begin June of 1887, and to be conducted every June thereafter, the only interruption

in the prescribed yearly enumeration was 1889. There were no explanations provided within the documents for the missing year of Osage enumeration.

Each census roll begins by identifying the tribe of enumeration; the Osage Nation allowed two non-Osage Indian tribes to reside on their reservation; the Kaw or Kansa and the Quawpaw. From 1887 to 1907 the consistency in the reporting order of the three tribes varied. However, each tribal census report was clearly differentiated by a cover sheet identifying the tribe, the year of enumeration, the Indian Agent conducting the enumeration, and the date the census was received by the Department of Interior. Some of the documents had deteriorated to the extent that dates received by the Department of Interior were either missing, or illegible.

With the exception of 1887 and 1888, all other years of enumeration provided six demographic variables: 1. Line numbers assigned to each individual enumerated, 2. Indian name if applicable, 3. English name if applicable, 4. Sex, 5. Age, 6. Relation to household: head, husband, wife, father, mother, daughter, son, adopted, ward, step-children, and grandparents. The censuses of 1887 and 1888 did not provide the sex of the individuals enumerated.

Members of the Osage tribe were categorized upon the bifurcated lines of full-blood and half-breed (later termed Mixed-Blood). The full-blood members were listed first, and sub-categorized according to their various bands. Bands are

identified by either bold print, skipping of un-numbered lines, and at times not purposefully identifiable, unless recognized out of familiarity. Bands were represented for all years except 1890, 1891, 1892, and 1893. These years correspond to the term of office of enumerator L.J. Miles, Acting Agent Indian Territory. A range of 14 to 17 Bands were identified over the 21 year time frame: Big Chief, Joes, Moh-e-kah-moie, Ne-kah-wah-she-tun-kah, Big Hill, White Hair, Tall Chief, Black Dog, Saucy Chief, Beaver, Strike Axe, Ne-kah-ke-pah-ne, Claremore, Wah-ti-an-kah, William Penn, Little Chief, and half-breed.

Line numbers assigned to individuals enumerated were cumulative and continuing in ascent without interruption between the full-blood and mixed-blood bands. This provided a measure of reliability in the actual tabulation of aggregate data. The exception of this cumulative line number assignment is 1887 and 1888. In both instances, line numbers began at 1 each time a different band was enumerated.

Summaries or recapitulations of the aggregate data for each census year were erratically provided. Within the 21 year time span of this research, there were 8 Indian Agents acting as Osage enumerators, each one having some variation in the recording of the census data. Aggregate summaries of the census were provided for the years 1887, 1890, 1900-1903, 1906, and 1907.

The first Osage census year, 1887, provided the summary format and precedent for category identification. Enumerators demographically identified Osage individuals by age, sex, full-blood, and mixed-blood. Nine summary categories were created from these four demographic variables. The categories were: males over 18 years; females over 14 years; school age males (no ages provided); school age females (no ages provided); males under 6; females under 6; total males; total females. The 1887 summary categories are problematic due to an inability to determine mutually exclusive categories. The summary categories, when provided, became increasingly age specific over the 21 year time frame. For instance, in 1890, school age males and females were specified by age as children between ages 6 and 16 years old. Again this revision proved statistically problematic due to the categorization of females as over 14 years of age. The two categories, while no longer as ambiguous, remain over-lapping and non-mutually exclusive. Additional summary category revisions were made in 1901, and the category females over 14 years became females over 18 years of age, but only for that one particular year. It was not until the 1906 census that the females over 14 years category was permanently revised to females over 18 years of age.

Aggregate summaries of the remaining 12 years (1888, 1891 through 1899, 1904, and 1905) include 6 mutually exclusive constructed categories by the researcher. The

same demographic characteristics identifying Osage by Indian Agents were used to create the summary categories. The categories are: males 18 years of age and older; females 18 years of age and older; children 6 to 17 years of age; children under 6 years of age, total persons over 18 years of age; and total children 0 to 17 years of age. Sex ratios were not differentiated in tabulating raw scores among children due to its non-applicability to this research thesis.

The primary concern of this thesis is to determine shifting Osage population composition between full-blood ancestry and not-full blood ancestry members. However, the mutually exclusive categories of children and adults did provide the opportunity to examine fertility rates between full-blood and not-full-blood Osage citizens. These fertility rates are a point of contention made by both Wilson (1985) and Burns (1989). The data do support their arguments that mixed-blood Osage persons were prolific in their number of offspring as compared to full-blood Osage persons. The full-blood Osage members tended to have three to four children per household, including adopted persons; the mixed-blood Osage band tended to have six to eight children per household, including adopted persons.

As mentioned earlier, there were 8 enumerators of the Osage Nation from 1887 to 1907. The variation in enumeration and presentation of data is due to both random error of the enumerator from year to year, and more

significantly to the replacement of enumerators from one census year to another. Variations can be described by organizing the analysis around the Indian Agent's term of office.

Carrol H. Potter, Captain 18th Infantry, served as Acting Agent for Indian Territory for 1887 and 1888. Both census were handwritten tabulations, and an aggregate recapitulation was provided for 1887. However, the summary data provided was not reliable and totals did not reflect actual sum scores. Potter also did not provide a summary statement for the 1888 census year, and failed to include the sex of the individual being enumerated at the aggregate level. Those individuals designated "Head" of the household with only Osage names as identification could not be identified in regards to gender. The occupancy of head of household could include both males or females of any age. Categorical summaries were created from the aggregate data for the 1888 census, but individuals who could not be determined in regards to gender by household status, were not included in the summary statements.

L.J. Miles, Acting Agent Indian Territory, enumerated the Osage census between 1890 and 1893. Miles provided a summary for the 1890 Osage census only and did not provide summaries of children under 6 years of age. Compounding the problem is the overlap between the categories Children 6 to 16 years of age and females over 14 years of age. Had these been mutually exclusive categories a figure could have been

mathematically derived to accurately represent the children under 6 years of age category. Approximate estimates have been calculated for children under 6 years of age but does not include persons who are 17 years of age, and the potential to double count females between the ages of 14 and 16 years can not be controlled. Categorical summaries were created from the aggregate data for the years 1891 to 1893.

The third Osage census enumerator was Acting Agent H.B. Freeman, Lieutenant Colonel, 5th Infantry. No summaries were provided for the years 1894 thru 1897, categorical summaries were created from the aggregate data.

William J. Pollock served as the fourth United States Indian Agent to enumerate Osage citizens for the years 1898 and 1899. Pollock did not provide census summaries for either years and constructed summary categories were used.

O.A. Mitscher, enumerated the Osage census for the years 1900 to 1903. Summaries were provided for all four years and as mentioned earlier, the only variation in category assignment occurred in 1901: females were enumerated as above 18 years of age, all other categories for the years 1900 to 1903 remained consistent with the summaries provided by previous enumerators. Summaries did not provide data for the children under 6 years of age and approximations were based on non-mutually exclusive categories.

Frank M. Corser served as a Special Indian Agent in 1904 did not provide a census summary. Summaries were

extracted from the raw aggregate data. Frank Frantz served as the United States Indian Agent for the Osage in 1905 and 1906. No summary was provided for the 1905 Osage census and again constructed categories were utilized. A summary was provided for the 1906 census by Frantz, and the summary category of females was revised to females over 18 years of age as opposed to females over 14 years of age. This improved the usefulness of the data for determining populations by age, but continued to exclude 17 year old persons. The final census examined in this research, 1907, was conducted by Indian Agent Ret Millard. A summary was provided by Millard but he failed to report summary data for children under 6 years of age. Approximations were calculated from the existing summary data but the categories female over 18 years of age and children between 6 and 16 years does not provide total inclusion of the female population. The estimated number of children under 6 years of age skews the summary totals and they are not equal to summary totals provided by the enumerator.

For those census summaries constructed by the researcher from raw aggregate data, error rates were calculated based upon tabulations errors occurring within each sub-group full-blood Osage and not-full-blood Osage for each year applicable. Tabulations of the raw aggregate data were made by coding individuals into four sex/age demographic categories among the two subgroups full-blood Osage and not-full-blood Osage. Each category was summed

for a combined sub-group total of full-blood Osage and not-full-blood Osage. These totals were then compared to the sub-group totals of the census.

Totals were represented by the line item number of the last individual enumerated in each group. In the full-blood category the line number represents the cumulative total of the full-blood population. In the not-full-band, the line item represents the cumulative total for the entire Osage population. Therefore, the total of the full-blood population was subtracted from the total Osage population to derive the not-full-blood total population for each year. This number was compared to the number of line items contained in the not-full-blood census for reliability. Percentages of error are calculated by dividing the total occurrence of tabulation error within each sub-category by the total Osage population count for each year.

Missing cases represents an under-enumeration of persons as compared to the line item totals of the aggregate data. Overcount errors represent an excess of persons enumerated by the researcher as compared to the line item totals of the aggregate data. Error rates for each year of the census are included as footnotes for census summary tables 3 thru 23. Error rates were as follows: 1888 full-blood Osage 2.257 (23 missing cases), not-full-blood Osage (6 missing cases) 1.318; 1891 full-blood Osage (11 missing cases) 1.138, not-full-blood Osage (Overcount 62 cases) 9.825; 1892 full-blood Osage (50 missing cases) 5.417, not-

full-blood Osage (00 missing cases; 1893 full-blood Osage (13 missing cases) 1.406, not-full-blood (4 missing cases) 0.596; 1894 full-blood (16 missing cases) 1.731, not-full-blood (over count of 49 cases) 6.767; 1895 full-blood Osage (6 missing cases) 0.666, not-full-blood Osage (4 missing cases) 0.524; 1896 full-blood Osage (over count of 2) 0.217, not-full-blood Osage (5 missing cases) 0.629; 1897 full-blood Osage (4 missing cases) 0.446, not-full-blood Osage (2 missing cases) 0.242; 1898 full-blood Osage (overcount of 19) 2.054, not full-blood Osage (1 missing case) 0.117; 1899 full-blood Osage (1 missing case) 0.112, not-full-blood Osage (overcount of 1) 0.113; 1904 full-blood Osage (overcount of 3) 0.357, not-full blood Osage (36 missing cases) 3.529; 1905 full-blood Osage (1 missing case) 0.118, not-full blood Osage (overcount of 1) 0.091.

Missing cases represents an under-enumeration of persons as compared to the line item totals of the aggregate data. Overcount errors represents an excess of persons enumerated by the researcher as compared to the line item totals of the aggregate data. These figures are included as footnotes for each Table of the Osage census presented in Chapter Nine.

CHAPTER IX

FINDINGS

In 1887, (TABLE III) the total Osage population was 1,494; 71% of the population were full-blood Osage persons (1,066) and 29% were not-full-blood Osage persons (428). Total full-blood Osage males and females (312 persons and 317 persons respectively) are more than double that of non-full blood Osage males (214 persons) and females (214 persons). The total number of full-blood Osage children school age and under 6 years are significantly higher (29%) than non-full-blood Osage children (17%).

In 1888, (TABLE IV) the total Osage population decreased to 1,474 persons; a net loss of 20 persons. The full-blood Osage population decreased by 47 persons from 1887 to 1,019 and represents 69% of the total Osage population. The not-full-blood Osage population increased by 27 persons to 455 and represents 31% of the total Osage population. Full-blood Osage children ages 0 to 17 years, increased by 11 persons to 448, and represented 30% of the total Osage population. The not-full-blood Osage children increased by 33 persons; representing 20% of the total Osage population. There are several explanations for disparities in summary totals and changes in the demographic composition of the Osage: 1. Tabulation errors in extracting summaries

TABLE III
 TABULAR STATEMENT OF THE CENSUS
 August 6, 1887

	Full-Blood	%	Not-Full	%
Percent of Total Osage Population				
Males Over 18 Years	312	21%	91	6%
Females Over 14 Years	317	21%	82	6%
School Age Males	130	9%	68	5%
School Age Females	126	8%	67	5%
Males Under 6 Years	87	6%	55	4%
Females Under 6 Years	94	6%	65	4%
Total Children School Age and under 6 Years	437	29%	255	17%
Total Males	529	35%	214	14%
Total Females	537	36%	214	14%
FULL-BLOOD AND NOT-FULL-BLOOD COMPOSITION				Percentage of Total Population
Total Osage Full-Blood	1066		71%	
Total Not-Full-Blood Osage	428		29%	
Total Indians of Osage Blood	* 1501			

* Total reported by the Department of Interior, actual figures provided sum to 1494. Percentages based upon actual figures (1494) and not Department of Interior Summary total (1501).

TABLE IV
 TABULAR STATEMENT OF THE CENSUS
 July 16, 1888

	Full-Blood	%	Not-Full	%
Percent of Total Osage Population				
Males 18 Years and Older	330	22%	97	7%
Females 18 Years and Older	241	16%	70	5%
Children 6 to 17 Years	272	19%	158	11%
Children Under 6 Years	176	12%	130	9%
Total Persons Over 18 Years	571	39%	167	11%
Total Children 0 to 17 Years	448	30%	288	20%
FULL-BLOOD AND NOT-FULL-BLOOD COMPOSITION				Percentage of Total Population
Total Full-Blood Osage		1019		69%
Total Not-Full-Blood Osage		455		31%
Total Indians of Osage Blood		1474		

Error 23 missing cases full-blood Osage persons (2.257)
 Error 06 missing cases not-full-blood Osage persons (1.318)

1889 Census Not Enumerated

from raw data; the tabulation error in enumerating full-blood Osage was 2.257 or 23 missing cases, and 1.318 or 6 missing cases in enumeration of not-full-blood Osage. However, the error rates have been calculated for the tabulations of full-blood Osage and not-full-blood Osage with no differentiation among age categories. The error rate can not be applied with any specificity to age category enumerations. 2. Summary figures may reflect actual decreases or numerical shifts from the revision of the 1888 census categories. Two categories were changed: females over 14 years to females 18 years and older, and children 6 to 16 years of age to children 6 to 17 years of age. This categorical revision controlled for the possible double count of females ages 14 to 16 years of age, and included 17 year old females into the census summary that were otherwise excluded in the 1891 summary. These changes were initiated by the researcher to provide mutually exclusive categories of comparison. However, these changes can not exclusively account for compositional changes in Osage population. 3. Changes in population composition may be attributable to changes in enumerating Osage in 1888.

No census data were provided for the year 1889. Explanations for the interruption in the annual census of the Osage population was not provided in the archival documents. The 1890 census (TABLE V) showed a net decrease in the total Osage population by 288 persons for a total of 1,186 Osage.

TABLE V
 TABULAR STATEMENT OF THE CENSUS
 September 1, 1890

	Full-Blood	%	Not-Full	%
Percent of Total Osage Population				
Males Over 18 Years	275	23%	96	8%
Females Over 14 Years	304	26%	100	8%
Children 6 to 16 Years	247	21%	164	14%
Children Under 6 Years	Not Summerized			
Total Children 6 to 16 Years	247	21%	164	14%
Total Males and Females (Males over 18/Females over 14)	*579	49%	*196	17%
FULL-BLOOD AND NOT-FULL-BLOOD COMPOSITION				Percentage of Total Population
Total Full-Blood Osage	** 826		70%	
Total Not-Full-Blood Osage	** 360		30%	
Total Indians of Osage Blood	** 1186			

* No totals were provided by the Department of Interior, males over 18 years and females over 14 years were simply summed for total males and females category. The category females over 14 and the category children between 6 and 16 overlap and are not mutually exclusive.

** All totals were summed by the researcher and exclude children under 6 years of age.

Total Osage full-blood population was 826 persons, a decrease of 193 persons, and represents 70% of the total Osage population. The total not-full-blood Osage population was 360 persons, a decrease of 95 persons, and represents 30% of the total Osage population. Comparison of the categories for children is not included due to extensive missing data in the 1890 census summary. Explanations for changes in composition may be attributed to changes in the source of census summaries. The 1888 census summaries were extracted from raw data, whereas the 1890 summaries were provided by the Department of Interior. In addition, no census enumeration of Osage was taken in 1889, and the 1890 census reflects a two year time span in compositional changes. The most likely cause of compositional change is due to revisions in the enumeration of Osage persons from 1888 to 1890, and errors of the Indian Agent in tabulating the results.

In 1891, (Table VI) the total Osage population increased by 411 persons to 1,597. The Osage full-blood population increased by 140 persons to 966, but decreased in percent of the total population from 70% in 1890 to 60% in 1891. The not-full-blood Osage population increased by 271 persons to 631, and increased their percent of the total population from 30% in 1890 to 40% in 1891. The differences in percentage of population between full-blood and not-full-blood children also diminished between 1888 and 1891. Full-blood children ages 0 to 17 years totaled 445 persons

TABLE VI
 TABULAR STATEMENT OF THE CENSUS

1891

	Full-Blood	%	Not-Full	%
Percent of Total Osage Population				
Males 18 Years and Older	290	18%	113	7%
Females 18 Years and Older	231	15%	105	7%
Children 6 to 17 Years	252	16%	242	15%
Children Under 6 Years	193	12%	171	11%
Total Children 0 to 17 Years	445	28%	413	26%
Total Persons Over 18 Years	521	33%	218	14%
FULL-BLOOD AND NOT-FULL-BLOOD COMPOSITION				Percentage of Total Population
Total Full-Blood Osage	966			60%
Total Not-Full-Blood Osage	631			40%
Total Indians of Osage Blood	1597			

Error 11 missing cases full-blood Osage persons (1.138)
 Error 62 overcount cases not-full-blood Osage persons
 (9.825)

representing 28% of the total Osage population; an increase of 198 persons. Non-full-blood Osage children represented 26% of the total Osage population with 413 persons; an increase of 249 persons. There are several explanations for the significant changes in Osage composition: 1. 1891 census summaries were extracted from raw data with an error rate of 1.138 (11 missing cases) for full-blood enumeration and an error rate of 9.825 (overcount of 62 cases) for non-full-blood Osage. 2. Summary categories were revised from the 1890 census, changing females over 14 years to females 18 years and older, and children 6 to 16 years of age to children 6 to 17 years of age. This categorical revision controlled for the possible double count of females ages 14 to 16 years of age, and included 17 year old females into the census summary that were otherwise excluded in the 1891 summary. These changes were initiated by the researcher to provide mutually exclusive categories of comparison. However, these changes can not exclusively account for the increase of Osage population 3. Actual increases in population may be attributable to changes in enumerating Osage membership and the inclusion of additional persons in the 1891 census.

In 1892, (TABLE VII) the total Osage population decreased by 39 persons for a total of 1,558. The total full-blood Osage population decreased by 43 persons to 923 or 59% of the total Osage population. The total not-full-blood Osage population increased by 4 persons to 635 or 41%

TABLE VII
 TABULAR STATEMENT OF THE CENSUS
 1892

	Full-Blood	%	Not-Full	%
Percent of Total Osage Population				
Males 18 Years and Older	245	16%	119	8%
Females 18 Years and Older	254	16%	103	7%
Children 6 to 17 Years	244	16%	243	16%
Children Under 6 Years	180	12%	170	11%
Total Children 0 to 17 Years	424	27%	413	27%
Total Persons Over 18 Years	499	32%	222	14%
FULL-BLOOD AND NOT-FULL-BLOOD COMPOSITION				Percentage of Total Population
Total Full-Blood Osage	923			59%
Total Not-Full-Blood Osage	635			41%
Total Indians of Osage Blood	1558			

Error 50 missing cases full-blood Osage persons (5.417)
 Error 00 missing cases not-full-blood Osage persons

of the total Osage population. The total full-blood children 0 to 17 years of age decreased by 21 persons to 424, or 27% of the total Osage population. The total not-full-blood Osage children remained the same in number from 1891 to 1892 at 413, but increased in percentage of population by 1 percent to 27% of the total Osage population. The year 1892 marks the point in time where both full-blood and not-full-blood Osage children represent the same percentage of the total Osage population. In the remaining years 1893 to 1907, the not-full-blood Osage children will exceed full-blood Osage children in total population representation. Explanations for changes in composition may be attributed to tabulation errors in extracting summaries from raw data. The tabulation error for full-blood Osage was 5.417 or 50 missing cases, and 0 missing cases in the tabulation of not-full-blood Osage.

The Osage population increased by 37 in 1893 for a total of 1,595 persons. (TABLE VIII) Total Osage full-blood persons increased by one to 924, but decreased in percentage of the total Osage population by 1%, from 59% to 58%. Total not-full-blood Osage increased by 36 to 671 persons, and from 41% percent of the total Osage population to 42%. Children 0 to 17 years of age decreased in population for both the full-blood and not-full-blood Osage. Full-blood Osage children decreased by 17 persons to 407, or 26% of the total Osage population.

TABLE VIII
 TABULAR STATEMENT OF THE CENSUS
 1893

	Full-Blood	%	Not-Full	%
Percent of Total Osage Population				
Males 18 Years and Older	261	16%	118	7%
Females 18 Years and Older	256	16%	124	8%
Children 6 to 17 Years	258	16%	259	16%
Children Under 6 Years	149	9%	170	11%
Total Children 0 to 17 Years	407	26%	429	27%
Total Persons 18 Years and Older	517	32%	242	15%
FULL-BLOOD AND NOT-FULL BLOOD COMPOSITION				Percentage of Total Population
Total Full-Blood Osage	924			58%
Total Not-Full-Blood Osage	671			42%
Total Indians of Osage Blood	1595			

Error 13 missing cases full-blood Osage persons (1.406)
 Error 04 missing cases not-full-blood Osage persons (0.596)

Not-full-blood Osage children increased by 16 persons, and remained 27% of the total Osage population. Changes in composition may be partially due to tabulation errors in extracting summaries (full-blood Osage 1.406 or 13 missing cases and not-full-blood Osage 0.596 or 4 missing cases) but can not account for the total variation.

In 1894, (TABLE IX) an additional 53 persons were enumerated for a total Osage population of 1,648. Total full-blood Osage remained the same at 924 persons, and decreased 2 percentage points of the total Osage population from 1893 to 1894; 58% to 56% respectively. The total not-full-blood Osage increased from 671 persons to 724, and increased 2 percentage points from 42% to 44% of the total Osage population. Full-blood Osage children decreased by 2 persons (405) and represented 25% of the total Osage population. Not-full-blood Osage children increased from 429 person to 474 persons, and increased their percentage of the total Osage population from 27% to 29%. Explanations for the changes in Osage composition may be attributed to tabulation error in extracting summaries, but does not account for the total variation. Full-blood Osage tabulation error 1.731 or 16 missing cases, and not-full-blood Osage 6.767 or an overcount of 49 cases.

In 1895, (TABLE X) there were 15 additional persons enumerated for a total Osage population of 1,663. Total Osage full-blood persons decreased an additional 24 persons, representing 54% of the total Osage population.

TABLE IX
 TABULAR STATEMENT OF THE CENSUS
 August 24, 1894

	Full-Blood	%	Not-Full	%
Percent of Total Osage Population				
Males 18 Years and Older	270	16%	128	8%
Females 18 Years and Older	249	15%	122	7%
Children 6 to 17 Years	242	15%	271	16%
Children Under 6 Years	163	10%	203	12%
Total Children 0 to 17 Years	405	25%	474	29%
Total Persons Over 18 Years	519	32%	250	15%
FULL-BLOOD AND NOT-FULL-BLOOD COMPOSITION				Percentage of Total Population
Total Full-Blood Osage	924		56%	
Total Not-Full-Blood Osage	724		44%	
Total Indians of Osage Blood	1648			

Error 16 missing cases full-blood Osage persons (1.731)
 Error 49 overcount cases not-full-blood Osage persons
 (6.767)

TABLE X
 TABULAR STATEMENT OF THE CENSUS
 August 19, 1895

	Full-Blood	%	Not-Full	%
Percent of Total Osage Population				
Males 18 Years and Older	267	16%	139	8%
Females 18 Years and Older	243	15%	135	8%
Children 6 to 17 Years	232	14%	278	17%
Children Under 6 Years	158	10%	211	13%
Total Children 0 to 17 Years	390	24%	489	29%
Total Persons Over 18 Years	510	31%	274	17%
FULL-BLOOD AND NOT-FULL-BLOOD COMPOSITION				Percentage of Total Population
Total Full-Blood Osage	900		54%	
Total Not-Full-Blood Osage	763		46%	
Total Indians of Osage Blood	1663			

Error 06 missing cases full-blood Osage persons (0.666)
 Error 04 missing cases not-full-blood Osage persons (0.524)

Total not-full-blood Osage increased by 39 persons and represented 46% of the total Osage population. Full-blood Osage children declined an additional 15 persons, and not-full-blood children increased an additional 15 persons in 1895. Full-blood Osage children represented 24% of the total Osage population, not-full-blood Osage children 29%. Changes in composition may be attributed to tabulation errors in extracting summaries (full-blood Osage tabulation error 0.666 or 6 missing cases and not-full-blood Osage tabulation error 0.524 or 4 missing cases) but does not account for the total variation.

In 1896, (TABLE XI) the total Osage population increased by 49 persons to 1,712. The total full-blood Osage population increased by 18 persons to 918, while the not-full-blood Osage total population increased by 31 persons to 794. Both the full-blood and not-full-blood Osage population represented the same percentage of the total Osage population as in 1895; 54% and 46% respectively. Children ages 0 to 17 years of age increased in population for both the full-blood Osage, an increase of 26 persons to 416, and not-full-blood Osage, an increase of 22 persons to 511. However, full-blood Osage children remained the same in percentage of the total population (24%) while non-full-blood children increased their percentage of the total Osage population to 30%. Once again, changes in Osage composition may be attributed to tabulation errors but does not account for the total variation.

TABLE XI
 TABULAR STATEMENT OF THE CENSUS
 June 30, 1896

	Full-Blood	%	Not-Full	%
Percent of Total Osage Population				
Males 18 Years and Older	255	15%	146	9%
Females 18 Years and Older	247	14%	137	8%
Children 6 to 17 Years	254	15%	283	17%
Children Under 6 Years	162	10%	228	13%
Total Children 0 to 17 Years	416	24%	511	30%
Total Persons Over 18 Years	502	29%	283	17%
FULL-BLOOD AND NOT-FULL-BLOOD COMPOSITION				Percentage of Total Population
Total Full-Blood Osage			918	54%
Total Not-Full-Blood Osage			794	46%
Total Indians of Osage Blood			1712	

Error 02 overcount cases full-blood Osage persons (0.217)
 Error 05 missing cases not-full-blood Osage persons (0.629)

Tabulation error for full-blood Osage 0.217 or an overcount of 2 cases, and not-full-blood Osage 0.629 or 5 missing cases.

In 1897, (TABLE XII) 10 persons were added to the Osage enumeration for a total population of 1,722. The total full-blood Osage population decreased an additional 22 persons to 896, representing 52% of the total Osage population. The total not-full-blood Osage population increased an additional 32 persons to 826, representing 48% of the total Osage population. The population of children ages 0 to 17 years of age mirror the demographic changes occurring at the total full-blood and not-full-blood Osage categories. Full-blood children decreased in population by 16 persons to 400, and not-full-blood children increased by 20 persons to 531; 23% and 31% of the total Osage population respectively. Changes in Osage composition may be attributed to tabulation errors but does not account for the total variation. The full-blood Osage tabulation error is 0.446 or 4 missing cases, and the not-full-blood tabulation error is 0.242 or 2 missing cases.

In 1898, (TABLE XIII) an additional 56 persons were included in the Osage census for a total population of 1,778 persons. Full-blood Osage persons increased by 29 persons to 925, but remained 52% of the total Osage population. Not-full-blood Osage increased by 27 persons to 853, representing 48% of the total Osage population.

TABLE XII
 TABULAR STATEMENT OF THE CENSUS
 1897

	Full-Blood	%	Not-Full	%
Percent of Total Osage Population				
Males 18 Years and Older	254	15%	154	9%
Females 18 Years and Older	242	14%	141	8%
Children 6 to 17 Years	246	14%	311	18%
Children Under 6 Years	154	9%	220	13%
Total Children 0 to 17 Years	400	23%	531	31%
Total Persons Over 18 Years	496	29%	295	17%
FULL-BLOOD AND NOT-FULL-BLOOD COMPOSITION				Percentage of Total Population
Total Full-Blood Osage	896		52%	
Total Not-Full-Blood Osage	826		48%	
Total Indians of Osage Blood	1722			

Error 04 missing cases full-blood Osage persons (0.446)
 Error 02 missing cases not-full-blood Osage persons (0.242)

TABLE XIII
 TABULAR STATEMENT OF THE CENSUS
 1898

	Full-Blood	%	Not-Full	%
Percent of Total Osage Population				
Males 18 Years and Older	262	15%	158	9%
Females 18 Years and Older	246	14%	151	9%
Children 6 to 17 Years	246	14%	303	17%
Children Under 6 Years	171	10%	241	14%
Total Children 0 to 17 Years	417	24%	544	31%
Total Persons Over 18 Years	508	29%	309	17%
FULL-BLOOD AND NOT-FULL-BLOOD COMPOSITION				Percentage of Total Population
Total Full-Blood Osage	925		52%	
Total Not-Full-Blood Osage	853		48%	
Total Indians of Osage Blood	1778			

Error 19 overcount cases full-blood Osage persons (2.054)
 Error 01 missing cases not-full-blood Osage persons (0.117)

Total children ages 0 to 17 years of age also increased population for both full-blood (17 persons to 417) and not-full-blood (13 persons to 544). However, the full-blood Osage children dropped one percentage point in total population representation to 24%, and not-full-blood Osage children remained the same at 31% of the total Osage population. Composition changes in the Osage population may be attributed to tabulation error in extracting summaries. The full-blood Osage tabulation error was 2.054 or an overcount of 19 cases. The not-full-blood Osage tabulation error was 0.117 or 1 missing case.

The 1899 census (TABLE XIV) reflects a decrease of 14 persons in total Osage population and marks the year when full-blood Osage and not-full-blood Osage both represent 50% of the total Osage population. The Osage full-blood population decreased by 40 persons, while the not-full-blood Osage population increased by 26 persons. Full-blood Osage children decreased an additional 25 persons, and not-full-blood Osage children increased by 26 persons; 22% and 32% of the total Osage population respectively. Composition changes in the Osage population may be attributed to tabulation error in extracting summaries. The full-blood Osage tabulation error was 0.112 or one missing case. The not-full-blood Osage tabulation error was 0.113 or an overcount of one case.

TABLE XIV
 TABULAR STATEMENT OF THE CENSUS
 1899

	Full-Blood	%	Not-Full	%
Percent of Total Osage Population				
Males 18 Years and Older	254	14%	164	9%
Females 18 Years and Older	239	14%	158	9%
Children 6 to 17 Years	229	13%	302	17%
Children Under 6 Years	163	9%	255	15%
Total Children 0 to 17 Years	392	22%	557	32%
Total Persons Over 18 Years	493	28%	322	18%
FULL-BLOOD AND NOT-FULL-BLOOD COMPOSITION				Percentage of Total Population
Total Full-Blood Osage			885	50%
Total Not-Full-Blood Osage			879	50%
Total Indians of Osage Blood			1764	

Error 01 missing cases full-blood Osage persons (0.112)
 Error 01 overcount cases not-full-blood Osage persons
 (0.113)

From the 1900 Osage census (Table XV) to 1907, the Osage full-blood population steadily declines in percentage of total Osage population for both adults and children. In 1900, the total Osage population was 1,783, an increase of 19 persons. The full-blood Osage population was 866 persons a decrease of 19 persons, and represents 49% of the total Osage population. The not-full-blood Osage population increased by 38 persons and represented 51% of the total Osage population. In addition, an alarming drop in the percentage of full-blood Osage children occurred between 1899 (392 persons) and 1900 (345 persons). The shift may be due primarily to the discrepancies between extracted summaries from the 1899 census and summaries provided for the 1900 census by Indian agents. Population figures for children under 6 years of age were approximations based on non-mutually exclusive summary categories, and may skew total population estimates. However, these population percentages of children do not change significantly for the remaining years which indicates that if the numbers are skewed, they remain consistent approximations from 1900 to 1907. Full-blood Osage children represented only 19% (345 persons) of the total Osage population compared to 30% (528 persons) of not-full-blood Osage children.

In 1901, (Table XVI) the total Osage population count was 1,788, a net increase of 5 persons from the 1900 census. The total full-blood Osage population decreased by 18 persons, and the not-full-blood Osage total population

TABLE XV
 TABULAR STATEMENT OF THE CENSUS
 1900

	Full-Blood	%	Not-Full	%
Percent of Total Osage Population				
Males Above 18 Years	240	14%	169	10%
Females Above 14 Years	281	16%	220	12%
Children Between 6 and 16	205	12%	309	17%
Children Under 6 Years	*140	8%	*219	12%
Total Children 0 to 16 Years	*345	19%	*528	30%
Total Males All Ages	** 437	25%	** 457	26%
Total Females All Ages	** 429	24%	** 460	26%
FULL-BLOOD AND NOT-FULL-BLOOD COMPOSITION				Percentage of Total Population
Total Full-Blood Osage	** 866			49%
Total Not-Full-Blood Osage	** 917			51%
Total Indians of Osage Blood	** 1783			

* Not provided in original summary but are approximations calculated from summary figures. The categories female over 14 years and children between 6 and 16 are not mutually exclusive and overlap. Totals do not equal the Department of Interior's totals for males and females all ages. Percentages also do not equal 100.

** Department of Interior totals and are not based upon approximations of children under 6 years of age.

TABLE XVI
 TABULAR STATEMENT OF THE CENSUS
 August 19, 1901

	Full-Blood	%	Not-Full	%
Percent of Total Osage Population				
Males Above 18 Years	254	14%	175	10%
Females Above 18 Years	276	15%	239	13%
Children Between 6 and 16	203	11%	315	18%
Children Under 6 Years	*115	6%	*211	12%
Total Children 0 to 16 Years	*318	18%	*526	29%
Total Males All Ages	** 426	24%	** 466	26%
Total Females All Ages	** 422	24%	** 474	27%
FULL-BLOOD AND NOT-FULL-BLOOD COMPOSITION				Percentage of Total Population
Total Full-Blood Osage	** 848			47%
Total Not-Full-Blood Osage	** 940			53%
Total Indians of Osage Blood	** 1788			

* Not provided in original summary but are approximations calculated from summary figures. The categories female over 14 years and children between 6 and 16 are not mutually exclusive and overlap. Totals do not equal the Department of Interior's totals for males and females all ages. Percentages also do not equal 100.

** Department of Interior totals and are not based upon approximations of children under 6 years of age.

increased by 23 persons. These figures represent full-blood Osage as comprising 47% of the total Osage population and 53% for the non-full-blood Osage. Both full-blood and not-full-blood Osage children decreased in their percentage of representation of the total Osage population. Osage full-blood children showed a greater decrease in population (27 persons) than non-full-blood children (2 persons). These changes in the age category children 0 to 16 years may not reflect actual persons but changes in summary approximations due to the revision of the category females 14 years and older to females above 18 years by the Department of Interior. The revision remains a non-mutually exclusive category and omits females 17 years of age, and it is not clear if above 18 years includes 18 year old females or begins at age 19. In addition, summaries were not provided for children under 6 years of age and figure approximations are calculated from irregular categories.

The 1902 Osage census (TABLE XVII) shows a significant increase of 45 persons for a total Osage population of 1,833. Full-blood Osage decreased by one person, and not-full-blood Osage increased by 46 persons and represented 54% of the total Osage population. The full-blood Osage children experienced a decrease of 5 persons, representing 18% of the total Osage population. The not-full-blood Osage children experienced an increase of 34 persons, and represent 31% of the total Osage population. The 1901 category of females above 18 years of age reverted back to

TABLE XVII
 TABULAR STATEMENT OF THE CENSUS
 1902

	Full-Blood	%	Not-Full	%
Percent of Total Osage Population				
Males Above 18 Years	246	13%	186	10%
Females Above 14 Years	278	15%	240	13%
Children Between 6 and 16	214	12%	347	19%
Children Under 6 Years	*109	6%	*213	12%
Total Children 0 to 16 Years	*323	18%	*560	31%
Total Males All Ages	** 426	23%	** 493	27%
Total Females All Ages	** 421	23%	** 493	27%
FULL-BLOOD AND NOT-FULL-BLOOD COMPOSITION				Percentage of Total Population
Total Full-Blood Osage	**	847		46%
Total Not-Full-Blood Osage	**	986		54%
Total Indians of Osage Blood	**	1833		

* Not provided in original summary but are approximations calculated from summary figures. The categories female over 14 years and children between 6 and 16 are not mutually exclusive and overlap. Totals do not equal the Department of Interior's totals for males and females all ages. Percentages also do not equal 100.

** Department of Interior totals and are not based upon approximations of children under 6 years of age.

females over 14 years of age in 1902. Therefore summaries for children under 6 years of age experienced an inconsistency in approximations from 1901 to 1902. Because of the non-mutually exclusive nature of females over 14 and children 6 to 16 years of age, these inconsistencies can not be controlled. However, the approximations do not appear to have changed significantly to prevent a generalization of children ages 6 to 16 years of age.

In 1903, (TABLE XVIII) the Osage population showed an increase of 17 persons for a total population of 1,850. The full-blood Osage population decreased by 6 persons, and represented 46% of the total Osage population. The not-full-blood Osage population increased by 23 persons, representing 54% of the total Osage population. Full-blood Osage children ages 0 to 16 years of age increased by 4 persons and continued to represent 18% of the total Osage population. Not-full-blood Osage children decreased by 5 persons and represented 30% of the total Osage population. The category females over 14 years of age remained intact, and summary approximations for 1902 and 1903 offer a degree of consistency for comparison.

In 1904, (TABLE IXX) the Osage population increased by 11 persons for a total population of 1,861. Full-blood Osage persons remained the same at 841 persons, but decreased in percentage of representation for the total Osage population (45%).

TABLE XVIII
 TABULAR STATEMENT OF THE CENSUS
 1903

	Full-Blood	%	Not-Full	%
Percent of Total Osage Population				
Males Above 18 Years	240	13%	194	11%
Females Above 14 Years	274	15%	260	14%
Children Between 6 and 16	213	12%	351	19%
Children Under 6 Years	*114	6%	*204	11%
Total Children 0 to 16 Years	*327	18%	*555	30%
Total Males All Ages	** 421	23%	** 500	27%
Total Females All Ages	** 420	23%	** 509	28%
FULL-BLOOD AND NOT-FULL-BLOOD COMPOSITION				Percentage of Total Population
Total Full-Blood Osage	** 841			46%
Total Not-Full-Blood Osage	** 1009			54%
Total Indians of Osage Blood	** 1850			

* Not provided in original summary but are approximations calculated from summary figures. The categories female over 14 years and children between 6 and 16 are not mutually exclusive and overlap. Totals do not equal the Department of Interior's totals for males and females all ages. Percentages also do not equal 100.

** Department of Interior totals and are not based upon approximations of children under 6 years of age.

TABLE IXX
 TABULAR STATEMENT OF THE CENSUS
 1904

	Full-Blood	%	Not-Full	%
Percent of Total Osage Population				
Males 18 Years and Older	250	13%	202	11%
Females 18 Years and Older	233	12%	210	11%
Children 6 to 17 Years	224	12%	385	21%
Children Under 6 Years	134	7%	223	12%
Total Children 0 to 17 Years	358	19%	608	33%
Total Persons Over 18 Years	483	26%	412	22%
FULL-BLOOD AND NOT-FULL-BLOOD COMPOSITION				Percentage of Total Population
Total Full-Blood Osage	841			45%
Total Not-Full-Blood Osage			1020	55%
Total Indians of Osage Blood	1861			

Error 03 overcount cases full-blood Osage persons (0.357)
 Error 36 missing cases not-full-blood Osage persons (3.529)

Children ages 0 to 16 years of age increased for both the full-blood and not-full-blood Osage population. Full-blood The not-full-blood Osage population increased by 11 persons (1,020 persons), representing 55% of the total Osage population. Osage children increased by 31 persons, representing 19% of the total Osage population, and not-full-blood Osage children increased by 53 persons, representing 33% of the total Osage population. Composition changes in the Osage population may be attributed to tabulation error in extracting summaries. The full-blood Osage tabulation error was 0.357 or an overcount of 3 cases. The not-full-blood Osage tabulation error was 3.529 or 36 missing cases. Also, the category female over 14 years of age was changed to females 18 years and older. The remaining years from 1905 to 1907 remain consistent in this classification of adult females and allow for summary approximations from Indian agent data (1906 and 1907) to reflect fairly accurate figures of Osage children.

In 1905, (Table XX) the Osage population increased by 75 persons for a total of 1,936. The Osage full-blood population increased by 3 persons but decreased in percent of total population to 44%. The non-full-blood Osage population increased by 72 persons and represented 56% of the total Osage population. Children 0 to 17 years of age increased for both full-blood (2 persons) and not-full-blood populations (45 persons), representing 34% of the total Osage population.

TABLE XX
 TABULAR STATEMENT OF THE CENSUS
 August 24, 1905

	Full-Blood	%	Not-Full	%
Percent of Total Osage Population				
Males 18 Years and Older	246	13%	216	11%
Females 18 Years and Older	238	12%	223	12%
Children 6 to 17 Years	228	12%	425	22%
Children Under 6 Years	132	7%	228	12%
Total Children 0 to 17 Years	360	19%	653	34%
Total Persons Over 18 Years	484	25%	439	23%
FULL-BLOOD AND NOT-FULL-BLOOD COMPOSITION				Percentage of Total Population
Total Full-Blood Osage	844		44%	
Total Not-Full-Blood Osage	1092		56%	
Total Indians of Osage Blood	1936			

Error 01 missing cases full-blood Osage persons (0.118)

Error 01 overcount case not-full-blood Osage persons (0.091)

Composition changes in the Osage population may be attributed to tabulation error in extracting summaries. The full-blood Osage tabulation error was 0.118 or 1 missing case. The not-full-blood Osage tabulation error was 0.091 or an overcount of 1 case.

The 1906 (Table XXI) census of the Osage showed a population increased of 58 persons for a total of 1,994. Again, the full-blood Osage population decreased by 6 persons with a representation of 42% of the total Osage population. The not-full-blood Osage population increased by 64 persons and represented 58% of the total Osage population. Osage full-blood children ages 0 to 16 years of age decreased from 360 persons in 1905 to 340 persons in 1906, representing 17% of the total Osage population. Not-full-blood Osage children increased by 51 persons representing 35% of the total Osage population. Census summaries were provided by the Department of Interior and omitted children under 6 years of age. Approximations were made from the summary totals provided for in the remaining categories.

The September 9, 1907 Osage census (Table XXII) showed an increase in the total population by 162 persons, for a total of 2,156. The full-blood Osage population increased by 33 persons but decreased in percentage of population to 40%. The non-full-blood Osage increased by 129 persons, representing 60% of the total Osage population.

TABLE XXI
 TABULAR STATEMENT OF THE CENSUS
 1906

	Full-Blood	%	Not-Full	%
Percent of Total Osage Population				
Males Above 18 Years	256	13%	226	11%
Females Above 18 Years	242	12%	226	11%
Children Between 6 and 16	191	10%	423	21%
Children Under 6 Years	*149	8%	*281	14%
Total Children 0 to 16 Years	*340	17%	*704	35%
Total Males All Ages	** 425	21%	** 580	30%
Total Females All Ages	** 413	21%	** 576	29%
FULL-BLOOD AND NOT-FULL-BLOOD COMPOSITION				Percentage of Total Population
Total Full-Blood Osage	** 838			42%
Total Not-Full-Blood Osage	** 1156			58%
Total Indians of Osage Blood	** 1994			

* Not provided in original summary but are approximations calculated from summary figures. The categories female over 14 years and children between 6 and 16 are not mutually exclusive and overlap. Totals do not equal the Department of Interior's totals for males and females all ages. Percentages also do not equal 100.

** Department of Interior totals and are not based upon approximations of children under 6 years of age.

TABLE XXII
 TABULAR STATEMENT OF THE CENSUS
 September 9, 1907

	Full-Blood	%	Not-Full	%
Percent of Total Osage Population				
Males Above 18 Years	244	11%	244	11%
Females Above 18 Years	241	11%	228	11%
Children Between 6 and 16	201	9%	464	22%
Children Under 6 Years	*185	9%	*349	16%
Total Children 0 to 16 Years	*386	18%	*813	38%
Total Males All Ages	** 435	20%	** 661	31%
Total Females All Ages	** 436	20%	** 624	29%
FULL-BLOOD AND NOT-FULL-BLOOD COMPOSITION				Percentage of Total Population
Total Full-Blood Osage	** 871			40%
Total Not-Full-Blood Osage	** 1285			60%
Total Indians of Osage Blood	** 2156			

* Not provided in original summary but are approximations calculated from summary figures. The categories female over 14 years and children between 6 and 16 are not mutually exclusive and overlap. Totals do not equal the Department of Interior's totals for males and females all ages. Percentages also do not equal 100.

** Department of Interior totals and are not based upon approximations of children under 6 years of age.

Osage children ages 0 to 16 years of age also increased for both full-blood (46 persons) and non-full-blood persons (109 persons). The non-full-blood Osage children had a significantly higher increase of children ages 0 to 16 years of age, and represented 38% of the total Osage population. This is compared to full-blood Osage children representing 18% of the total Osage population. These significant increases in non-full-blood children and adults can not be attributed to categorical changes in census summaries, and are assumed to reflect an actual increase in non-full-blood population.

CHAPTER X

CONCLUSION

The importance of establishing a tribal membership roll for the Osage can not be over emphasized. The Osage hold a unique historical precedence in the value of tribal membership by its concomitant entitlement to lucrative annuities from communally held mineral resources. Not only did tribal membership entitle a person to land allotment tracts, but also a permanent headright to annuities that would be inherited for generations to come.

The Bureau's prioritization of the annuity roll over allotment is extremely provocative. First they sought to establish the annuity roll and this roll would serve as the basis for land allotment. Emphasis seemed to be placed more on who was to benefit than on who culturally was an Osage tribal member. Primarily the factions that emerged within the Osage tribe (full-blood verses Euro-mixed-blood) was over who is to be placed on the annuity rolls, hence recognized as an Osage member, and not allotment per se.

The annuity roll based on the 1881 Osage Constitution was in question by the full-blood Osage at the time the Osage Allotment Act passed. The 1888 Act, restricting white males and offspring of white males married to Osage women,

did not exist. The "traditionals" or full-bloods and old-mixed-bloods objected to the prior inclusion of offspring from Euro-Indian marriages. (Burns, 1989:510) However this issue became moot when the federal government change the criteria for Osage membership in 1897. Congress passed an Act that abolished the 1888 exclusion of Euro-Indian mixed-bloods. The legal basis being it is illegal to disqualify a person based on the sex of a parent. (Burns, 1989:512) This latter revision was also included in the Osage Allotment Act of 1906. (34 Statutes, 539).

Another point of contention by the full-blood Osage was the dissolution of the Osage Constitution in 1900. Within their Constitution were their own criteria for tribal membership. The federal government selectively choose those criteria that would lead to expedient rolls, and abolished those that were perceived unfavorable to a majority of Osage allottees. The Osage full-bloods wanted to recognize only those mixed-bloods who lived among them and shared their common culture and language, and had some blood ancestry within the tribe. Total reliance on blood quantum for membership was never used by the traditional Osage, to them degree of blood did not necessarily determine degree of cultural affiliation. (Burns, 1989:511)

The Euro-Indian mixed-blood group were referred to repeatedly as being "more" progressive than their full-blood, Indian-mixed-blood, and old-mixed-blood counterparts. Progressive in terms of abandoning traditional Osage culture

for the Western "civilized" culture. The "traditionals" criteria for citizenship; sharing a common culture and language, was not considered in the federally adopted version of the Osage roll. Common soil came to be interpreted as living on the reservation or some other evidence of continuing citizenship and affiliation with the tribe. (Burns, 1989:513-514) Enumerators interpreted this as anyone residing in or near an Osage community. This often included European settlers illegally living on the Osage reservation. When one considers the pressures mounting on the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) to open "unassigned lands", their action to dissolve the Osage Constitution is not surprising.

It certainly gave more leverage for the BIA to maneuver negotiations more expediently. However, this suspension of the Osage Constitution may not have been legal. The interim government established by the BIA was not a government created by the Osage people. The council government was only to administer annuities from the mineral estate and provide a quorum for allotment. (Burns, 1989:523) The numerous Congressional Acts passed were intended to expedite resolve in the "membership problem". The criteria of having to be on the roles prior to December 31, 1881, or born before July 1, 1907, were of little reconciliation to the "traditional" Osage members. They contested the 1881 annuity roll, and the January 1906 annuity roll on the grounds of fraudulent enrollees. Again their emphasis on

Osage citizenship was placed upon shared culture, language, and geographical boundaries. The federal government chose to compartmentalize the traditional Osage criteria of all three being necessary for citizenship. Each criteria was made in and of itself sufficient to include persons for Osage membership; disregarding the request to have all three met simultaneously.

The issue of oil annuities for those identified as Osage members promised extraordinary wealth for those who gained citizenship with the Osage Nation. The oil reserves found under the Osage Reservation were no more than some other tribes, but the Osage held their resources communally making for the largest investment potential of any known tribe, and these revenues were to be shared equitably among individual members. This was enough motivation for both mixed-blood and full-blood alike to have their names placed on the rolls.

Statistical Politics

The need for the federal government to intervene in Osage Tribal affairs stems from the needs of growing nation. The issue of land allotment served to initiate the process of identifying and enumerating Osage persons by a set of exact criteria. A cultural or ethnocentric bias was evident by the manner in which the federal government created membership criteria. Their emphasis on geographical

proximity and Judeo-Christian inter-racial marriages are only a few.

Social inequality was experienced by the Osage when they were excluded from political participation on the basis of race. The Osage were not the only ones who experienced this political exclusion. The entire racial category Indian and those persons who make up this category are excluded to some extent from the political system. There are no other race categories who have had a specific federal administration created to represent all of their social, political, and economic needs. (The Bureau of Indian Affairs) What may have once begun as an attempt to recognize American Indians and their tribes as sovereign nations became an exploitive control mechanism. The pressures of "frontierism" served to rationalize the expediency of the federal government's enumeration of Osage citizens for the purposes of allotment. Osage government was dissolved, traditional tribal membership abolished, and communal lands were allotted. American Indian communal tradition was a small voice in a large wilderness of private property entrepreneurs.

Today, these past events have come to their fruition. By closing the roll effective July 1, 1907, the youngest living Osage allottee would be 86 years old in 1993. All those Osage members born after July 1, 1907, do not have undisputed citizenship with the Osage Nation. There are references to descendents and children of allottees on the

final roll as being citizens, but it has never been verified in courts. Un-allotted Osage receive census roll number cards, and degree of blood in the Osage tribe, but they do not verify that the person is an Osage citizen. Finally, more and more Osage are born who do not possess a headright, and are unable to vote in the selection of the Minerals Council. The Mineral Council is the Osage Nation's only form of government to date, and if one can not participate in council selection, then a majority of Osage persons are essentially without government. (Burns, 1989:523)

Today, federal policies have changed, and tribes are encouraged to assert governmental autonomy, to some degree. The boundaries are still being drawn as to how far tribal sovereignty will be tolerated, and again we must examine the dominant cultures' intolerance.

A specific case in point is the current Commission established to create a new constitutional Osage government and criteria of Osage citizenship. In a 1993 meeting, attended at the Osage Museum, Pawhuska, Oklahoma, a 7 member council was to be established to discuss issues pertinent to Osage government and citizenship. Three members are to represent the plaintiff; traditional Osage seeking to establish voting privileges. Three members are to represent the defendants; Euro-Indian mixed-bloods seeking to retain the current Osage Mineral Council and citizenship. The seventh person is to be representative of the Osage people, with a knowledge of their culture, history, and present

community needs. A Judge however, mandated that the seventh person must be decided upon within 90 days, to "expedite" resolution. The Osage people attempted to choose a member of their Nation, but due to the time needed to invest as the seventh member of the Commission, and no monetary compensation for that time, none were willing to commit, or at least make a decision to commit within the time frame mandated. On the night the seventh member was to be selected, one committee member choose not to attend the meeting, therefore violating the mandate of having a quorum. The seventh member could not be decided upon on the last meeting held prior to the deadline established by the Judge. The meeting was public, and a traditional Osage member asked why they were not consulted on the choosing of the seventh person. The defendants then stated, "this may be a public meeting but we do not want to know your opinion."

The following week the Judge appointed a law professor from Oklahoma, to serve as the seventh member. Many of the Osage people feel that the seventh member choosen was not reached by a consensus of the Osage people and skeptical that their needs will be sufficiently represented. It seems that history once again is repeating itself, in establishing Osage tribal government and citizenship, expediency has become the rationalization for abrogating tribal sovereignty.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alonso, William, and Paul Starr. Editors. (1987), The Politics of Numbers. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Alterman, Hyman. (1969), Counting People: The Census in History. New York: Halcourt, Brace & World, Inc.
- Anderson, Margo J. (1988), The American Census: A Social History. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Bailey, Garrick. (1973), "Changes in Osage Social Organization 1673-1906", University of Oregon Anthropological Papers, No.5.
- Bailey, Garrick. (1968), Osage Economic and Territorial Change: 1673-1839. M.A. Thesis, University of Oregon Department of Anthropology. Eugene.
- Bahr, Howard M., and Bruce A. Chadwick, and Joseph H. Strauss, (1975), American Ethnicity. Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath and Company.
- Bahr, Howard M., Bruce A. Chadwick, and Joseph H. Stauss. (1975), American Ethnicity. Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath and Company.
- Board of Indian Commissioners: Annual Report 1885. Pages 90-91. United States National Archives and Record Service: American Indians. Roll4158.
- Burns, Louis F. (1989), A History of the Osage People. Fallbrook, California: Ciga Press.
- Burrell, Gibson and Gareth Morgan (1979), Sociological Paradigms and Organizational Analysis. Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Heinemann.
- Chapman, B.B. (1942), "Disolution of the Osage Reservation: Part I". Chronicles of Oklahoma. Volume 20, Number 3. pages 244-254.
- Chapman, B.B. (1942), "Dissolution of the Osage Reservation: Part II". Chronicles of Oklahoma. Volume 20, Number 4. pages 375-386.

- Chapman, B.B. (1943), "Dissolution of the Osage Reservation: Part III". Chronicles of Oklahoma. Volume 21, Number 1. pages 78-87.
- Chapman, B.B. (1943), "Dissolution of the Osage Reservation: Part IV". Chronicles of Oklahoma. Volume 21, Number 2. pages 171-182.
- Clawson, Dan (1980), Bureaucracy and the Labor Process. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- de Tocqueville, Alexis. (First published 1835: 1984 Copyright edition), Democracy in America. New American Library: New York.
- Dobriner, William (1969), Social Structures and Systems: A Sociological Overview. California: Pacific Palisades.
- Duncan, Otis Dudley. (1984), "Notes on Social Measurement: Historical and Critical". pp. 12-38. New York: Russell Sage Foundation
- Edwards, Richard (1979), Contested Terrain. United States: Basic Books Inc., Division of Harper Collins Publishers.
- Eckstein, Harry and Apter, David Earnest (1963), Comparative Politics: A Reader. New York: Free Press of Glencoe.
- Emerson, Robert (1983), Contemporary Field Research: A Collection of Readings. University of California, Los Angeles: Waveland Press, Inc.
- Feagin, Joe R., (1989), Racial and Ethnic Relations. (Third Edition) Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.
- Fontana, Bernard L. (1972), Look to the Mountain Top. Executive Editor Robert Letacopi. San Jose, California: Gousha Publications.
- Forer, Norman, (1979), "The Imposed wardship of American Indian Tribes: A Case Study of the Prairie Band Potawatomi", The Imposition of Law. New York: Academic Press, Inc.
- Giddens, Anthony, (1975), The Class Structure of Advanced Societies. New York: Harper and Row Publishers.
- Glazer, Nathan (1971), "Blacks and Ethnic Groups: The Difference, and the Political Difference It Makes". SP18 (Spring).
- Glazer, Nathan and Moynihan, D.P. (1975), (ed.) Ethnicity. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

- Gordon, Milton M. (1964), Assimilation in American Life. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Gordon, Milton M. (1978), Human Nature, Class, and Ethnicity. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Greeley, Andrew M. (1974), Ethnicity in the United States. New York: John Wiley.
- Hicks, George, L., and Philip E. Leis (1977), Ethnic Encounters. North Scituate, Mass.: Duxberry Press.
- Hoult, Thomas Ford. (1969), Dictionary of Modern Sociology. Totowa, New Jersey: Littlefield, Adams & Company.
- Kelman, (1987), "The Political Foundations of American Statistical Policy" pp. 275-302. The Politics of Numbers. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Kickingbird, Kirke, Chibitty, Charles J., Kickingbird, Lynn, and Curtis Berkey. (1977), Indian Sovereignty. Washington, D.C.: Institute for the Development of Indian Law.
- Kuvlesky, William, P. (1991), "Ethnic Groups Racial Groups, Minorities and Other Things: Toward Conceptual Harmony", Paper Presented at the 1991 Southwestern Sociological Association Meetings, San Antonio.
- Lujan, Carol (May, 1990), "As Simple as One, Two, Three: Census Underenumeration Among American Indians and Alaska Natives", Bureau of the Census. Undercount Behavioral Research Group Staff Working Paper #2. Center for Survey Methods research.
- Marger, M.N., (1991), Race and Ethnic Relations. (Second Edition) Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing, Inc.
- Mathews, John Joseph, (1961), The Osage: Children of the Stars. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- McReynolds, Edwin C. (1954) Oklahoma A History of the Sooner State. Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press. (p. 291)
- Michels, Robert. (1959) Political Parties: A Sociological Study of the Oligarchical Tendencies of Modern Democracy. New York: Dover Publications.
- Morgan, David R., England, Robert E. and George G. Humphreys. (1991) Oklahoma Politics and Policies: Governing the Sooner State.

- Mosca, Gaetano (1939) The Ruling Class. (Elementi di Scienze Politica) 1st Edition New York and London: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc.
- National Archives Microfilm Publications. Indian Census Rolls; 1885-1940.
- Oklahoma Indian Affairs Letter. Armstrong to H.B. Freeman. November 23, 1894, Letter Book 292, pages 49-50.
- Parenti, Michael (1978), Power and the Powerless. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Parsons, Talcott, (1960) Structure and Process in Modern Society. New York: The Free Press.
- Pateman, Carole (1970), Participation and Democratic Theory. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Pevar, Steven L. (1992) The Rights of Indians and Tribes: The Basic ACLU Guide to Indian and Tribal Rights. Second Edition. Southern Illinois University Press: Carbondale and Edwardsville.
- Peterson, William. (1986) "Politics and the Measurement of Ethnicity". pp. 187-234. The Politics of Numbers. New York: Russel Sage Foundation.
- Ponca, Billie (June, 1990), Site Director, Whitehair Memorial Resource Center, Ralston, OK. Interview.
- Prewitt, Kenneth. (1983), "Public Statistics and Democratic Politics". Reprinted 1896, The Politics of Numbers. pp. 261-274. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- RCIA, Records of Correspondence (1885), National Archives and Records Service: American Indians. Page 91.
- Rose, Peter, (1981), They and We. (Third Edition), New York: Random House.
- Rousseau, Jean-Jacques (Original Print 1911: Copyright 1967) The Social Contract and the Discourse on the Origin of Inequality. Edited by Lester G. Crocker. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Scales, James R., and Danney Goble. (1982), Oklahoma Politics: A History. Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Schermerhorn, R.A. (1970), Comparative Ethnic Relations. New York: Random House.

- Shibutani, T. and Kwan, K.M. (1965), Ethnic Stratification: A Comparative Approach. New York: The Macmillian Company.
- Shryock, Henry S., Jacob S. Siegel, and Associates (1976), Condensed Edition by Edward G. Stockwell. The Methods and Materials of Demography. New York: Academic Press, Inc.
- Simpson, G.E. and Yinger, J.M. (1965), Racial and Cultural Minorities. (Fourth Edition) New York: Harper and Row, Publishers.
- Snipp, C. Mathew (1986), "American Indians and Natural Resource Development: Indigenous People's Land, Now Sought After, Has Produced New Indian-White Problems", American Journal of Economics and Sociology. 45:4.
- Snipp, C. Mathew (1991), American Indians: The First of This Land. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Starr, Paul. (1986), "The Sociology of Official Statistics". pp 07-58. The Politics of Numbers. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Sumner, William Graham. (1906 Edition), Folkways. New York: Dover Publications.
- van den Berghe, Pierre L. (1975), Man in Society: A Biosocial View. New York: Elsevier.
- Weber, Max. (1919/1920), General Economic History. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Transaction Books. 1981, p. 275.
- Weber, Max. (1922), Economy and Society. Guenther Roth and Claus Wittich, Editors. New York: Bedminster. 1968, pp. 90-100.
- Willie, Charles V. (1983), Race Ethnicity, and Socioeconomic Status: A Theoretical Analysis of Their Interrelationship. New York: General Hall, Inc.
- Wilson, Terry P. (1985), The Underground Reservation: Osage Oil. Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press.
- Yetman, Norman R., Editor (1991), Majority and Minority: The Dynamics of Race and Ethnicity in American Life. Fifth Edition. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

VITA ²

Jackie R. Burns

Candidate for the Degree of
Master of Science

Thesis: THE EFFECTS OF THE POLITICAL ECONOMY IN THE
CONSTRUCTION OF RACE CATEGORIES: CASE STUDY OF THE
OSAGE NATION

Major Field: Sociology

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, July
31, 1960, daughter of Patsy J. Hefner-Burns and
Morris R. Burns.

Education: GED, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, in 1979;
received Bachelor of Science Degree in Sociology
from University of Oklahoma at Norman in August of
1986; graduate studies pursued at Syracuse
University and State University of New York:
Environmental Science and Forestry, Syracuse, New
York, from 1986 to 1989; completed requirements
for the Master of Science degree, Sociology,
Oklahoma State University in July, 1993.

Professional Experience: Research Assistant,
Department of Sociology, University of Oklahoma,
May 1985, to August 1985. Research Supervisor,
Department of Sociology, University of Oklahoma,
April, 1986, to August, 1986. Reserach Assistant,
Special Grants Project Department, State
University of New York: Environmental Science and
Forestry, August, 1986, to December, 1987.
Teaching Assistant, Department of Sociology,
Oklahoma State University, August 1990, to May,
1992. Professional Research Interviewer,
Department of Sociology, Oklahoma State
University, June, 1992, to present.